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Person B: All right. Let’s see. So do you want to go ahead?

Person A: So I said that for the drug one, I don’t know. I don’t feel super strongly about this, but I was leaning more towards agreeing. Mainly because of what I’ve learned about the arbitrary difference between legal drugs and illegal drugs has often historically been a form of racial control more than it’s been about the protection of citizens. Because obviously there are a lot of really terrible things that are allowed in America like tobacco. And alcohol is much worse than cannabis and alcohol has been around forever. So that was basically the gist of why I was leaning more towards agree. And I feel like we could figure out more effective ways to help people struggling with addiction or drug use that’s non-recreational.

Person B: Yeah. I do feel the same way about the latter half of what you said. I just would prefer to maintain the idea that drugs aren’t that great, mostly because of the whole science of addiction and all that business.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: How do you -- even though there’s like marijuana, that’s kind of more under an entertainment lexicon, you know?

Person A: Mm-hmm.

Person B: And so it’s kind of like, okay, maybe that’s not as bad, but is it a gateway to other things? And then once it gets past that, there’s this whole idea of regulation. And we do it for food so like -- and drugs are a little bit more -- I mean I think that’s -- I know why we do all the testing on the drugs we already have or are already in development.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: In terms of like the drugs for therapy,

Person A: Mm-hmm.

Person B: So it’s like do you want it to be for entertainment or do you want it to be for therapy? And where is the line there? But I do agree with the whole what you’re saying about the lines being drawn more on the basis of race and stuff, and how can we focus on the ideas of compassionate care and yeah.

Person A: Yeah, totally. It’s a difficult topic because you don’t want to encourage people to ruin their lives and incentivize people that it’s okay if they try out cocaine. But I don’t know. I have a lot of friends who have experimented with drugs, and it’s never completely ruined their lives at all. But for some people it does, and that’s tricky because addiction is really complicated, and you don’t want to enable somebody.

Person B: Yeah. So I can see where you wouldn’t want -- or you’d want to not -- I guess it’s where the priorities lie. It’s hard to figure out.

Person A: Yeah, definitely.

Person B: Yeah, how everybody wants to save lives and all that.

Person A: For sure.

Person B: So it’s like which order do you do it in? But I think that, legal or illegal, it feels more like a secondary problem than figuring out how to care for people.

Person A: Yeah. Totally. I think another -- I don’t know if this is really like an argument or a point or a general question, but I kind of wonder how, I guess from like an economic standpoint -- I don’t know if it’s really economic -- but if drugs were to be legalized, if that would help regulate it in any way. Because a lot of places where drugs are coming from are from illegal places.

Person B: Oh, yeah.

Person A: Yeah. Dealers are off doing their own thing. And if it could be regulated by like actual manufacturers who have standards for the drugs, then maybe like OD’ing wouldn’t happen so often because it’s not like things are cut with other like bad substances.

Person B: Yeah, yeah. It’s really important. That’s why regulation exists so you can know where your source material comes from. And if people are so crazy about where their organic food comes from, you’d think they would be a little more picky about what’s in their mind-bending psychedelic or whatever.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Yeah. Let’s see. Anything else or?

Person A: Not really.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Yeah, I don’t know. I don’t feel super passionate about it. I feel like there are just a lot of problems in the world.

Person B: Yeah, there is. I mean locally though, it’s also really hard. Because you see on the BART [Bay Area Rapid Transit] how people found needles and stuff in the seats.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: And I would like to fix that first.

Person A: Yeah, definitely. I know.

Person B: How do you get that to stop happening?

Person A: Yeah. How do you?

Person B: It’s really interesting. It happens more than once, and then there’s this whole underground culture. And I wonder if -- I don’t know if making -- and it depends on which level of drugs too, I guess.

Person A: Yeah. But I think that’s the difficult part, like where do you draw the line and what -- because there’s schedule one drugs, and for a long time marijuana was a schedule one drug. And these are all kind of just arbitrary lines.

Person B: The different categories, right?

Person A: Yeah, yeah.

Person B: Yeah, there’s so much.

Person A: I know. It’s ridiculous. Maybe we should focus more on caring for people than caring about the things hurting the people.

Person B: Yeah, that’s definitely it. I have a friend in a nursing program, and she’s doing a unit on compassionate care. That’s why it’s on my mind, but --

Person A: Yeah, that’s super important.

Person B: Yeah, and she has to give presentations to people who are in recovering addiction centers. Not sure if that’s what they’re called but you know.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Those people are actually very curious about the effects that the drugs have on the brain and the body.

Person A: Oh, yeah.

Person B: It’s really interesting what she’s been telling me.

Person A: It is super interesting.

Person B: They ask a bunch of questions. And she, in a position as an educator, is like, “how do I do that without making them feel bad for their past choices?”

Person A: Yeah. I think it depends on person to person, because a lot more people are a lot more comfortable talking about their past, but I don't know.

Person B: Yeah. I guess it's different if you are in a center like that. Like you’re seeking out help and treatment.

Person A: Yeah, totally.

Person B: There’s the population beyond that would be more difficult to reach, I think.

Person A: Oh, for sure.

Person B: Yeah. There's a lot of little arms and stuff that come out of this, like the racial lines, the socioeconomic lines.

Person A: Mm-hmm.

Person B: People who suffer from other mental health issues and things of that nature.

Person A: Yeah, definitely.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: That's a pretty cool program, the compassionate care thing.

Person B: Yeah. It's the Bay Area, right? So that's what we tend to focus on.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: So if you want to do that.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: But it's just really interesting. I don't know if doctors have to go through that type of training.

Person A: I don't know. I feel like they would, but I don't know.

Person B: Yeah. Some doctors, they seem pretty cold.

Person A: Yeah. I’ve always thought that was interesting, because getting into med school is no joke and then some people, I feel like, shouldn't be doctors.

Person B: Yeah. Like the nurses, they do a lot of work. They gather all the information. The doctor just comes in and says you have this and take this.

Person A: Yeah. My aunt's a nurse, and her job is definitely a lot more people-work than what doctors do.

Person B: Yeah. Sounds pretty brutal but also important at the same time.

Person A: Oh, yeah. For sure. Medical field just sounds like a big mystery to me -- like interesting.

Person B: Yeah. It's a lot to do.

Person A: I don't know how long this thing [conversation] is supposed to go.

Person B: [The experimenters] said until 4:20 funny enough.

Person A: Yeah. I don't know what else to talk about.

Person B: Yeah, I’m trying to write. Was there anything else you wrote down on your little list? I think I said everything though.

Person A: Yeah. I think I said everything too. I thought the little tidbit about how -- where did they legalize drugs like Puerto Rico or something?

Person B: I think it was Portugal.

Person A: Portugal? Yeah. I thought it was interesting, but I wonder -- because that's the thing. That's really wonderful that's there, and I always get excited but I also get wary when they show statistics like that. Because trying to implement it in a larger space --

Person B: Yeah. Portugal’s quite small,

Person A: Yeah. It's a lot harder to do. So maybe if it was more like a city effort or like a country effort, it’d be easier. But making things happen at the nationwide levels.

Person B: Yeah. But look at like San Francisco, they can't even agree first of all. So many like --everyone’s a bleeding-heart liberal, but they can't agree with each other on how do to deal with the issues that -- you know?

Person A: Yeah, totally.

Person B: Like what makes a good solution, have like a needle exchange or what, you know?

Person A: Yeah.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: Oh, okay.

Person A: Okay.

Person B: It was nice talking to you.

Person A: Yes, nice talking to you too. Okay.

Person B: Okay, goodbye.

Person A: Bye bye.
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Person B: Cool. Do you oppose or support?

Person A: I support reparation for slavery. How about you?

Person B: All right. I'm iffy about it. I could see why some people oppose it, and I could see why people agree with it. But I don’t know. It’s really debatable.

Person A: I support it, but in terms of an implementation of the type of reparations to give, I mean that's a very complicated issue. We have such a complicated history of America working with or dealing with minority groups. And I may be going off topic a little bit, but I think there'd have to be a very intense study to see the type of reparations. And just growing up as a minority in this country, I've definitely witnessed a lot of systemic inequalities that exist, and that definitely serves as the foundation for -- how do I say this? I see a lot of inequalities in the systems, and it sets people at a disadvantage. And I think historically with African Americans that were subject to slavery, they’re definitely starting their foundations already at a disadvantage. And then with systems being built, such as the housing discrimination, they have the school-to-prison pipeline. There [are] a lot of things that -- it's a very complicated situation where I don't think there can be a kind of, "It's so great." I don't think it's a black and white issue.

Person B: Yeah. But one thing is that sometimes not everyone now deserves it. Because I grew up in Compton, and I went to school in Long Beach, so I know some areas. But there are some people that don't give a fuck. So they just sit on the welfare paycheck, and they don't try to work, or they don't try to find a job. They're just living off the government because they can. And so, they’re putting a bad image on other folks who are actually trying to do something with their lives. And it’s kind of like why should they be being paid when they're not trying? That’s why I'm opposed to it because not everyone deserves it, kind of thing. Because I understand it's pretty fucked up what happened in the past. But I don't know.

Person A: Mm-hmm. In terms of they -- I mean, who is “they”? Is that like a specific group or -- because in terms of folks taking on governmental assistance, I don't think it's necessarily just underrepresented communities. It's a more diverse group. Like the more PC way to say it, it’s a more diverse group that goes for governmental assistance.

Person B: Yeah, you're right. There are minority groups that need it, but there are also minorities that don't try to get out of it. They just keep doing nothing, and they just live by day off the welfare paycheck when they should be out looking for jobs, or they should be trying to do something. I'm not saying all of them, but I'm just saying there are some people.

Person A: But just to kind of counter that, they could be trying to get jobs or they could be trying to get that opportunity. But when you're walking into a place of employment and there’s already an implicit bias that the person that's hiring that may hold, that could already put the person at a disadvantage, like if they come in and they see that they're of a particular denomination or a particular race. Some people have these preconceived notions and have these stereotypes that these folks are a certain way, and then they already don't give them the opportunity. And then consequently, they can't advance themselves and get themselves off. I'm very involved in like social justice issues, so if I come off like --

Person B: No, no. You're good. Don't worry about it.

Person A: It’s just, for me, I actually grew up in an affluent community, and I was one of three folks that were a part of my minority group. So I didn't have representation, but I was exposed to the opportunities that are given to folks with affluence. And then, moving on into college years and then you see the inadequacies, and I don't -- and I may be going off on a tangent, but it's definitely a lot of it is relative to opportunity. They don't have the opportunities in these type of communities. So that may be the reason why it's hard to get out of that state. It’s just, for me, having been able to be a part of social groups where folks had the complete opposite of me, it has definitely opened my eyes to do a lot more research and to see that it's beyond -- I feel like there are systems that exist that people are not aware of that blatantly keep people disadvantaged.

Person B: Yeah. I don't know. Because where I grew up, like the type of middle school I went to and elementary school, it was predominantly either Blacks or Mexicans and Asians. And so, I was part of that minority group, because -- sorry, I'm Mexican by the way. So I understand how that’s a struggle. We were all minorities there, but we were all given the same opportunities. And I don’t know. It just depends on how you use them and sometimes some people don't want to use it.

Person A: Yeah. In terms of, “we're given the same opportunities,” I’m on the fence about that, because it’s like, “What are those opportunities that are equal?” Just to put it in example, bringing it back to the schooling system that I was at, we had like twenty, thirty AP classes, and then you go to another school and it's like two. Or they don't have the same kind of infrastructure in terms of who's teaching -- the resources that are on campus. The resources that are at our school are not the same. So it's hard for me to think that we're all given the same opportunities when we're not starting with the physically same resources. So I just feel like if we all had an equal playing field, then I could really format an opinion on whether or not people are just not taking advantage or are just milking the system. I have a background in helping out underrepresented students in education. So it’s definitely -- I know firsthand that resources are not the same.

Person B: I don’t know. Because in my experience I've worked -- I was part of my afterschool program at my middle school, and I later on volunteered at the same program. And one of my mentors, he was telling me I have a -- he’s really strict on these kids. If you don’t have above a 3.0 or a 2.0 at least, I think you wouldn't be able to participate in some of these programs. And there were some kids that would get straight F’s. And some of those F’s were zero percent. So that means that they really had to try not to do anything, because they didn't turn in any homework assignments or go to any of the tests. And so then, since they got zero, a bad GPA, they weren't allowed to participate in his good programs. And so, they would complain that he was -- what’s the word? I don’t know. But basically alienating the people that would do bad. They would make it seem like they're doing bad and it's not fair.

Person A: Or just being an obstacle for them. Is that what you're trying to say?

Person B: No.

Person A: Oh, okay.

Person B: Not obstacle, but -- so my friend made, not a program, but a system where if you get above a 2.0, he would hold a party for you, for the people that did very good. So like a pizza party or like a movie party or something like that where he’d play a movie and everyone would just relax and eat food. And the people that didn't have that 2.0 would have to sit out or go somewhere else. And so the whole point of that was so these kids would actually have to try and do good in school. But some kids didn't, because -- I don’t know. They don't care. And so, they would complain that they weren't able to participate in these fun programs because they were doing bad. And so, people started getting on my friend’s ass about like, “Oh, why can’t he participate?” And he's like, “Well, how is that my fault?” He's like, “They’re supposed to be trying, and if they’re not trying, how can I help them if they won’t help themselves?” kind of thing. And I don’t know. And so eventually, they got on his ass too much, and he had to let them in or whatever, and I don’t know. I just don’t see how that’s right.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Oops.

Person B: Oh.
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Person B: Hello.

Person A: Hello. Yup.

Person B: So I guess you said the -- do you oppose or support legalizing drugs in the U.S. -- and you support legalizing?

Person A: Yes, right. Yeah.

Person B: What is your reasoning?

Person A: So I think that it would be more cost-efficient to regulate the drug when we make it legal. And also, I also believe that people still have freedom of choice to do whatever they want, even if they kind of harm their own body.

Person B: I can agree with people being able to have the freedom to do what they want, but drugs like marijuana [are] one thing, but things like heroin and LSD and things like that, I don't see really a purpose for them. They're a lot more dangerous than marijuana is. I think that there was a part of the question that talked about how people are afraid to go to the police to ask for support because the drugs are illegal. I don't think we should legalize them, but I think we should decriminalize the system that makes those who are using these drugs have to immediately go to jail as if they are criminals rather than people who are sick.

Person A: But I think this kind of goes hand in hand when you kind of want to decriminalize. The drug user is kind of de facto legalizing the drug for some reason. And I wanted to let you know, my stance is cautiously support and not fully support -- like legalize everything, so it should have some kind of additional safeguard. For example, the age limit or the area where people can use.

Person B: Well the problem with that is you still just end up with the same thing. It's just that now we have maybe the smoke companies now creating drugs like heroin to sell, and then they'll start trying to advertise that to everybody who is of age. Which would be -- they could say, "Oh, you're 21," but it doesn't really matter what age you are. LSD or heroin is still a bad thing to consume -- as well as crack cocaine -- and from experience, I know that it's not something that is necessary or even good for anybody. And I wouldn't want to legalize it just because it would add revenue to the U.S. income. It is not really worth that kind of danger because that could kill thousands more people rather than having them go to jail. The problem I think is the criminalization of these drugs. If they were decriminalized, in a sense, saying, "Oh, well, someone says I need help because I'm a heroin addict." Instead of saying, "Oh, you're a heroin addict, you need to go to jail," maybe have a trial period where they are evaluated, they're put into a program where they can be helped, and then within that program a therapist maybe can decide whether they are able to actually continue a program of healing or not. In which case, if they seem like they're not ready to do that, then they do need basically a time out and go to jail but still continue to get support. Because if it's legalized, you'll end up with the same issue. You'd still be paying for a bunch of people going to try and get clean.

Person A: I think I have one point. It being legalized doesn't mean that the country would get more revenue from taxation or anything, but my point of view was that if it's legal then that would be more resources to put into regulating and helping people with any problems. There can be more funding and everything following the legalizations. Because [if] you make it legal, it's no longer underground, and people can bring their support from the government and also from the market mechanism as well. But as long as you make it illegal, it's kind of hard to pull any resources from the government or even from the private sector.

Person B: I don't really see that making any difference whether it's legal or not. People are still going to see people who take heroin or cocaine as a criminal. And I don't think anyone's going to want their tax dollars to go towards that either way because they see them as a criminal. So if they're saying, "Oh well it's legal now," then they're like, "Well, these are just legal drug addicts, and they're legal criminals." People would be first upset about the fact that it's legalized, and then they really wouldn't want any of their tax dollars going towards that.

Person A: I can give you some examples. For example, like for a private company, they would have more incentive to make a drug that’s less harmful to the body of the people who use it, instead of [having] people use it illegally and they don't know what the substance they are actually using. Sometimes it's worse than the pure substance that they use. So it can be less of an unknown chemical. Instead you know the quality and what are you putting in your body, instead of putting any shady substance because it's illegal. No one can control it. It can be even worse.

Person B: Well the difference between say, pure cocaine and crack cocaine, they're both still really bad for your body whether you know what's in it or not. It's not like really -- to me, I don't really see a difference. I have family members who are addicted to crack cocaine and family members who are addicted to heroin. From experience, I know that it's not something that can be differentiated between, "Because this is a pure substance, I paid more money and this company gave it to me now, and so it's better." I think that would just make the companies try and force more people to have the drug, but not so much put money into the healing. The healing system would just be kind of like a back burner when it should be at the forefront of the system. If there was a legalization, which I still totally disagree on, I don't think that it would be healthy for the U.S. as a whole. The Midwest is going through a terrible heroin addiction. And they have always been kind of forgotten as the people that have really bad heroin addictions, and no one cares about them. They don't really say that they're criminals, but they're always trying to go through this healing process. And I think that that is what's more important than just trying to find some way to get everyone to be on the same level of high.

Person A: I think that's not my point, but I think my point is that when you make anything legal, like private sector would come to the area. For example, even the health insurance -- that can be covered by health insurance instead of like [having] to pay it by yourself, or harder for people who use illegal drugs to find any treatment just because it's illegal. I don't know.

Person B: Well, I understand. I think I was a little confused, but I understand what you're saying about the insurance thing. The problem with that is I think the majority of people who probably are addicted to these drugs probably don't have health insurance to begin with and can't afford it to begin with. So even if they wanted to have insurance to help pay for the helping of getting off these drugs, they wouldn't have to be a part of these insurance companies. Even people who really need Medicare can't get Medicare. So I don't really see things being under insurance. If anything, it would help rich people who are addicted to some kind of drug get help. But the problem is they already are getting help, and most of them aren't criminalized anyway. They're just like, “Oh, that's really sad.” Which it is sad that they are addicted to the drug. Like Demi Lovato -- I don't know if you know, Demi Lovato has had a relapse and she's a heroin addict and she's going to rehab. But if it was legalized, she'd still be going to rehab. She probably paid to go to rehab. And like, if some guy on the street overdoses on heroin or overdoses on a drug that he paid for legally, he still can't go to the hospital and get help because he probably doesn't have insurance. Because most people in the U.S. don't have insurance.

Person A: I think most people in the U.S., they would have insurance. Like I know that a lot of people don't have insurance, but the majority of people still have insurance. And that would cover maybe not all of the people who use drugs, but many of them at least.

Person B: I highly doubt that because the people -- majority of my family don't have health insurance. And majority of the people that I know that are addicted to drugs, including people who are alcoholics that need support, also don't have health insurance. So I'm pretty sure that the majority of the U.S. does not have health insurance. Or if they do, they can't really afford their premiums to pay for health insurance. So it would depend. If insurance would be covered or if healing for drug addicts would be covered, it’d have to be covered on a basic level. Which would be extremely expensive for the government and insurance companies because becoming sober from any drug, even alcohol, takes a lifetime because it's an everyday process. So that’s the other thing, I don't really think the government will really be happy with that. Because one, we could get a patient who's addicted to any kind of drug, whether it's alcohol, heroin, cocaine -- that kind of addiction lasts an entire lifetime. It doesn't end after a couple of years, 5 or 10 years, you could relapse after 20 years of not having a certain drug. And this again, I have experienced. Both my parents were alcoholics when they were younger and have been sober for 40 years. But they had a friend who was sober for 50 years, and one day they just slipped up and had a drink. And they relapsed and they ended up dying within a month and a half. And it had been 50 years of them not having a drink. So it's something that seems like a really expensive kind of system just to legalize.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: Bye bye.

Person A: Bye.
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Person B: Do you want to go first?

Person A: Yeah, sure. So my opinion was that the speakers should be allowed. And I'm guessing yours is that they shouldn't, correct?

Person B: Yep.

Person A: Okay. So I guess I can just kind of give the reasons for why I think they should be, and we can go from there. One of my reasons is the fact that Berkeley is a public university. So free speech being kept in mind, they do have the legal right to come on campus and speak. Also, there are affiliated campus organizations like the College of Republicans who are able to invite speakers and use the facilities granted that they're able to pay for the facility and all associated costs. Which they were able to, which allows them to invite the speakers on campus. I know the question stated that there is psychological damage that can be caused, and I understand that and I respect that. But at the same time, I feel like that possibility for damage is present just through media influences or like -- it's not that they're not aware that these sentiments exist. And not that I agree with these sentiments, but I do think that in order to promote a healthier political climate, I think that dialogue needs to take place.

Person B: Is that it?

Person A: For now, yes.

Person B: Oh, okay. So I think my main thing was that there's a difference between hate speech and free speech. And if you were to use examples from the past year, like what's happened at Berkeley -- I guess since we both go here, we can kind of both relate. But if the school finds itself spending an enormous amount of money on police and barricades and guns and "protection," then I don't think it's a good idea. Because everyone -- although people do have a right to come and speak because it's a public university, the university is first supposed to be held accountable by its students who go there, who pay tuition there. And so, the campus needs to be a safe space for everyone. And if the university is going to spend thousands and thousands of dollars on security purposes, then that should be a big red flag telling them that this person is not creating a safe environment. And it's kind of like they're anticipating that bad things will happen, but then they're having police to try and make it not happen. And as a result, you get hundreds of cops all over campus. Sproul [Plaza] is shut down, barricaded. You have destruction of university property because [of] what's happening at these events. The kind of people that these controversial speakers attract are ones that like to get violent. And sometimes [they] don't even care about the actual topic being discussed. They just want an excuse to wear masks and throw bricks basically, right? That's what happened last time, is that a controversial speaker came and then a group of people came and caused a lot of violence. And as a result, students had to pay for the damages. And I think Berkeley is not the only place that people can come and speak. If they wanted to speak, they could go and rent a hall in Oakland or in another place in Berkeley or an auditorium. It doesn't always have to be the university that has to be at the central action. So that's just what I think.

Person A: No, I respect that. So what I'm understanding is you're coming from more of a financial stance than a psychological one, is that correct?

Person B: I'm saying both. Like if the university is spending so much money to have police, then that should be a red flag that they shouldn't be having this thing happen in the first place. Because right when the university lets this stuff happen, they're putting "free speech" above the safety of their students. And that's not okay. They need -- I'm coming from a safe perspective because as a person of color, as a person who visibly practices her religion and comes from an immigrant family, I'm always the one who has to be scared after these kinds of things and has to be scared about what these controversial speakers have to say. And I would hope that my thousands of dollars in tuition, that the university would keep me safe and not allow any controversial person to come and speak, regardless.

Person A: I respect your sentiments there, but at the same time, your tuition is being paid, but so [are] the tuition of students whose thoughts coincide with the values of these speakers and who want to hear these speakers. So I think the members of the group who invited the speakers, the College Republicans, their tuition is also being put for this. And I know that the police have a pretty negative image, and I'm not going to comment on that. That's not the purpose of this call.

Person B: That would be a different debate.

Person A: That would be a very different debate, but yeah. The police are there for safety, right? So the presence of outsiders, that can't be controlled. But the university does take measures, and putting the police there is for the students’ safety.

Person B: Honestly, having police there makes the environment more hostile. Like when I was there, I saw so many cops who are wearing bulletproof vests. In theory, if they're there to protect us, shouldn't they be giving us bulletproof vests? Like, they had these huge guns, tasers, dogs. What kind of setting does that give someone when they go to class that morning? Even if they're not a political person. Even if they're so neutral about the whole situation, or are so oblivious to what is happening that day? A lot of people come from neighborhoods that the police are always at, the police are always raiding. And just having the presence of so much armory and artillery and things that are used to kill people are -- it's just a very negative academic environment, and it's not conducive to learning at all. And we pay tuition so the university can teach us, not so that we can invite speakers to come and hear them speak. Like, I understand everyone else is paying tuition, but safety has to be everyone's priority, and that nobody's going to argue against that. Like, "Oh, I would prefer to not be safe versus hear this person speak." It's not like every single person is being given the same spotlight as these people are. And I think a lot of the times they come just so they can incite a crowd, and then sometimes they don't even show up at the end of the day. So I don't even know if they're even purposeful or professional in how they go about having their event.

Person A: So to that, I mean, I have two questions. Do you have any -- I know safety is a concern and I respect that, I one hundred percent agree with that.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: So do you know if students were injured during the protests? Or if students are fearing their safety than that's the situation that they're not being forced to put themselves in. So if it's a concern or like a worry then you don't have to place yourself in that situation. And as far as I recall, I don't remember any reports of students being injured or any of that. And then another thing is you brought up a point that the main purpose here is to learn, and learning happens through conversation and dialogue and that's a part of learning, right? Being able to listen to an opposing viewpoint and being able to make of it what you will in order to form your own opinions. So just from that I don't think it gets in the way of learning, but at the same time I do think that argument has weight because I did have classes that were canceled because of this. But that was because the professors didn't agree with the speakers’ views and they chose not to host class. But because safety concerns and students couldn't come to class or any of that.

Person B: So are you suggesting that we wait until a student gets hurt and then stop inviting controversial speakers?

Person A: No, I don't think that's wise to any extent actually. But I'm just saying if we're going to say that it's a threat to safety, and then the campus does their part by instilling police, and then we say, "Oh, the police make the students uncomfortable,” I think it comes to a point where you have to accept something, right?

Person B: Yeah, and not invite the speaker or not let them host it. Like, why does it have to be Berkeley, where like right now, if we don't go to class, our grades are in jeopardy. We need to study. There are exams going on, right? Like we're here for a certain amount of years. For a lot of people, their homes are thousands of miles away, right? So the school is part of their daily life. It's part of what they do. That's part of their purpose. They're here to get their degree. They're here to learn about a subject. There are literally so many other venues that are accessible to Berkeley students that can manage that big of a crowd that are not on campus, and that everyone can choose to be around if they want to. If a person wants to get to class, and the class is not canceled, and they have no choice but to go through a specific route on campus to get there. And if the protest or the event or whatever is happening along that route, they have no choice but to go through it. Either that or they're forced to alter something that they have full right upon. That is, a safe passage to their classroom, just so that other people can hear someone speak when they could have done that just as easily a block away. Like there are so many theaters and venues that they could have had it at.

Person A: So, I totally respect that other spaces that are available. But that's because Berkeley students -- it's quite obvious that the administration leans one way on the political spectrum and the students lean in the opposite direction most clearly. But then, is this atmosphere -- is it being created because students fear their safety or because students don't agree with the viewpoints of the speakers present?

Person B: I think it can easily just be both, because sometimes a lot of these speakers --

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: Oh. Wait, are we done? That was so fast. Oh, we only had 12 minutes.

Person A: Oh, wow. That flew.
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Person A: Hey.

Person B: Hi.

Person A: We're talking about reparations, right?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Okay. Cool.

Person B: Do you want to go first?

Person A: I don't know. I think we could just be like, “do you agree or not” first.

Person B: Yeah, so I opposed.

Person A: Oh, well I agreed.

Person B: Yeah. Honestly, I thought that, especially with our current political climate, doing something like this would just anger a lot of people, and they think that they have the right to be angry. And I feel it would just cause more conflict than it's really worth.

Person A: I definitely get your point. But at the same time people are going to have opinions and be mad about shit no matter what you do.

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: I don't know necessarily that it's worth getting all the shit that it's going to cause if it did happen, but I think it is still a good cause or something worthy.

Person B: I definitely think it's a good cause, but I just feel it really would make things worse. Because it's not just opinion, it's that they have to pay higher taxes to do this and they think it's okay now. So I feel it would really just cause a lot of conflict and a lot of anger instead of, "Oh, we're sorry.”

Person A: True. Wait, but who would think it's okay now?

Person B: Just a lot of people who are honestly kind of racist and because of our president, they think it's okay.

Person A: Mm-hmm. Yeah, I get that. I think it doesn't necessarily have to be solid money, but I think people should do more community building, like tutoring initiatives or better loans, or just really small stuff like free glasses that help kids do better in school, you know? Small stuff. It doesn't have to be thousands of dollars. You know?

Person B: Yeah, yeah. I definitely know what you mean. But I think then it becomes hard of like, defining the line of who gets. Because if you're like, “Free glasses for kids, but only Black kids,” then other poor different races will be like, “Wait, what? How about us?” Do you see what I mean?

Person A: True. Yeah, I do.

Person B: It's very hard to just identify a certain race, because it's going to be human nature to be upset and to wonder, “Why not us?”

Person A: True. For sure.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: I mean -- I don’t know, I was thinking -- because you know how prisons are -- did you watch Thirteen? It's on Netflix.

Person B: I feel like -- oh, I watched a little bit. Yeah.

Person A: Yeah, the way prisons are like basically legal slavery, it can -- you could use it in that way and it's definitive who is affected and who isn't.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: But then again, it would still be complicated because then people who are Black but not in prison -- yeah. It's definitely hard. I get it.

Person B: Yeah. I definitely think our prison system needs to be changed. I hate the way our prison system works.

Person A: Yeah, it's bad.

Person B: It's just horrible. They're humans.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: And it doesn't even save us money. It costs a lot.

Person A: Yeah. It really, really does. I don’t know. I guess reparations in itself isn't the most practical thing. I think just helping more is what is needed. But I guess -- there's that one quote that’s like, “You can't pull a knife that's nine inches deep into someone's back and pull it out two inches and then say it's healed” or something.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: I feel like it's like that. But it's so hard to go about -- because you can't repair slavery, you know?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: You can't put it back. But then again, Black people in America especially are still facing so much shit.

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: So if not reparations, what? You know?

Person B: Mm-hmm. I think like -- it sounds bad, but it's been so far that's it's very hard to delineate. I think like they were mentioning descendants of slavery or something. I feel like that's just very hard to detect too, you know?

Person A: Really?

Person B: I don't really know, but there were so many people then. And I think it's a little different because it's been so long, that I feel a lot of people are just not going to be okay with it because of costs or they'll be like, “Why not us?” Things like that. Because what if there's a descendant and they ended up really well, like they're really rich now, and you just give them more because they’re a descendant? Do you see how some people could get really mad?

Person A: Yeah, I do.

Person B: Yeah. Because we don't know where these descendants are now.

Person A: That's true. But largely they’re not. We could have specifics that would kind of -- yeah.

Person B: Yeah. I definitely agree with that.

Person A: Because it was two generations ago -- of slavery. So it's not that hard to delineate, but if people were freed before that then it would be iffy.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: But still. You know?

Person B: Yeah. I definitely agree. It’s not right.

Person A: Yeah. It’s difficult.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Yo, dude, are you here for the money? Because I am.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: I need to -- I bought a $100 ticket to a concert because I'm dumb so I'm here.

Person B: Oh my God, what concert?

Person A: Mitski. But I was thinking of going to Illenium, but that's $80 extra.

Person B: I heard Mitski is really good.

Person A: Yeah, I'm really excited.

Person B: Yeah, Illenium tickets are crazy expensive. It sold out so fast.

Person A: Yeah, because people go every year. But I found a guy who was going to sell it to me for $80, which is pretty good already.

Person B: Oh, that is really good. That’s really cheap for Illenium.

Person A: Yeah, for a resale it’s crazy. But I was like, “eh.” Plus the rolling, that’s too much.

Person B: But it’s before Thanksgiving, so you have time to just be dumb and recover and eat.

Person A: That’s true. Is this your first study getting paid or have you done this before?

Person B: This is my first one.

Person A: Oh, same.

Person B: Oh, really?

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: I was like, “Oh, I don’t have to really do much. So.”

Person A: Yeah, I'm down to get paid.

Person B: $13 to talk.

Person A: Yeah, I kind of feel bad for whoever has to listen to this portion.

Person B: Yeah. Oh man. And you just mentioned rolling too.

Person A: Maybe they don't know what rolling is.

Person B: Rolling dough.

Person A: Yeah, you know, rolling in the snow because we're so wholesome. No, snow -- I feel like rolling in the snow is the other one. That’s bad. Wow, we're so good at politics. What year are you?

Person B: I'm a senior. How about you?

Person A: I'm a sophomore.

Person B: Oh, what major are you?

Person A: Psychology, you?

Person B: I'm ISF [Interdisciplinary Studies Field].

Person A: What is that?

Person B: It's Interdisciplinary, so you combine different majors to create a thesis.

Person A: Oh, cool, what are you combining?

Person B: Psych, Soc [sociology], and Econ to do like consumer behavior.

Person A: Oh, nice! Cool.

Person B: How do you like psych? I heard there are really interesting classes.

Person A: Yeah, I'm starting to take my first upper divisions this semester and I really like it.

Person B: Oh, really?

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: What's been your favorite?

Person A: Okay, honestly my favorite class ever was American Sign Language, but my favorite psychology was Personality. What was yours?

Person B: I took Psych 2 last semester, and I actually really, really liked it.

Person A: It's cool, right?

Person B: Yeah, you just learn so much and look around at the world, and you’re like, “I see all these psychology things.”

Person A: Yeah, you're like, "Oh, hindsight bias -- oh, Freud."

Person B: Yeah, yeah. Or procrastination, oh my God.

Person A: Yeah, all of it. And then getting sick after the exam and I’m like, "Oh I know what that is."

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: It’s so funny.

Person B: Or overconfidence for tests. Oh, man.

Person A: Uh-huh.

Person B: Oh, man. I can cram a midterm in a day.

Person A: Oh yeah, I can cram it an hour before. Don’t do that. That’s bad.

Person B: Dude, I'm that person that's holding their paper at the doorway reading frantically -- my notes.

Person A: Big mood. Where's your apartment? Do you live in an apartment?

Person B: Yeah. I live on Dwight and College. How about you?

Person A: Oh, cool. I live on Kittredge and Shattuck.

Person B: Oh, that's really far.

Person A: No. It's next to the Berkeley Public Library. It’s not crazy far. I have friends who live on the Northside.

Person B: Oh, really?

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Wait, are psych classes all in Tolman [Hall]?

Person A: Mine are in Li Ka Shing [building].

Person B: Oh, that's far.

Person A: Yeah, I mean it's really close to my apartment so I'm okay with that.

Person B: That's true.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Are you excited for Mitski?

Person A: Yeah, dude. I'm so excited. I'm going to see Seth the Sky this Friday too. Or next Friday? Next Friday.

Person B: Oh my God, Seth the Sky is so good, I saw him before.

Person A: Really?

Person B: Yeah, I really liked him.

Person A: Did you roll or did you just go?

Person B: Oh, I was just drunk.

Person A: Oh.

Person B: Drunk on fun, for whoever’s listening.

Person A: I can't believe we're getting paid for this.

Person B: I'm hoping that once we go off, they just pause and stop listening.

Person A: I hope so, but maybe they have to listen the whole way through to be like, “Oh maybe they start talking about reparations again.”

Person B: We've had a very wholesome conversation.

Person A: Yeah, I mean neither of us was racist and neither of us were like, “Oh you're a terrible person.” I was a little scared when they were like, “Oh you're going to debate.” I was like, “Oh no.”

Person B: Yeah, that's what I thought. I was like, “Oh no, we're going to have this big fight,” and this is Berkeley.

Person A: Yeah, I get your point though. Conceptually, it’s good. Practically, it’s bad.

Person B: Yeah, but it's like “in a perfect world.” Well, in a perfect world, we wouldn't have slavery in the first place.

Person A: Yeah, I get it.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: I don't know. It's so confusing.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Because dang, I would also like to get paid for my ancestors who did not work on the Chinese railroad. But I would love to get paid.

Person B: Same.

Person A: You know? I don't know.

Person B: I mean I would want it -- but then my friends would be like, “What the fuck,” and I would feel really bad.

Person A: Yeah exactly. I don't know. People would just be getting fucked.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: And it's not even necessarily by race, but it is, you know?

Person B: Yeah, it's definitely a factor.

Person A: Yeah. A huge factor, which is –

**[Experimenter says time is up.]**

Person B: Oh, I think he’s talking.

Person A: Oh, shit.
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Person A: All right then.

Person B: So what do you think about this topic?

Person A: I said that I supported legalizing drugs.

Person B: Oh, I said I oppose it.

Person A: Oh, okay. Well, that makes sense -- why we were paired up.

Person B: Yeah. So why do you support it?

Person A: There are a lot of reasons. I guess primarily, to me it doesn't make sense to jail someone for something that doesn't affect other people. So it’s kind of like alcohol and weed are legalized because it's not like you're affecting anyone else by doing drugs. Of course your choices can affect others, but just on principle alone, doing a drug only affects you. And then beyond that, drug use is really racialized and disproportionately affects minority groups. And criminalization is a waste of money and it doesn't ever really ever help the addicts.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: What are your thoughts?

Person B: So I oppose it because of the simple reason that if you legalize drugs in the U.S., then more people will start taking it who were fearful of taking it and then it would already be more prevalent. And I think maybe even the death rate would increase, because more people will have more free will to take the drugs and they'll start taking it on a more frequent basis. And it will become hard to control and there won't be any limits or boundaries to how many drugs people are taking. So I thought that it's not a good idea to legalize drugs in the U.S.

Person A: Right. I get what you're saying. I think I disagree just because there have been other cases in countries where they have legalized drugs and it actually has lowered the death, because they have more resources funded to help people who are in crisis situations. And there are more resources for rehabilitation. So I don't know necessarily that legalizing it would actually increase the use. I mean it might increase casual use, but as far as deaths go or serious consequences of drug use, I think that it actually might do the opposite, because we spend so much money going after cartels, jailing people for drug convictions, just like the amount you spend on a prisoner every year is like tens of thousands of dollars.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: And I feel that money could easily go towards clean needle programs or rehabs or counseling, especially for low income people because that's usually who's affected. And they're going to be doing it anyway, and you might as well have help available.

Person B: So if you don't legalize the drugs and still do these programs, they're still being supported, right? It's not like, "Oh, they're not being supported." So I just don't feel that it should be legalized.

Person A: Uh-huh. Well those programs, they don't have as much funding as they should. I guess I'm saying the funds could easily be diverted.

Person B: Yeah, I get it your point.

Person A: Yeah. I get the gut reaction of like, "It doesn't seem right to legalize drugs." Right?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: I don't know. I just, looking at it from like -- I like to be consistent in my logic. And so I support alcohol and I support weed, so I don't see how drugs -- I mean there is difference because there's a difference in the severity, but it's kind of like drawing this really arbitrary line between what's considered super illegal. Especially because they have that dumb schedule system where it's like some drugs are considered worse than others, and marijuana is a level one drug and cocaine's a level three. It's really stupid. So I feel like at least we should redo the way that we rank them.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: I don't know what else to say.

Person A: Yeah, me neither. I don't know.

Person B: I think now we just have to kind of use the time to discuss something else or something like that.

Person A: Okay. I don't know. Do you have any other thoughts about anything?

Person B: I mean, I'm not too sure. About this topic, I'm not too sure what I should choose, but I would stick to my claim of not supporting the legalizing of the drugs.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: I guess it would be the same for you as well. You would support legalizing the drugs, right?

Person A: I mean when I saw the question -- it's kind of -- I support more decriminalizing them than legalizing them.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: So I guess it's kind of different because legalizing is like you can use it and there are no consequences. Whereas decriminalizing means that you won't get a felony offense for it.

Person B: Yeah. I think what you're trying to say is making sense, but in terms of the legalizing, I don't know if that really makes sense. I think decriminalizing or something could be done.

Person A: Yeah. I agree.

Person B: But I think legalizing is too much of free will. Right?

Person A: Yeah, I agree. I think that's more where towards I lean.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: I guess I feel pretty strongly about it, but not too much. It's not like I'm a drug user so I don't really care if it's legalized or not.

Person B: Yeah, me too.

Person A: I think more than anything I'm just passionate about it because I know that really low income, Black and Brown people are really -- you know, they feel the consequences of these laws. And certain drugs that Black people use more will get harsher sentences than the ones White people use. Just dumb stuff like that.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Yeah. So.

Person B: So why did you decide to do this study today?

Person A: Well, I have a meeting at five and I had an hour gap, so I thought why not make some money? What about you?

Person B: Yeah, me too, I just thought I would get some exposure to being in a study research.

Person A: Yeah. Have you done any other ones?

Person B: No, I'm a freshman so I'm just -- this is my first time. What about you?

Person A: I did one a week ago. It was my first one. I'm a senior. I don't know why I didn’t do this sooner, but I did one a week ago and it was really -- it was 20 minutes. And I was like, "Oh that was easy.” I don’t have that many classes this semester, so I was like, “Might as well fill my time with something that makes a little extra money.”

Person B: Yeah. So what was your topic on last time? Was it similar to this?

Person A: It was a different study -- it wasn't about this at all, it was something different.

Person B: So would you continue doing this, this semester?

Person A: Yeah, why not? I have free time -- I have an actual job so I don’t know why I don’t take more hours there. But.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: This is cool too.

Person B: So what's your major?

Person A: Conservation and Resource Studies. What about you?

Person B: Oh sorry, what’s that?

Person A: Conservation and Resource Studies.

Person B: Oh, okay.

Person A: What about you?

Person B: I'm undecided as of yet, but I'm leaning towards Interdisciplinary Field Studies major.

Person A: Oh, that's the one where you get to pick everything?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: That's how mine is too. It's really nice.

Person B: So is your major offered in the L&S College or?

Person A: No, it’s Natural Resources.

Person B: Oh, okay. So you applied for the College of Natural Resources.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Oh, okay. That’s nice.

Person A: How do you like it at Berkeley so far?

Person B: I think it’s pretty tough. I mean, I didn’t expect it to be so tough.

Person A: Yeah, it’s hard.

Person B: Yeah, it is pretty hard.

Person A: Crushes your spirit.

Person B: Uh-huh, yeah. So what classes are you taking this semester?

Person A: I’m taking Environmental Problem Solving, Urban Garden Ecosystems, and Public Policy 101. And then I’m also writing my thesis, so that’s an extra three units.

Person B: Oh, okay.

Person A: Mm-hmm. What about you?

Person B: I’m taking English R1A, Psychology 1, then CS198 which is a DeCal [student-run course] thing, and Psych 198 which is public speaking.

Person A: Oh. So just like, learning how to talk in front of crowds?

Person B: Yeah, pretty much.

Person A: That’s a useful skill.

Person B: Yeah, I mean it was an elective and I didn’t want to really stretch myself too much this term because I have to go back earlier to play in a tournament.

Person A: Oh, what do you play?

Person B: I play chess.

Person A: Oo, that's cool.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Are you one of those chess geniuses who competes and stuff?

Person B: Yeah, I play in -- I'm from India actually, so I play for my state and country also, yeah.

Person A: What part of India are you from?

Person B: I'm from Delhi.

Person A: Oh, okay. I'm going there in December after I graduate with my friend because she's from there. I’m really excited.

Person B: Oh wow, that’s nice.

Person A: I've always wanted to go.

Person B: Yeah, it's pretty good. Like if you haven't been there you will really like it, to go and see the different places that it has to offer.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Where are you from?

Person A: San Diego.

Person B: Oh, okay.

Person A: California.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Did you -- have you lived there your whole life?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Oh okay, so do you have family here?

Person B: No.

Person A: Oh wow, that must be hard.

Person B: Yeah, but I do have some friends here in Oakland, so I go sometimes there during the weekend. But yeah, it's a bit hard.

Person A: Yeah. I can't imagine being that far away.

Person B: Oh yeah. I mean it's more to do with the food and stuff that gets a bit difficult.

Person A: Oh.

Person B: But otherwise it's fine.

Person A: Why is that?

Person B: It's because I'm a vegetarian and I'm used to eating home-cooked food.

Person A: Yeah, I feel you. I'm vegan, so I get it.

Person B: Yeah, okay. Oh, you're vegan.

Person A: Yeah, so I don’t eat meat either.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: And there aren't very many good Indian places around here.

Person B: No, there aren't. I mean, the ones that are there aren't really Indian, Indian food. They're kind of portraying themselves as Indian restaurants but they aren't really the main food that you get there.

Person A: Oh, I see. Do you live in the dorms?

Person B: Yeah, I stay in Unit 1.

Person A: Oh, okay. I guess it will be easier when you get your own kitchen and you can cook for yourself.

Person B: Yeah, probably.

Person A: Yeah, that's how I felt.

Person B: Yeah, but I'm not too good at cooking either.

Person A: You'll learn.

Person B: Yeah. Where do you stay here?

Person A: I have an apartment on Northside.

Person B: Oh okay.

Person A: Mm-hmm.

**[Experimenter says time is up.]**
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Person A: Hello.

Person B: Hi. How's it going? What's your name?

Person A: Hi, I'm [name redacted]. What's your name?

Person B: [Name redacted].

Person A: [Name redacted], nice to meet you.

Person B: Oh, it’s hella loud. Okay. All right, cool. So drugs, what's your position on that?

Person A: I support the legalization of drugs in the U.S.

Person B: All drugs?

Person A: Define -- I don't know, I guess.

Person B: Do you think crack cocaine and meth should be legal?

Person A: I don't think making them illegal is an effective way to stop the use of it.

Person B: Uh-huh. Yeah. That's true.

Person A: So I think there's a better way. I don't think that it should be promoted, [as if] you should use these drugs or anything, but I don't think that making them illegal is something that is an effective way to go about it.

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: Yeah. What's your position?

Person B: I think there are a lot of issues with drugs. I think making weed legal was a good call, but I think certain drugs like heroin and opium and meth and whatever currently should not be legal because there's no point in making it easier to access. Because there are just so many issues that arise from them.

Person A: Mm-hmm.

Person B: So. while people can access it, I think we'd have more problems if it was easier accessible, like guns for instance.

Person A: Okay. I guess that makes sense. But I think that drugs -- making them illegal doesn't necessarily make them harder to access. I feel like if you wanted a drug, it's definitely pretty easy to go out and find it.

Person B: I mean, I don't really know where to get opium, specifically.

Person A: But if you wanted to know where to get opium, I think you could do that.

Person B: Yeah, true. Yeah. So what do you think should be done?

Person A: I think instead of using prison as a punishment, drug addicts and drug users should be sent to rehabilitation centers and actually be treated for their addiction.

Person B: Yeah, that's a good call.

Person A: Yeah, because, at the end of the day, it's purely biological, so if you just send drug users, to jail, they're obviously going to go back. So I don't think it's useful to just use the law as a punishment.

Person B: Yeah, I don't know. I think maybe people who make the drugs should be in trouble somehow, but I don't think just throwing a bunch of people in jail who were using these drugs is a good call because we spend more money on jail than our education system.

Person A: Yeah, that's true.

Person B: But yeah, I still don't think that drugs should be legal. There should be some punishment for people who are making these drugs that are causing a lot of people harm.

Person A: Yeah. But there's no way you could ever find all the drug dealers in the world or punish all of them because --

Person B: No, but the ones you can find.

Person A: I guess that's true. Yeah.

Person B: They could work from limiting it from the source. That would be a good way to solve the problem.

Person A: Mm.

Person B: Because if drugs are legal, then I don’t know. I just don’t think it's a good call. I think there'd be a lot of health issues and stuff. Even kids in middle school could get Triple C and stuff, you know?

Person A: Well, obviously there’d be an age limit. It wouldn't be like, “Oh, if you're 12 you can go out and buy heroin.” That's not how it should be, but I don't know.

Person B: Yeah, yeah.

Person A: If you’re 12 and you want heroin, I think there's ways you could -- if you were really determined to get a drug, you could.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: So I don't think making it legal would be like, “Oh, everyone is going to start doing it now.” Because I think if you wanted to before, then you're definitely probably already doing it.

Person B: Yeah. What would be the benefit of making them illegal?

Person A: Well, a lot of people go through really unsafe methods to get drugs, which is super harmful. Obviously, there’s no company mass producing drugs. So it’s just on an individual basis, and a lot of people they get it through are not very good people and they could lace drugs. It’s just not safe for people.

Person B: Yeah. But it’s not safe if it’s legal either.

Person A: I mean if it's legal then companies could regulate it, or you know how you regulate food?

Person B: Yeah. Oh, like the USDA and stuff.

Person A: Yeah. You're not going to find -- I don't know, if – there are consequences for if there's something dangerous in your food, and it would probably be the same way for new drugs.

Person B: Mm-hmm. I feel like there should be some consequence though for people using these crazy drugs because they are a threat to society. I don't want someone just -- it's kind of scary walking around people that are all cooked out on heroin, and they shouldn't just be able to do that with no consequence because it's pretty scary and they're so unpredictable.

Person A: Yeah, that's true. I do believe that that's not safe, but at the same time having consequences, I don't feel like affects them in any way.

Person B: I don't know, but don’t you think more people would be willing to try it if there were no consequences and then maybe we'd have a stronger addiction problem, like a higher addiction rate?

Person A: I don't know if you read it in the survey, but it was talking about how -- I don't know what country it was, like Venezuela or something, they legalized drugs and since then, their addiction rates and drug problems have gone down by a lot. Which I think makes sense because I think there’s sort of this -- if something’s illegal, some people might want to do it more.

Person B: Mm. Yeah. Maybe.

Person A: If something’s legal, some people are like, “Oh, it’s probably not that cool anyways.”

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: I think that’s the thing with a lot of drugs. It’s the stigma around it.

Person B: Yeah, maybe. I also don’t think a lot of people are doing it because it’s illegal. I think people are doing it for the high and that feeling.

Person A: Yeah. Mm-hmm.

Person B: And I think more people would do it for that feeling and get addicted if it was easily accessible. Yeah, there should be some sort of, I don’t know, something.

Person A: Yeah, I agree it should be regulated.

Person B: Yeah. Can’t be a free for all.

Person A: Yeah. No, it should definitely be regulated. We shouldn't just have hard drugs at the store.

Person B: Yeah. Get some cocaine with your Cheerios. Yeah. Okay, well, that was an exciting discussion.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: We can agree to disagree. It's cool.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: So what'd you do today?

Person A: I took a nap for three hours which is nice

Person B: A three-hour nap?

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Dang. I'm always super groggy after long naps like that.

Person A: Me too, but I felt so refreshed today.

Person B: That's good. That normally really disorients me.

Person A: Yeah. Mm-hmm.

Person B: Cool.

Person A: How was your day?

Person B: My day was good. I spent the night at a friend's. And then I had a studio project for Landscape Architecture. So we had a project where we had to create time-lapse videos of our design process with creating a green wall for Davis Hall. And so I've never made a video before and I'm really not savvy in terms of technology. And yeah, my video was horrible. But there were some videos that were really out there. Someone put on this very explicit song and their design was a pube wall for Davis Hall.

Person A: Oh my God.

Person B: Their whole design was based on pubic hair, people and human form.

Person A: That’s amazing.

Person B: It was pretty intense.

Person A: Wow.

Person B: So we were all – I mean I admire their audacity and their courage to be able to put that in front of a whole class watching.

Person A: Yeah. I know.

Person B: And literally it’s like, “Free the pubes,” and then their name.

Person A: Wow.

Person B: I’m just like, “Oh my God.”

Person A: That’s a cool project though.

Person B: Yeah it was interesting. And then we went on a walk to Northside [Berkeley].

Person A: Ooh that’s a long walk.

Person B: To some theology school. Have you heard of this religious theology school?

Person A: No, I haven’t.

Person B: Okay. Well yeah, so we went there because we have to make a design for this place. And then I had my swim class. I read a bit. It’s been pretty chill.

Person A: Nice.

Person B: Yeah. I might bake cookies later and watch Jane the Virgin or do yoga.

Person A: Oh, that sounds like a fun evening.

Person B: Yeah. Do you watch any shows?

Person A: Not right now but I have seen Jane the Virgin and I've seen pretty much everything on Netflix, basically.

Person B: Everything on Netflix?

Person A: Not everything. But a lot. Most of the things.

Person B: Most of the TV shows or movies or just everything?

Person A: TV shows.

Person B: Okay. That's a lot of material to go through.

Person A: I'm dedicated.

Person B: Yeah. I am not. It takes me -- I've only finished one series. No, two series.

Person A: Oh, wow.

Person B: Gossip Girl and One Tree Hill.

Person A: Wow.

Person B: And those took me years.

Person A: Those are long though.

Person B: Yeah, yeah. What are some of your favorite TV shows?

Person A: I like The Office.

Person B: Solid.

Person A: And Friends. Yeah.

Person B: Nice. Classics.

Person A: And yeah just classics.

Person B: Sitcoms.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Cool. I feel like this conversation is going to be so boring for whoever is listening to it to listen to.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: I would hate to listen to this conversation.

Person A: Just small talk. Yeah.

Person B: Cool. Do you have any fun plans for the weekend?

Person A: I have a midterm on Tuesday so that's going to be fun.

Person B: So you're just studying for that all weekend?

Person A: I'm going to try to.

Person B: But you're not going to.

Person A: Who knows? We'll see. We'll see what happens. Yeah what about you?

Person B: My ex is actually coming to visit me.

Person A: Oh my God.

Person B: So that'll be fun.

Person A: That’s interesting.

Person B: So I think we're going to –

Person A: Do you want him to come visit you?

Person B: Yeah. Kind of. I don't know. I mean I'm excited to see him. I don't know. We'll see.

Person A: Okay.

Person B: All right. So we're going to Oktoberfest in September, which is weird.

Person A: Oh, that's cool.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: Yeah. Okay. Bye.

Person A: Bye. Nice talking to you.

Person B: Nice talking.
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Person A: All right.

Person B: Okay. So what are your views on this?

Person A: Okay, so I gently disagreed with them not allowing the speakers. I disagreed with that, so yeah.

Person B: Why is this?

Person A: It’s mostly because I feel that everyone in a democracy should have a chance to express their opinions, however controversial they may be. So this is basically taking away the fundamental principle of democracy.

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: So that's why I felt that they should have had a chance to speak and the university should've done a better job at dealing with the repercussions that might have been caused after this speech. The actions taken should not have been something like canceling the entire speech.

Person B: Right, so my opinion is that, since your view is based on this is a democracy, and in a democracy free speech is vital, I kind of separated these controversial speakers from free speech and hate speech. So to me, there was a difference between the two. And because it borderlines on hate speech, I think that there really is a limit to the first amendment. There definitely should be some protection against free speech that can cause tangible, actual harms.

Person A: Mm-hmm. Yeah. But don't you think there might be somebody in the audience who resonates with these ideas, and banning someone from speaking who resonates with the ideas is basically discriminating against them?

Person B: Right. I think in terms of that, it really goes to -- personally, I would think that the controversial speakers are kind of irresponsible in their rhetoric. It's kind of like they're preaching discrimination, and they themselves are discriminating against at least somebody in the audience. And it kind of preaches controversy rather than actual accuracy. A lot of the things that they say aren't grounded in facts.

Person A: Uh-huh. Yeah. All right. So you said that the arguments aren't really based on facts. But I still come back to my argument that they should still have a chance. Raising controversy should never be an issue for the university. Everyone has the right to speech and taking away this right -- however controversial they may be, however baseless their arguments may be -- it's finally discriminating against them at the level of a citizen, right?

Person B: Mm-hmm. Well, in that case, do you see a separation between free speech and hate speech?

Person A: I do agree that the topics might have been inclined toward hate speech, but I'm not saying that hate speech should be allowed. I'm just saying there should have been a better way of dealing with it. Yeah.

Person B: Mm-hmm. Yeah. It's kind of like using the analogy of if Person A tells Person B all these false things, or even they may be correct things, to Person B, and that really pisses Person B off, and then Person B goes and murders Person C, for example. And obviously Person A didn’t directly kill Person C. It was completely Person B’s doing. There is some sort of accountability on Person A’s part, and they do have a moral responsibility in the death of Person C. What is your view on that?

Person A: Mm-hmm. That analogy makes sense. I agree with the idea. It’s basically abetting to murder, I guess, or something. But I do agree with that. Yeah, I do agree with that.

Person B: Mm-hmm. Yeah. I mean, to some extent, I do agree that the university should allow controversial speakers, but when it comes to those specific controversial speakers, maybe not Ann Coulter but definitely Milo, there should be some sort of limit as to what he should be able to say, especially because he is responsible for the things that he preaches to a really big audience like Berkeley.

Person A: Yeah. But don't you think that Berkeley as a university should just give the students here an option to listen to every opinion or argument out there before -- basically my point is Berkeley is deciding for the students here. They are deciding what thing is right, what's wrong. Even if the argument might morally and ethically be wrong, wouldn't it be -- it's basically deciding for the students here, right?

Person B: Right. Well, I do agree with you with the opinion that the school should not decide what the students are able or not able to attend. So maybe the solution would be to have some sort of democratic vote, because obviously when those speakers were scheduled to come, there were major protests and that was all on part of the left side. If the right showed up and there were clashes, then we would see more of a kind of democratic discourse, but they didn't. It was purely the left side opposing the speaker. We didn’t really see a lot of people in favor of these speakers, so I think if Berkeley were to cancel a speaker's events, it would probably have to be through like a democratic vote by majority.

Person A: Uh-huh. So basically you're saying this popular opinion -- there wasn't exactly any voting on this, right?

Person B: Right.

Person A: Yeah, that makes sense. Yeah.

Person B: It was just a lot of violence.

Person A: That's true. Yeah. Heard about they had closed streets down and all.

Person B: Yeah, yeah. It was chaotic.

Person A: Yeah. My entire argument was just that it's basically taking away someone's right to speech and making someone's decision for them. But yeah, I think we've gone through that now.

Person B: Yeah. I definitely see your opinion, and I understand how it's aligned with democratic values and yeah.

Person A: Yeah. Don't you think there could be some better way that they at least let him speak and at the same time prevent any mass-scaled violence apart from a democratic voting process or something? Because even if it's 55 - 45 percent vote, there is still a 45 percent of the population who wants to hear the speaker. Do you think there’d be a better way of dealing with that?

Person B: Mm-hmm. Well, in that case, it's kind of hard, because the tenant of a democracy is majority rules. So if it does come down to 55 versus 45, it sucks it's the way it is, but I do think majority rules in a democracy.

Person A: Fair enough. That makes sense. Yeah. All right. Mm.

Person B: May I ask if you're a Democrat or Republican?

Person A: I'm not from the U.S., so it's –

Person B: Oh, okay.

Person A: Yeah, I don't have an opinion on that.

Person B: Yeah, I'm not American either.

Person A: All right, okay. So do you have an inclination towards one side?

Person B: I think maybe socially liberal, but then economically conservative. What about you?

Person A: If I choose a party, I'd be inclined towards the Democratic Party, but I haven't been here long enough to exactly make a decision.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Yeah. And as of now, my opinion means nothing.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Yeah. So what do you think about the other topic [in the study] -- the drugs topic?

Person B: I said that I was kind of indifferent. But I was leaning towards legalizing it. What about you?

Person A: Yeah, I was strongly for legalizing it because I believe it’s similar to alcohol. Because it's legal, it's not as widespread as a problem as drugs.

Person B: Right.

Person A: And it's not as bad a problem, and I think too much money is wasted on fighting drugs.

Person B: Yeah, I completely agree.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: I think it's very inefficient too.

Person A: It is.

Person B: Yeah. And also when it comes to drugs like heroin or Class A narcotics, I think we have to see it less as a criminal problem than a physiological problem because they are physical addictions.

Person A: Yeah. But again, then if you ban drugs because of an addiction, then there's addictions to nicotine, addictions to alcohol. So that just basically means you need to ban everything, right?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Because you can’t -- how do you decide?

Person B: Yeah. No, that's what I meant. I mean it is a bodily addiction, so the government should stop treating it as like, “Oh, let's arrest you because you are in possession of an illegal drug.” But rather than that, legalize the drug and then the government coming to the aid of that person and sending them to a drug program rather than prison.

Person A: Uh-huh. Yeah. They should deal with rehabilitation more than just incarceration. Oh my God. Yeah.

Person B: Yeah, absolutely.

Person A: Yeah, I get it. Yeah.

Person B: Yeah. I think we're on the same page.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Where are you from?

Person A: I'm from New Delhi.

Person B: Oh, okay.

Person A: Yeah where are you from?

Person B: I'm from Hong Kong.

Person A: Okay, so are you a freshman?

Person B: I'm a senior, actually.

Person A: All right, okay.

Person B: Yeah, what are you?

Person A: I am a freshman, yeah.

Person B: Oh okay, how do you like Berkeley?

Person A: Pretty good so far. Yeah, pretty hard.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Is it a known school from where you are?

Person A: My school, yeah. I think so, I guess.

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: Yeah. Mm. So how was your time at Berkeley?

Person B: I have mixed emotions.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: I mean academically it's really rigorous, but the campus is nice.

Person A: Yeah that's true. That’s true.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: It's been really hard so far.

Person B: Has it?

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: What major are you?

Person A: I'm math and CS [Computer Science].

Person B: Oh, I see. Yeah, it's really competitive in that major.

Person A: It is, yeah.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: All right then.

Person B: Okay.

Person A: All right, it was good talking to you.

Person B: Yeah same here.
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Person B: Okay. So, our topic is the campus speakers, right? Okay, so my position is that I do not agree with allowing extremely controversial speakers to speak on campus. Only because I just believe that free speech doesn't include hate speech, and they're kind of promoting that. I’m not saying they shouldn't be allowed to speak, but they shouldn't be protected as much as they are.

Person A: So I really don't agree at all with the political opinions. Oh, wow. Do you have a really bad echo?

Person B: Yeah, hold on. Let me try and put the volume down. What about now?

Person A: I think that's better. Yeah, so I really don't agree politically with the speakers that they've invited to campus. I don't like them at all. I think though that as a public institution, Berkeley has to allow them to speak on campus. Just because I feel like if there's a precedent set that a public institution can decide not to allow someone to speak because that institution feels that their ideas are wrong, then that perhaps could be a dangerous precedent to set for later on. Because it sort of gives them that power to decide, then, what is acceptable [and] what isn’t. But I also think that the protesters definitely have a right to use free speech and express their dissent at what they have to say, as well. Yeah.

Person B: Yeah. Yeah I get that too, because it's like -- I mean, yeah, we should allow them to speak because you never know. Maybe in the future everything will change. You know, maybe liberal speakers -- that would be the controversial thing to have at the school. And it's like, we wouldn't want that same thing to happen to us. So yeah, I guess I agree with you on that part. But yeah, I just -- I don’t know. I feel the platform they were given was so protected, at least the time that I was here. You know, with Milo Yiannopoulos. There were so many police and so many things to avoid a protest. But it’s like, if they're going to allow those kinds of opinions, which obviously a lot of people don't agree with, then they should allow, like no offense, for things to go kind of crazy. Because people aren't going to agree with it. And if they want to be able to have that opinion, they should know that people are going to be against it, and vice versa.

Person A: Yeah. I agree. And I think the whole protest thing -- it was really sad how that turned out, because I was initially planning on participating in the protest, but I heard how violent it was getting. And I really wish that some of the groups that came to campus that sort of were inciting that violence wouldn't have come, because I feel it could have been a great way for the campus to come together and speak up. Like, “Yes, we're allowing the speaker to come because it's free speech, but that doesn't mean that we're going to stand for what he's saying.” I wish that they hadn't gotten so violent, so that everyone would be able to sort of come together and express that.

Person B: Yeah, that would've been nice. But I think in an ideal [world] that would've worked out. But I don't know. It's probably just like the opinions and all the people who oppose him; they have such strong opinions and such, because they feel like their voice hasn't been heard for so long. And maybe that's why they resorted to such violence. But I agree that it wasn't the best way. But honestly it's -- I don't know what the best way would have been. Like yeah, a peaceful protest would have been nice. But I don't know, is that really going to help things or -- hmm. It's just a thought. But yeah, I kind of agree with you.

Person A: Yeah, I agree too that there's a lot of frustration. I understand a lot of frustration, but I never believe in violent protests. Because I feel in that way then -- because his speech is very hateful and incites violence against groups that have had a long history of having violence expressed towards them. But I feel like more violence isn't necessarily the answer to that, you know.

Person B: Mm-hmm. I guess so. I don't know. It's just something to think about because I've been -- ever since it happened last year and people would bring it up, I've always had this iffy opinion on it. But it's always nice to hear people who -- because, I don’t know, I feel like -- I'm not sure, but I think Malcolm X didn't really like the peaceful approach that Martin Luther King Jr. took. I always thought it'd be interesting because -- Oh, what was that? There's this one protest where things got kind of violent, or something happened, and it was violent, but something did occur that changed things after that. So it's like -- I always think about maybe -- not saying violence is the answer, but sometimes it makes things seem way more like, “These people are serious about this,” you know?

Person A: Yeah. I agree that sometimes violence, in the past, has had to be the thing that inspired change. And I guess like what you mentioned earlier, in a perfect world it would have been like that. I guess it is idealistic to hope that things could always be accomplished peacefully. But I wish that that perfect world could exist a little bit more.

Person B: Yeah, we should always strive for that perfect world, honestly.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: But, I think -- I'm not sure I have anything else to say about it.

Person A: I really don't think so either. How much time do you think we have left?

Person B: They said till 4:50, but I don’t know.

Person A: 4:50?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Wait, in the 12 minutes -- is there a timer on this? Oh wait, there’s a timer. We have 3 minutes left in the talking [portion].

Person B: Okay, okay. Yeah, cool.

Person A: I didn’t see that at first.

Person B: I forgot about that. It says 12 minutes to debate your topic. Yeah, yeah.

Person A: If we run out of things to say, we’re supposed to use the time to get to know each other.

Person B: Okay, so, let’s do three things about me.

Person A: Okay.

Person B: Okay, so I am -- well it’s not very interesting -- I am a starting sophomore. My major is most likely MCB [molecular and cell biology], maybe pre-med. And that’s all I got.

Person A: I’m just starting my junior year, and I’m a chemical engineering major.

Person B: That’s so cool. Yay.

Person A: Well.

Person B: That’s cool. So what do you want to do with that? Do you want to do crazy stuff? Chemical engineering. What’s your end goal?

Person A: I’m really interested in sustainability, so I’m doing the biotechnology concentration. So I’m mostly interested in bioplastics or biofuels.

Person B: Oh yeah. Yeah, that’s really cool.

Person A: Yeah. Where are you from originally?

Person B: Okay so, I’m from Palmdale, California in SoCal, but my family is all from Mexico.

Person A: Oh, cool. I’m originally from near Redding, California, so like way up north.

Person B: Oh, okay. So what classes are you taking this semester?

Person A: Classes. I’m taking three chemical engineering classes, so it’s reaction kinetics, mass transfer, and biotechnology. And then -- it’s called Chem 135, it’s like chemical biology.

Person B: Wow.

Person A: What about you?

Person B: I’m taking Chem 3A, Math 1B, and a R1A class.

Person A: Good luck with the Math 1B and Chem 3A.

Person B: Oh my God. I know, huh? But whatever.

Person A: Not fans of those.

Person B: Yeah, I don’t know. I really like the Chem 3A teacher this semester though, so hopefully it won’t be that bad. But I’ve heard everything about it.

Person A: Who’s your professor?

Person B: Mr. -- oh my God, I forgot his name. The one that is younger.

Person A: Does he have a meme page? Is it Pete Marsden or something?

Person B: Yeah, Marsden. Yeah, yeah.

Person A: Yeah. Okay yeah, he’s great. I haven’t had him, but I heard he’s great.

Person B: Yeah, he’s really cool. And then for math I have -- I think his name is Francis Christ? Spelled “Christ.”

Person A: Hmm. I haven’t heard of him. I had -- I’m going to butcher his last name -- but it’s Ristiken? He Russian.

Person B: Ah.

Person A: He was really good. He’s really funny.

Person B: Oh, that’s nice. Yeah, for 1A I had -- wow, I’m just forgetting all my professors. Richard? Oh, I don’t think I’ll remember, but he was cool. He was just -- I don’t know, his tests were pretty weird, like very conceptual at times.

Person A: So you’re MCB, but you’re taking the “1” series?

Person B: Yeah, I just -- I don’t like how 10A is just kind of -- the way it’s set up. I took it for a few weeks and I was not having it. I really like more “calculus” calculus, not “statistics” calculus.

Person A: Yeah. My roommate did the “10” series because she’s also MCB, and she said that it was just brutal, like how they combined everything together.

Person B: Yeah. And they shove in statistics at the end, I heard. And I was, “Uh-uh.” I’d rather just take a semester of statistics.

Person A: Yeah. Yeah, I was looking at what she was doing because she was taking the equivalent at the same time I was taking the “1” series. And it just seemed awful.

Person B: Yeah. I was there for a week, and I just walked out. I was like, “Nope, I’m not doing this anymore.” And the teacher was like really -- I had Stankova.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Oh, wait. I think she -- oh, are they saying something?

Person B: Yeah, I think we have to end it now.

Person A: Oh, okay.

Person B: Goodbye.

Person A: Goodbye.
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Person A: Okay, so do you oppose or support legalizing drugs?

Person B: I oppose legalizing drugs.

Person A: Oh.

Person B: How about you?

Person A: Really? I thought I chose “oppose.” Okay. So, you oppose and I support?

Person B: I guess, yeah?

Person A: Okay. So.

Person B: Was it your stance?

Person A: What, sorry?

Person B: Was that your stance? Supporting?

Person A: Yeah, yeah.

Person B: Okay. Okay, dope.

Person A: So do you want to go first?

Person B: Sure. I oppose legalizing drugs because it's going to affect people primarily, and it's easier for them to access it. And it's also easier for teenagers to access them, and it's going to influence their life. Pretty much basically, yeah.

Person A: Yeah. I support because I think if you just ban them, probably there will be black markets and people will also get it, no matter how. And even if we legalize it, it doesn't mean that everyone could get access. We can make laws on that. For example, we can prohibit teenagers from using it, probably just like alcohol here. We can set laws here, and this doesn't mean that everyone has easy access. But if we just stop legalizing it, probably it will make more kills on society. What do you think?

Person B: I think it’s illegal for teenagers to use them. And even right now, the ones who are getting those are getting them in some kind of, like you said, a black market or something. But I feel like if the drugs are legalized in the U.S., then I think it'll be easier for them to get it since there are more people who can get them legally. And we cannot keep track of if they use it or they sell it.

Person A: Yeah. People can have easier access, but it is up to the individuals to decide whether to use it. Because, you know, guns are also legalized here so -- well, anyway. For example, the guns are not [what] kill people. It’s people who kill people. So when you legalize drugs, it doesn't mean it's drugs' fault, it’s people [who] choose to use drugs. So we can educate people on that.

Person B: Or the only difference of the guns and drugs is that drugs are more addictive.

Person A: Yes.

Person B: And once you use it, it’s going to kind of influence you. And it's going to make you want to use more of them. Like unlike guns, where unless you're psycho or something, it’s not going to change your perspective, I'd say.

Person A: Yeah. Well there's many things that you can be addicted to, like smoking tobacco. And legalizing drugs doesn't mean people have to be addicted. It’s just the way of managing these things to avoid black markets. And also the government can keep an eye on it more accurately.

Person B: Okay.

Person A: Okay. Do you have anything else to say?

Person B: Not really. So, do you have any more to say then? Yeah.

Person A: I'm thinking.

Person B: Okay. Do you have any more to say about the topic?

Person A: I don't know. I'm thinking.

Person B: Okay. Yeah, go ahead.

Person A: Actually, I thought I chose “oppose” before, but I can't be sure about that.

Person B: Or I think it's because I chose I'm not really strongly into the stance for all the topics, but I chose “very strongly” for this one. So I think that's why they chose this one for us.

Person A: Oh. Okay. Hmm.

Person B: I mean, I'm pretty much just against -- or I'm pretty much someone who is against this because I've been growing up in kind of an environment that's against it, I guess.

Person A: Oh. Okay.

Person B: I've seen many friends who are kind of going easy with using drugs. And since I've seen some people who are using drugs, but -- it’s up to them. It’s -- yeah.

Person A: I think I chose “oppose,” but just not “very strongly oppose.” So, well, I can think of reasons to oppose and I can think of reasons to support, so it’s all okay with me.

Person B: All right. Mm. Okay, I think it's pretty much it then. How are you doing today?

Person A: Good. How are you? How are your finals?

Person B: Oh, I'm not taking any classes here so.

Person A: Oh. That's cool.

Person B: Which ones are you taking?

Person A: Sociology and psychology.

Person B: Nice.

Person A: I have two finals tomorrow.

Person B: Tomorrow?

Person A: Yes.

Person B: Oh dang. Are you prepared?

Person A: No. I’m going to do those tonight.

Person B: Yeah. I do have some kind of examination for another degree next Monday. And I guess that’s like finals for me.

Person A: Oh. That's around the corner. Okay.

Person B: Yeah. I still need to prepare for it, I guess.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Mm. Okay, where did you come from?

Person A: China.

Person B: China? Okay. When did you come here?

Person A: Oh you mean when? I came here on July 1st.

Person B: Last year?

Person A: No, no. This year.

Person B: This year?

Person A: For summer session. Yes.

Person B: Oh, okay.

Person A: What about you?

Person B: I’m from Korea.

Person A: Oh.

Person B: I came here around 2009.

Person A: Oh. Wow.

Person B: It’s been a while here.

Person A: That's cool. So you're a student here?

Person B: Mm-hmm. Are you just here for summer session?

Person A: Yeah, I'm just [here] for summer session.

Person B: Okay.

Person A: So what's your major?

Person B: I'm intended computer science.

Person A: Oh. Cool.

Person B: So are you in a college, or are you -- ?

Person A: College? A college in Beijing. I’m a freshman.

Person B: Okay. That's cool. Yeah, I want to also go to kind of like an international boarding program for a summer. And I hope to apply for it this summer or next summer.

Person A: Oh.

Person B: Yeah. I don’t really have any place I want to go in mind, but I guess I want to go back to Korea since I’ve not been there for a while. But I think I'm also okay with other places.

Person A: I never been to Korea before.

Person B: Yeah. I've never been to China either. So when are you going back to China then?

Person A: On Saturday.

Person B: Saturday?

Person A: Yes. Our school organized this so we have to go back with other students from our schools. And our teachers said we must leave on Saturday.

Person B: I see.

Person A: Yeah, I want to stay longer actually.

Person B: How is China different than here, let’s say?

Person A: Well, many differences.

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: Well there are too many people in China, so the average resources that everyone can get are rare. And so, generally, living here is more comfortable and convenient, probably.

Person B: Okay.

Person A: And actually China is too hot right now because it’s summer.

Person B: I heard Asia is really hot right now.

Person A: Oh. Probably. I think California is also hot, except the Bay Area. I don’t know why.

Person B: Yeah. Over here it’s really hot in summer and it’s really cold in the winter.

Person A: So in winter, will it be like very cold or just cool?

Person B: I mean –

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: Okay.
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Person B: Okay. You want to start?

Person A: Sure. Well, regarding the topic, I said that I do support extremely controversial speakers to speak on campus. But I, of course, said that I don’t strongly stand with it. Like, moderately. Because, yeah, there are some downsides. But just for me particularly, the first thing that would come to mind is that UC Berkeley wouldn’t be UC Berkeley if something like this was one hundred percent prohibited.

Person B: I understand. I did put that I did not support, but also not strongly. The thing is, being such an important institution that has a very powerful voice, if you allow a speaker that has very controversial views -- not in the sense of controversial, but in the sense of hate speech, which attacks the existence of others sometimes -- giving that person a microphone to speak to the world, for me, just makes me think that that seems to be okay, you know? So that’s my main counterargument. As I said, I do not know that much about the topic, but I don’t like when people with supremacist ideas have a microphone to the world.

Person A: I can most definitely understand that. For me, personally, I know that nothing has one hundred percent affected me in the past year that I’ve been here. I don’t necessarily pay that much attention to the speakers that would come and go and what not. But I do understand where you’re coming from. That especially if it’s hate speech. But I don’t know. I guess I didn’t necessarily concentrate on hate speech specifically, just extremely controversial. Because I mean there’s such a big spectrum, and with every kind of topic there’s always going to be people that have problems with it.

Person B: Yeah. I understand. For me it’s also not about the controversial part, because I myself have some controversial views sometimes. But also I wasn’t here last year about that. I’m new, so I'm not entirely sure what the context was. But I do think there should be a minimum rule. But not saying like controversial ideas. But if the person is known to have a very extreme or a supremacist or hate speech view. I think that should be a minimum rule to let people come. For me it’s just basic respect. There’s a super diverse community here that may feel very attacked by these things. So maybe not a wide restriction, because that can be used by everyone in any way, but ground rules or something like that.

Person A: Yeah. For sure that would definitely create a much more respectful and safer environment and what not. But then again, you never know what kind of stuff happens also behind the works. Like whether maybe the university actually allows such things because they just want the publicity and stuff like that.

Person B: Mm-hmm. Yeah.

Person A: Yeah. So many things are just about money these days, so you never know. And then regarding extremely controversial speakers, honestly if they don’t say something that is extremely out there, or just so far down the spectrum that it’s sometimes considered crazy or just absolutely ridiculous, without that no one’s going to listen to them. This is how they get listened to. This is how they receive attention.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: So, you never know. Even the speakers themselves, they may not one hundred percent agree with how they’re talking, but they have to get out there somehow.

Person B: Yeah, yeah. I agree. I watched this movie that talked exactly about that, and how a person was super famous and had this book that was super controversial. And then they did not think about that at all -- they did not have these views in real life. So yeah. But yeah, I don't know. It’s a very hard topic to talk about because it depends a lot on the topic, like the specific issue that you’re talking about. So, yeah.

Person A: Yeah. Probably the other problem that I would just have with that -- why I just said that I don’t really support it one hundred percent -- is the fact that so much money goes into security and that type of stuff. And personally, I’m an out-of-state student. I’m paying a lot of money to be at this school, and I really don’t want my money to be used on such measures.

Person B: Yeah. Yeah, I know.

Person A: Because I remember one of the last speakers last year or something like that. They had to hire a whole police force or whatever and it cost three hundred thousand dollars in total or something like that.

Person B: Yeah, that’s a lot of money.

Person A: That is ridiculous.

Person B: It's crazy. No, that’s incredible. Yeah. And also that’s a big issue. But the other thing for me is -- so right now in the world, I see a lot of people speaking and developing some ideas that I think are very dangerous. Like I don’t know. Well everyone talks about Trump, but there’s a wave of right-wing supremacy also in Europe and in other places. And I feel that if you do not strongly position yourself against something so inherently bad, at least in my view, you’re letting it spread and become a thing that’s considered okay for people. Like just another ideology even though it's very hurtful and it really harms small communities. So, yeah. I mean that’s my main argument, basically, but --

Person A: And I'm just always in a grey area. But I really do not like choosing extremes because I always find some sort of a problem with it as well.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: And then just the number one thing that especially people that do position themselves strongly is they just cram their beliefs down your throat. And I just can’t deal with that.

Person B: Yeah. Yeah, I understand. I study these things a lot and it’s the more you know, the weaker your position becomes because everything is a grey area.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: You know? So some basic things you learn -- I don't know -- this is not okay, this is okay. But then no one completely supports your beliefs. And there’s no one that has a very convincing set of things that they say politically that I agree with.

Person A: Mm-hmm.

Person B: So it’s always -- yeah. Yeah.

Person A: If you don’t mind me asking, where are you from? Because I hear an accent.

Person B: Yeah. I'm from Spain.

Person A: Oh, okay. Wonderful.

Person B: Yeah, yeah.

Person A: Are you an international student here?

Person B: Yeah, exchange student.

Person A: Oh, exchange student.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Okay. And you just got here recently? Or have you been here a while?

Person B: No, no. I just got here.

Person A: Oh, wow. Well, welcome.

Person B: Thank you. Yeah. You said you’re from out of state?

Person A: Yes. I’m from New York.

Person B: Oh, wow.

Person A: Yeah, yeah. I also get asked a lot here, though, if I’m an international student because I have a weird accent. My parents were both born in Poland. And they came here and, I don't know, it kind of rubbed off on me because I didn't speak English until a later age.

Person B: Okay. Yeah, of course. Well, I don't hear any accent, but that’s probably because I have one.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Yeah. Yeah, yeah. Well, it’s nice to meet you.

Person A: Nice to meet you as well. Are -- so just.

Person B: Yeah, I’m trying to come back to the topic, but I think I’ve said all my arguments already.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Yeah. It's like I said. It’s a grey area.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: All these things. There’s always going to be problems no matter which side you choose.

Person B: Yeah, that’s true. Also, for me, it’s very hard to understand that there are -- politically, people talk about two sides, and that’s what’s socially accepted. But the reality is so much more complicated, and it’s just not shown. And yeah, it’s kind of hard to position yourself on an axis with two sides when this is really not all there is to it. So, yeah.

Person A: Yes, of course. It’s the same with even politics here, like with the Republican and the Democrat. The problem is if people don’t like either, then they choose the Green or Nationalist party. But the problem with that is that they never win or gain enough attention, so.

Person B: Yeah, true. No, here it’s way worse than in Europe in those terms. Like there are two choices, literally.

Person A: Yeah. Yeah. Would you say, in Spain, is there anything about controversial speakers and the topic of free speech and what not?

Person B: There is. We have this -- I don't know if you’ve heard -- issue with Catalonia. Probably, yeah. Basically, it’s an area of the country that half of their population wants to be independent like another country, and the other half does not. So there’s a lot of controversy of how much their discourse should be accepted. And the other side says the same thing. And it's very polarized. So yeah, there’s a lot of issues with that, regarding that topic. Yeah.

Person A: Oh, I see.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Yeah. Here definitely in California as opposed to New York for me, it's just so many more people broadcast their opinions here because California is a very, very liberal state.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Yeah it is.

Person A: So it's honestly no surprise that of course Berkeley was the first UC school. So of course everything is just a hub here. It's all based from this campus.

Person B: Yeah. Of course. It's the leading institution. With that, it’s not surprising. Also, I wonder, why would you want to come to speak here if you held such different views and literally only maybe 20 people are going to be listening to you? I don't understand it from a rational point of view. Why? I don't know.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: Oh. It's done right?

Person A: I think so.

Person B: Yeah, I did not realize.

Person A: Okay.

Person B: Okay. Nice to meet you.

Person A: Nice to meet you too.
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Person A: Okay. Would you like to start?

Person B: You could start.

Person A: Okay. So I support government reparations for slavery because, well I mean, African Americans have suffered under slavery for many generations and, as we all know, widespread systematic discrimination is still present today. And so I feel like, though a compensation might not solve all the issues present with African Americans, this may still help alleviate some of them. And yeah.

Person B: Mm-hmm. Okay. Well, I oppose because there are many other large groups that have been exploited, and paying reparations is not necessarily the way to go. You're right in stating that there is still systematic oppression today, but instead of using money in that way, there could be better schools created instead of jails. Or eliminating food inequity by providing less unhealthy options in lower-income neighborhoods where a large number of the population resides. So I guess starting from the root of the problem rather than just paying the money. Because if that happens, then a lot of people in the country -- it will be chaos. The political climate is already bad, so that's going to make it worse. So instead of just handing money -- because a lot of people don't have that financial literacy, and they don't have that foundation or the resources to know about managing money. And I come from a low-income neighborhood where the majority of the population is Black, African American, Latinx. And [with] that I've witnessed a lot of people having programs like WIC [Women, Infants and Children Supplemental Nutrition Program] and they use the money to buy weed or unhealthy options, not even to feed their children. So I feel like it starts in a different area with education and setting the foundation to help set up people that have been oppressed. To help set them up for success in a different way.

Person A: Hmm.

Person B: Is that clear? Does that make sense?

Person A: Yeah, that makes sense. I mean, I guess in the absence of alternatives, this would be the way to go. But now that I've heard your options, I'm willing to change my mind.

Person B: Yeah, it makes sense. That would be perfect if every group who has been exploited like Native Americans, Latinx, whoever, everyone -- because everyone has been exploited. So it would be amazing if that could be the case to fix things, but unfortunately that's not realistic.

Person A: I mean, I'll have to say I'm in agreement with you here. I'm willing to change my mind. I didn't feel that strongly about this issue in the first place and you make a good point.

Person B: Thank you.

Person A: All right, so I guess we can just get to know each other better?

Person B: Yeah. I don’t think we’re allowed to say our names or anything, right?

Person A: I’m not sure.

Person B: Oh well, what year are you in?

Person A: Freshman. What about you?

Person B: Oh, me too.

Person A: Oh, cool.

Person B: I feel like we met. It was at the beginning.

Person A: Well, I’m sorry. I met a lot of people so I might not remember.

Person B: Oh no. At the entrance.

Person A: Oh, at the entrance.

Person B: Yeah. I feel like that’s you.

Person A: Hmm. Well.

Person B: What are you studying?

Person A: So right now, I’m planning on studying MCB, molecular and cellular biology.

Person B: Oh, nice.

Person A: What about you?

Person B: I’m thinking about doing poli-sci [political science]. Probably double majoring in sociology or social welfare.

Person A: Yeah. I heard you were very knowledgeable about this topic so like.

Person B: Oh yes, definitely. Yeah when I saw this on the board, I was like, “Yes. This is it.”

Person A: Yeah, I wish I could say it was the same for me, but for someone who’s more science-y I was like, “Oh no.”

Person B: Yeah. Yeah, I definitely -- it’s, yeah. It would be nice if that could be the case for everyone but --

Person A: Because I mean, yeah. I guess that politics are just not my thing. It’s just something I’ve never become interested in. It’s just how it turned out.

Person B: Yeah. Definitely I’d say that this is something that people wouldn’t follow through with because everybody knows that our education system is very messed up. And even then, people don’t -- people prioritize corporations or other things that aren’t really fixing anything.

Person A: Yeah. I mean I guess, maybe -- I’m not sure. I might just be making things up. But maybe it has something to do with the lobbying groups of the powerful corporations.

Person B: Definitely. Yeah, capitalism.

Person A: Yeah. Because the tobacco companies and other companies I can’t remember. Yeah, powerful groups.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: And I guess as a consequence of that, everything else gets thrown to the wayside.

Person B: Mm-hmm. So where are you from?

Person A: So I’m originally from New Jersey. I was born there.

Person B: Oh, nice.

Person A: And so as a child, my parents worked in China a lot. So I travelled back and forth.

Person B: That’s awesome.

Person A: And so, yeah. That was mainly in preschool though, and for first grade. So from second grade on, I stayed in New Jersey for schooling until end of seventh grade, yeah. So then I moved to San Diego where I finished middle school and high school.

Person B: Oh that’s nice.

Person A: So what about you?

Person B: I’m from LA.

Person A: Oh cool, so like what area?

Person B: From South Central.

Person A: Ah, yeah.

Person B: So I live in the Compton area. So when I tell people “Straight out of Compton,” they think I’m joking. But it’s not.

Person A: So what about you? You just grew up in LA? Was born there and all that?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: So do you have any hobbies you’re particularly interested in? Besides political science and all that good stuff?

Person B: Yeah. I really like to dance.

Person A: Mm. Yeah, so in high school I swam and I played the saxophone.

Person B: Oh that’s cool. I did the clarinet in elementary. I loved orchestra.

Person A: Sorry, just a bit of a non sequitur. I find it interesting that someday people just sit around in a big room and evaluate our conversation. Like grade us on our effectiveness of communication or something.

Person B: Yeah. I’ve never done anything like this. This is cool.

Person A: Yeah, me neither. I mean, to be honest, I was just really attracted to this study because they said you’d do something cool and you’ll get paid for it. So I’m like, “Why not? Win-win.”

Person B: Yeah. I didn’t think it would actually be speaking to other people. I thought it was just like, “Oh, fill out this survey.”

Person A: Yeah, that’s what I thought too. Maybe do a survey. Watch a short video. Do some sort of psychological study or something.

Person B: So what are you doing after?

Person A: After? Well I got chores I need done.

Person B: Same. I have a lot of homework.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: I’m taking STAT 20 and I have the discussion portion at six.

Person A: Ah, late classes.

Person B: Yeah, that sucks.

Person A: Yeah, that’s not me today. Today is actually my easy day. I only have two classes.

Person B: That’s nice.

Person A: Yeah, all in the morning. Yeah, Monday’s my busy day.

Person B: Oh. Yeah. Are you going to do any clubs or anything?

Person A: That’s what I’m planning. So from Calapolooza and all those club fairs, I grabbed a bunch of fliers. So now I’m just trying to sort through all of them. Find something that interests me.

Person B: Yeah. Yeah, there’s this group called Undergraduate Marketing Association so I’m thinking about doing that. That sounds really cool.

Person A: That’s cool. Sounds business-y, right?

Person B: Yeah. I think that I’d work with the nonprofit or the good part of business.

Person A: Yeah. I actually, now that I think of it, grabbed a bunch of medical related flyers. So that’s definitely something I’m super interested in.

Person B: Oh that’s awesome. I grabbed a flyer maybe you might be interested [in]. But I think it’s called something about medical -- Oh my God, I forgot what it was. But you have the chance to travel across the world -- I think it’s Nepal -- for two weeks and you get to do medical outreach. That’s kind of how they pitched it, medical outreach in another country. So that’s cool.

Person A: I mean, yeah, that’s pretty cool. Do you remember some names, maybe an acronym? I’m super interested now.

Person B: Yeah, I forgot what it was. I think it was Volunteers Around the World. I think that’s what --

Person A: Oh, I see, I see. Okay.

Person B: Yeah. I’m really thinking about doing that. So we’ll see how that --

Person A: All right. Volunteers Around the World. I’m going to try to remember that because I’m not sure if we’re allowed to take the note sheets.

Person B: Oh. Yeah.

Person A: I don’t know. Maybe they’ll make us throw it away. I don’t know.

Person B: Yeah, if not just look it up. Like “UC Berkeley, travel.”

Person A: Yeah. “Travel, Nepal, medical.”

Person B: Yeah. I wonder when this is done.

Person A: Well it’s a 12-minute conversation we’re supposed to have. I’m sorry we didn’t get to have a nice debate or anything.

Person B: Oh no. I’m not good at debate, so this is good.

Person A: Yeah. From what I’ve heard I would have sworn you were on some debate team. You argue your point pretty well.

Person B: I did mock trial in high school. That was really fun, but.

Person A: Ah, I see. Personally I’ve just never done any sorts of those activities that require you to present an argument. You know, like speech team or mock trial. Never done it.

Person B: Yeah. It’s pretty intense. I get a lot of anxiety and I shake. So I was like, “This is good. This is cool. This is chill.”

Person A: On the survey, I was like, “Oh, are you one of the people who is nervous all the time.” And like, yes.

Person B: Yeah, same. Same. Yeah, last summer I did a summer program at Oxford University in England.

Person A: Oh that’s pretty cool. So what did you do there?

Person B: So I took a politics course, a philosophy course, and one called “The Art of Rhetoric.” So it was basically debating, and I debated at the Oxford Union. So that gave me so much anxiety. I was shaking and I’ve never seen my hands shake like that. It was crazy.

Person A: Oh, for me my hands don’t shake. I just get super sweaty, especially on my palms. And the butterflies in my stomach.

Person B: Yeah. I feel like that’s better because it’s not as visual. You’re not going to give yourself away too easily.

Person A: Mm. Yeah, I suppose. So by the way, besides stats, what other classes are you taking?

Person B: I’m doing a class called “Pop Culture,” and it’s a socio class. So that’s my favorite class.

Person A: Oh, that’s cool. I’m just taking Sociology 1 in terms of that kind of stuff. Yeah.

Person B: Oh. Yeah. I don’t know why I didn’t choose to go with “Intro to [Sociology].”

Person A: Ah.

Person B: Yeah. I’m also doing Writing R1A. It’s talking about theories of knowledge and writing about -- analyzing, I guess, how people learn and stuff like that.

Person A: So just these few classes, right?

Person B: Yeah, and I also have a seminar. So it’s basically talking about different identities. Yeah, like how people identify themselves, or transgender topics and stuff like that. It’s really interesting.

Person A: I see. Well me, I just told you how I’m a more science-y guy. I’m taking MATH 1A and biology.

Person B: Nice. Is it just those two classes?

Person A: Well, and Sociology 1. Yeah.

Person B: Oh, okay.

Person A: And all the discussions and labs and stuff that come with it.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: Wait, are we done?

Person A: Are we? We are.

Person B: Oh yeah. All right, good luck with everything.

Person A: Thanks, it was nice talking to you. Good conversation.
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Person A: All right. Do you want to go first?

Person B: Okay, so our topic is “Do you oppose or support allowing extremely controversial speakers to speak on campus.” Right?

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Awesome. So I said I was in opposition. And honestly -- I know what they brought up on the survey was kind of -- 2017 about Milo. And honestly, I'm not very knowledgeable of that time.

Person A: Yeah, I wasn’t there either for that.

Person B: Oh, oh. Yeah. And honestly, I feel kind of weird kind of speaking about my answers because I'm not very knowledgeable.

Person A: Right, yeah. I feel that.

Person B: But I guess what my case is on this topic is that sometimes these words from extremely controversial speakers can be considered hate speech.

Person A: Right.

Person B: And what I consider hate speech is very hurtful words. And what I consider free speech is being allowed to say what you want to, but with tact, I guess. And I guess that’s the only difference for me between hate speech and free speech. Maybe?

Person A: Hate speech and free speech. So yeah, I don't know. The problem I have with that is when you have some group, a mob kind of saying what is safe --

Person B: Oh yeah, yeah. It's kind of like what -- yeah, what is that tact?

Person A: It's hard to define, and then when it is defined it's by the majority, right?

Person B: Yeah, so it's like -- it kind of goes -- yeah, that's true.

Person A: So I think that sometimes that kind of mentality, though I do agree with it in some ways, kind of creates an echo chamber of certain ideas or silences other ideas.

Person B: Mm. Mm.

Person A: And also going on with that, I kind of think that when you disallow certain people to speak, it can give them power and stuff, you know? Like where Milo -- I guess he -- I'm not sure, was he allowed to speak or? But I know that when people are banned from speaking, it kind of blows it up. It kind of makes a media sensation out of things sometimes. And whereas -- you know how free speech week happened last year?

Person B: Mm-hmm. Mm-hmm.

Person A: And then eventually Milo did get to speak but like 30 people showed up. And it wasn't a big deal. Whereas it can --

Person B: Yeah, when he was banned it was a big --

Person A: Yeah, so even if you don't agree with his ideas but he gets to speak, then, I don't know. It's just the people who want to listen to it, listen to it.

Person B: Yeah, yeah.

Person A: Yeah. I don't know, that's kind of my --

Person B: Yeah, I understand. Yeah, I'm definitely not very extreme on this topic. I'm definitely more moderate, in the middle, because I do understand people should have an outlet to say what they want to say or their ideas.

Person A: Yeah. Yeah. I think it is pretty important, especially for campuses, for people to talk about ideas.

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: And I guess it's not scary, but I think that when people start silencing ideas or --

Person B: Mm. Yeah, definitely.

Person A: But yeah. There are definitely cases where it could be -- yeah, it's just hard to define hate speech so.

Person B: Yeah, and sometimes you're not sure what's going to happen with -- if a very controversial speaker speaks, you don't know what exactly is going to happen. But you know, sometimes it's not bad at all. But you always assume a worst-case scenario. Yeah.

Person A: Yeah. Do you think that when people start speaking hate speech that -- is it psychological damage or do you think that it leads to violence or something? Is that your concern with it or?

Person B: Well, I guess hate speech can, what I think, implant dangerous ideas that could lead to violence, but it's not like it's always going to happen. It's not a direct causation or anything, because I don't know much about this. Yeah, I have no stats or anything to bring up like, “Oh, hate speech will directly cause violence.” But I feel like it could influence it maybe a little. Like there's a possibility?

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: But yeah. It's true that hate speech -- what is considered hate speech or?

Person A: Yeah. Because I feel like it often just gets defined as what opposes the majority of students' beliefs, which is, especially at Berkeley, pretty liberal. And I just --

Person B: And things could definitely be taken out of context and stuff.

Person A: Yeah. I definitely agree [that] violence and stuff definitely isn't right. But I'm kind of wary of the safe space kind of concept -- shielding people from hateful or violent ideas especially on campus. I just disagree with that because I feel like we do need exposure to those kinds of ideas.

Person B: Definitely. No, I definitely think so. That's the whole point of going out, meeting people.

Person A: It's the world. Yeah.

Person B: Yeah, definitely.

Person A: Yeah. But yeah, I don't know. And I think, yeah, especially silencing certain groups or saying they can't come speak on campus kind of --

Person B: Oh yeah, that's a big bummer.

Person A: Yeah, it gives more power to them. I went to university in New Zealand and there they had a student organization that was against abortion. And I don't agree with that, but the student union defunded them and stuff like that. That kind of stuff kind of worries me.

Person B: Oh. Mm.

Person A: Where just because you disagree with their ideas, you're going to defund a student group or organization. So.

Person B: Yeah. That's definitely an issue. I agree.

Person A: And then it gives more publicity to that group because they got defunded, whereas a majority of students don't agree with that. So it would be a small student organization and it wouldn't get that much publicity before.

Person B: Yeah, yeah. Yeah, it's just -- I don't even know what to say anymore because I just really wish I could just look up some examples or bring up some examples. But I really, honestly, can't think of any right now.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: My bad.

Person A: No, it's all good.

Person B: Mm.

Person A: But, so yeah. I don't know.

Person B: Yeah. I did debate this for a speech and debate competition a while ago, but I can't remember what I said or what I brought up.

Person A: Right, yeah.

Person B: Yeah. Because it's not super, I guess, recent? Or I mean, I guess it is recent because it was last year.

Person A: Right.

Person B: But not recent as in a few months ago or within 2018.

Person A: Yeah. But what kind of --

Person B: I mean it still goes on today, I'm just kind of ignorant about it.

Person A: Right, yeah. I'm not too up to date on current events and stuff. But, I don't know, I just feel like in general I'd want to allow almost -- or everyone to come speak, like who wants to. I think that campus should be a platform.

Person B: Oh yeah, definitely. Definitely. Yeah, I honestly agree. Unless it's very much like -- I don't know, I can't even think of a theoretical where I would not -- like extreme. I can't think of a physical example of extreme hate speech that has literally --

Person A: What about Ben Shapiro last year?

Person B: Oh.

Person A: Do you agree with him speaking on campus?

Person B: I mean, I don't -- he's -- when I think of someone I would stop to come to speak on campus, it would not be Ben Shapiro. It'd have to be extremely hate -- I don't know -- not even hateful, just maybe it's not -- it's just more violent. Physical violence at that point. Not even just --

Person A: Yeah, that's true.

Person B: Maybe that's what draws the line for me. I guess I can't really think of hate speech.

Person A: So like the speaker inciting violence or that person is a violent person?

Person B: Actually, yeah. I would think I would -- like that person is going to perform violence. I guess that's what --

Person A: Ah, yeah. I guess. But then at that point they're not really a speaker.

Person B: Yeah, they're not speaking. Yeah.

Person A: That's what -- okay, so about the Ben Shapiro kind of speaker.

Person B: Mm. I mean --

Person A: Because I remember walking past and seeing hundreds of protesters and SWAT team kind of people and stuff. It was crazy.

Person B: Really? Wow.

Person A: But that kind of -- I remember at that point being like, "Oh, I don't care about Ben Shapiro because he's just an idiot or whatever.” But I had never even listened to what he had said or anything before. It was just kind of that's just what I've heard about him, so.

Person B: Mm. I don't know. I have a few friends who listen to him. And although I don't fully agree, he’s just a speaker for those ideas, you know?

Person A: Exactly. And people wanted to see him, right? And so I feel like -- yeah, I don't know.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: I feel like when those people protest against Ben Shapiro when he's holding an event that people go and see, they try to disrupt that. I feel like that is worse than having a speaker on campus that you disagree [with]. I don't know.

Person B: Yeah. I could see -- I definitely see it.

Person A: Yeah. I think that is more dangerous --

Person B: Dangerous than whatever. Yeah. And whatever I think of as dangerous as I would not allow is definitely not -- I would say it's -- whatever they're stopping. People who are stopping those ideas I think is more dangerous than even --

Person A: Yeah, exactly. Because it creates that echo chamber, kind of.

Person B: Mm. Mm.

Person A: You're only listening to your own ideas, which I think -- yeah, you should definitely be exposed to -- even if you don't agree with something you should hear out what they say.

Person B: Yeah. Mm-hmm.

Person A: Or how they think. I feel like that's really important.

Person B: Mm-hmm. Yeah.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Yeah. Yeah, that's true.

Person A: Yeah. I wonder how long we've been speaking for.

Person B: Oh, it's been 12 minutes and 50 seconds. Or I mean, I guess they didn't count when we were --

Person A: Oh, like testing.

Person B: Yeah, yeah.

Person A: Alright. Well, yeah.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: Oh, okay, okay.

Person A: It was nice talking to you.

Person B: Yeah, nice talking to you too.

Person A: Bye.

Person B: Bye.
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Person A: Okay. So what was your stance on the topic?

Person B: Yeah, so I thought -- because the question said, “Legalize all drugs.” I didn't think that we should legalize all drugs, especially the very dangerous ones. Because -- okay, yeah. What's your stance? Let's just talk about that first.

Person A: I agreed. It said, “Decriminalize drugs,” which I agree with, but not legalize and make drugs available to all people.

Person B: Mm-hmm. Yeah. Yeah, I agree with that actually. Yeah, so I just said if drugs are legalized and made available to more people, then more people will be using drugs. Especially young people in school might view drugs as a safe and healthy alternative to entertainment, or a recreational tool rather than something that they shouldn't try.

Person A: Yeah, and I said that by decriminalizing drugs we're not putting the blame on -- it's not an easy fix just locking someone up and saying that the problem is dealt with. By decriminalizing drugs we should focus on rehabilitation instead of incarceration.

Person B: Mm. Yeah, that's a good point. So do you think we should decriminalize drugs for drug users, but still prevent the sales of drugs?

Person A: Yeah, I mean, prevent the sales of drugs but not incarcerate people because they're drug users.

Person B: Actually yeah, I think I actually agree with that.

Person A: I don't know. I feel like legalizing all drugs and decriminalizing drugs are two separate things and the survey meshes them into one.

Person B: Yeah. I agree.

Person A: So is this your first time taking a XLab [study]?

Person B: Yeah, what about you?

Person A: Yeah. Wanted to see what it was all about.

Person B: Yeah. It's kind of interesting. I don't know what they're trying to study.

Person A: Yeah, I didn't look too much into it. I just selected the one I was a candidate for.

Person B: Mm-hmm. Yeah. Mm. What's your name?

Person A: [Name redacted].

Person B: [Name redacted]? I'm [name redacted].

Person A: Oh, are you a first year or --

Person B: Yeah. What about you?

Person A: Same, first year.

Person B: Oh interesting. Mm.

Person A: What are you planning on studying?

Person B: I have no clue.

Person A: Same.

Person B: Oh really?

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Oh, that’s really comforting to hear.

Person A: In high school everyone knows -- I see everyone having an idea like, “I want to study this and that.” Like, “Go into law.” But once you get into college, it feels more chill. People are still exploring.

Person B: Yeah. It seems like most people know, so I'm glad that some people are in the same boat as me, you know?

Person A: Yeah. What are your interests?

Person B: I really like natural science and psychology. Well, biology and psychology really. But yeah -- or environmental science, so I'm not sure.

Person A: Are you in the College of Natural Resources or?

Person B: No, I'm in L&S [College of Letters and Science].

Person A: Oh same.

Person B: Oh okay. What are you thinking about?

Person A: I'm also thinking about biology or something in chemistry.

Person B: Mm. Yeah are you in CHEM 1A?

Person A: Not this semester. I took a preparatory course since I didn't take –

Person B: Oh CHEM P.

Person A: Yeah, CHEM P.

Person B: Yeah, I'm in 1A right now.

Person A: How's it going with that?

Person B: I mean, the midterm didn't go as badly as I thought it would. I thought the average would be like 40, but it's not.

Person A: Oh. So you did good then?

Person B: Yeah. I think the class average was like 40-something out of 57, which I thought wasn't too bad.

Person A: Yeah, that sounds really good.

Person B: Yeah. What classes are you taking?

Person A: I'm taking regular MATH 1A, English R1A, CHEM P, and Intro to Human Physiology.

Person B: Oh, I was going to take that. How is it?

Person A: It's okay. It's just mostly self-study.

Person B: Oh really? How come?

Person A: The professor is super chill, and it’s like everything that's going to be on the test is going to be in the textbook pretty much.

Person B: Oh wow, I want to take that then.

Person A: Yeah. I don't feel like you really have to go to lecture to even get an A in that class.

Person B: Oh wow. That's pretty nice.

Person A: Yeah, it's pretty nice.

Person B: Hmm. Yeah, that's good. Yeah. I'm taking CHEM 1A, Intro to Data Science, and Astronomy.

Person A: Oh. How's Astronomy? Sounds interesting.

Person B: Yeah, it's pretty nice and chill. You've probably heard about Filippenko.

Person A: Is he a professor?

Person B: Yeah. He's a really -- his astronomy class is pretty popular I heard, which is why I signed up. He's a really funny guy. The other day he was swinging a donut with a string to illustrate gravity.

Person A: Oh, isn't he the one who kind of looks like Albert Einstein?

Person B: I don't think he looks like -- I mean it depends on -- yeah. I don't know.

Person A: Yeah, my friend was taking astronomy too.

Person B: Oh really? He said he looks like Albert Einstein?

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: That's interesting. I mean, I don't know. I haven't seen a picture of Einstein when he was younger so.

Person A: Might be different guys.

Person B: Huh, maybe. Yeah.

Person A: Oh, so where are you from?

Person B: I'm from China.

Person A: Oh. What province or district?

Person B: I'm from Shandong. No one really knows it, so it's okay.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Because I'm not from any major city so. Yeah, and I went to high school in Seattle.

Person A: Oh. So you immigrated to the United States?

Person B: I wish. No, I'm an international student.

Person A: Oh.

Person B: It kind of feels like this is my home. But yeah, I'm not a citizen.

Person A: Oh, how are you liking the U.S.?

Person B: Yeah. I mean, I like it better than China.

Person A: Mm. Yeah, my parents are immigrants too from Mexico.

Person B: Oh, nice.

Person A: And from what I can tell when I go to Mexico and here -- I mean here is pretty chill, I guess.

Person B: Yeah. I like Mexico too. I've been there once.

Person A: Oh really, what part?

Person B: Guadalajara.

Person A: Oh, that's where I go every time.

Person B: Oh, really?

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Nice.

Person A: What part did you -- or what did you see there?

Person B: Well, I was part of high school exchange. I was doing an exchange with Lincoln High School. It's this bilingual school in Guadalajara.

Person A: Oh.

Person B: So I went to Tlaquepaque.

Person A: Tlaquepaque?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Oh, my great-grandparents live there.

Person B: Oh, really?

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Yeah. I mean, yeah, and I went to a bunch of fancy malls and stuff and taco stores. I really liked the tacos there.

Person A: Did you get the street tacos?

Person B: No, we went to a taco restaurant that my host family thought was really good. Yeah, I thought it was really good.

Person A: Oh. Wait, so do you speak Spanish?

Person B: I took Spanish 1 in high school. Not really.

Person A: That’s good. So not really then?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Huh.

Person B: Mm. Yeah, I wish I spoke Spanish better because I want to travel in Latin America more. So I might take Spanish next semester.

Person A: Yeah, Latin America is really beautiful. You should go to Mexico City if you have the time.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: Mm. What do you recommend?

Person A: Pretty much everything there. The cathedral, the pyramids.

Person B: Oh nice.

Person A: It's really beautiful.

Person B: Yeah, sounds like a great place. Have you been to any other Latin American countries?

Person A: No, I haven't. I want to though.

Person B: Yeah. It's nice.

Person A: Wait, so is this the end of the survey? I mean –

Person B: I guess, yeah. That was a pretty good conversation.

Person A: Yeah, not bad. All right, see you.

Person B: See you.
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Person B: Okay. So, what are your thoughts about reparations?

Person A: I think on the surface that, yes, I support the government to make reparations, but I do not feel strongly about it. Because even though -- I mean, they tried to make the reparations, I think if we're dealing with the case of racism and discrimination and stuff it's not just about the government. I feel it's also -- maybe the individuals should try and maybe -- I mean it's also on the individual.

Person B: So what do you mean by the individual? Would that be the recipient? Or just generally about racism, discrimination and all that?

Person A: Maybe the general people. I mean, I'm not sure but -- you know, maybe just -- yeah.

Person B: Okay. I see, I see. All right. Well I guess I'll just go through my perspective.

Person A: Yes.

Person B: So, I voted against it “fairly strongly.” Not “very strong.” And the reason why is because it's financially -- it's nearly impossible to do without putting a disadvantage on probably the same people who are going to receive the reparations. Meaning -- so if the government pays descendants of slavery, it's a slippery slope because if, for example, you get married, you have kids, wouldn't those kids also be eligible for the reparations? So that's why I think that financially, it's unreasonable. Ethically -- not necessarily ethics about, you know, just person-to-person interaction. I think it will breed more injustice as Whites, Latinos, Muslims, or just anyone who wasn't directly affected by slavery will just see this class that was affected randomly get a large sum of money and support. So that's why I think it won't work in that end.

Person A: Yeah. I think -- yeah, I totally understand everything. You're right. I mean if the support is financially, I think your argument really makes sense. I mean if we're only giving the support to the descendants of the slaves, but you said we're not giving the same treatment to other groups too.

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: Yeah. A lot of the support the government gives, it's not financially. But I'm not sure what other kind of support that the government can give.

Person B: Yeah. That's an interesting question because back -- I don't know how long -- when affirmative action was a thing, I think that was in some way, shape, or form a reparation for minorities to get into college. And it has worked. There definitely has been successful people who've been through that process getting higher education. But I think the issue is really how a community themselves support each other.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: For example, Latinos, especially ones I've seen, they actually have huge families. They group up. They pool their money to help the next generation go to education or pool their money to help another family member start a business. And in this case, this specific case, really affects Blacks and African Americans because they don't have a really helpful or preparing community. I've seen it. My Dad personally has been through that and he tells me, “Yeah, we don't really support each other.” And I think that's just a cultural thing. Something that the government can't directly affect.

Person A: I see. Yeah. Mm. I’m not sure what else to say.

Person B: Yeah. What year are you?

Person A: Junior.

Person B: Junior? All right.

Person A: What about you?

Person B: Same.

Person A: Yeah? I’m a transfer student though.

Person B: Okay. Where did you transfer from?

Person A: Oregon. Portland.

Person B: Oregon, Portland?

Person A: Yes.

Person B: So what made you come all the way to Berkeley from Oregon?

Person A: I guess because it’s Berkeley. Right?

Person B: Just because it’s Berkeley. All right, yeah. What were your other options, just out of curiosity?

Person A: I got into U Dub [University of Washington]. It’s down in Washington.

Person B: Okay.

Person A: And then I got into UCLA too. But I guess I didn’t apply to any university in Oregon itself.

Person B: That’s interesting. So what is your major?

Person A: MCB [molecular and cell biology].

Person B: MCB? Okay, so you’re going to be the next doctor?

Person A: Oh, I’m not doing medical though.

Person B: You’re not doing medical?

Person A: Yeah. What about you?

Person B: Bioengineering, so we’re in similar fields. Just different applications of it. You’ll be like the scientist discovering the cure to cancer and I’ll just be making some X-ray machines. Yeah.

Person A: Mm.

Person B: So what do you like about Berkeley since you’re a transfer student? This is your first semester I’m assuming?

Person A: Yes, first semester. So far, I guess it’s just okay. I mean I can’t think of anything special that I like.

Person B: I guess that leads up to my second question. Are you regretting Berkeley?

Person A: No, I’m not regretting it. So far it’s been okay.

Person B: All right, yeah. That’s good.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Have you seen Berkeley’s meme page?

Person A: I think yeah, but only a few times.

Person B: Oh okay. Yeah.

Person A: Yeah, I should look into it more.

Person B: I feel like after you go into that, you’ll be less pleased about Berkeley just because how depressive they are. But yeah. Mm, yeah. That’s good. Transfer student, MCB. What’s your toughest class?

Person A: Right now -- I guess I’m taking a history class just for the requirements. I mean it’s not that hard. But then we’re having our first midterm in a couple weeks, so I don’t know yet, how it’s going to be.

Person B: Okay.

Person A: I mean listening to the lectures is fun and all, but when it comes to the midterm, I guess it’s a different story.

Person B: Do you have homework in that class? Because I’m guessing it’s just readings.

Person A: Just readings. But a lot of readings, yeah.

Person B: All right. Yeah. Have you heard of Berkeley Time [courses catalog] yet?

Person A: Yes.

Person B: Oh yeah. Yeah, so you can definitely check up on your class through there.

Person A: Mm-hmm.

Person B: Have you ever heard of Tau Beta Pi?

Person A: No.

Person B: All right, so this is a test bank that’s from the engineering fraternity or honor fraternity, and they have a bunch of previous midterms and finals from other classes. You can check if any of your classes line up with that. It’s just some extra practice.

Person A: Okay? What is it called again?

Person B: Tau Beta Pi.

Person A: Okay.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Yeah, I think I’ve heard of it from my friend but I’m not sure if it’s the same thing or not. But I think she got the MCB midterms from that site.

Person B: Yeah, they should definitely have science or STEM midterms on there. I don’t know if they’ll have history on there. But the good thing about history is, really just know dates. Well if you can describe them you should be fine.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Yeah. How’s your day going?

Person A: Okay. So far.

Person B: All right. What made you participate in this study?

Person A: Well I guess you get paid.

Person B: Oh, you get paid. Yeah, the money.

Person A: Yes.

Person B: Help pay for those bills.

Person A: Yes.

Person B: Lunch for one day.

Person A: Yeah, so true.

Person B: Hmm.

Person A: I actually -- for my history class, we’re studying about slavery right now.

Person B: About what?

Person A: Slavery.

Person B: Oh, slavery. Oh, okay.

Person A: Yeah. But then, yeah.

Person B: So what in there actually helps reparations? What are some other pros for reparations?

Person A: Yeah, I’m trying to think about it. But it’s just that, for the reparations, what is it actually that they’re trying to better in the first place? I think if I -- I mean, if we know that more, then it will be easier to make an argument of why to support the reparations. But I mean right now so -- I’m just not sure –

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: Ah, all right. Looks like we have to finish up the conversation. It was nice talking to you.

Person A: Yeah, nice talking to you too.
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Person B: Okay. Do you want to go first?

Person A: Either way. You can if you want.

Person B: I don't really have a preference either.

Person A: Okay. Yeah, go ahead then if you want.

Person B: Okay. So I oppose legalizing drugs in the U.S. just because it's so dangerous allowing people to easily access drugs. Because the easier it is for people to obtain drugs, the easier it is for them to become addicted. Yeah, all right, that's my stance. How about you?

Person A: I don't -- I kind of see both sides of it. My thing with legalizing it, and I don't feel super strong about it, but [it] would be kind of a few things. People who choose to do drugs now, they're going to find a way. I totally understand your point of, "If it's legalized, it's easier to find," but you can always get around age limits or whatnot. But if you do legalize it, then there's the ability to, I don’t know, [it] feels funny framing it as "safer drugs," but you won't -- you'll have stuff that has -- you know, you can put restrictions on how it's made, processed, et cetera. And whatever it could be laced with, if you have people who try to find it on the street, potentially lessen that possibility. Yeah, I wasn't aware that -- I think it was Portugal in the sample questions said they've done this and it’s, in a sense, helped with drug addiction and seeing that as kind of a case study of sorts. Like, “Okay. A country has tried this and it has worked.” Apparently, according to that. So.

Person B: Yeah. I feel like in regards to the black market and other illegal means people take to obtain drugs, I feel like that will always exist. There will always be some sketchy part, especially when you're dealing with drugs. Yeah, you don't know what it's laced with and how it's being produced. And I feel like legalizing it, at least, the costs have far worse implications than keeping it illegal and preventing people, I guess, from easily obtaining drugs.

Person A: Yeah. I don't know what I envision if it was legalized as far as accessibility of it. But it wouldn't just be go to a convenience store and, "Oh, I'm going to get some heroin, okay." So I don't really know what the scenario of legal -- all drugs looks like. But I think in another, kind of small part in favor of [it] is, instead of the money being used [for] law enforcement and incarceration and people in jail, instead of all that going towards just locking people up, and trying to find that, in theory, you could instead frame that as -- or use that money to have rehab programs, educating people, mental health care, you know. Some people choose to do drugs because they like the feeling they get. Others, it's mental health issues that lead them into it. And I feel bad for the mental health people and that's where they can get help instead of [getting] arrested or whatever. Maybe they can get to a better place and -- yeah, it's probably wishful thinking there but --

Person B: No, that's very fair. Have you ever taken an Econ class at Berkeley?

Person A: Not at Berkeley. I did my -- I'm a graduate.

Person B: Oh, I see.

Person A: Yeah, I went to UCLA. Was an Economics major there, but it's been a little while.

Person B: Oh, okay.

Person A: But yeah, why do you ask?

Person B: There's the whole externality thing with educating people versus putting a tax on something that's very not ideal, I guess. And I feel like that applies to drugs as well. We should focus on educating people better, so that prevents them from going out and buying drugs versus, I don't know, yeah, putting a lot of money into law enforcement and putting people in jail.

Person A: Yeah. Then I don't know if this is a positive of it potentially, but if it were legalized and sold and there's the ability to tax it and raise funds so that can then go into again, you would hope, education, rehab programs, that type of stuff. Kind of like with cigarettes now. It's like, "All right, tax the heck out of it, if you choose do it then." I don't do drugs, I don't smoke any of that stuff, and I find it all kind of repulsive. So saying, "Oh, it should be legal," is kind of a funny stance I feel I have, but there are those silver linings of it where -- and again this kind of gets into the whole politics of it, which I feel like our country's a mess and a joke right now -- but there's the possibility that these funds that are raised could go to a helpful cause, that aspect of things.

Person B: Yeah. More like, I guess, doing good than removing the bad?

Person A: Yeah, I think that's a good way to frame it and put it. Because yeah, if you can -- I don’t think, as you said earlier, you're not going to remove the black market aspect of drugs, alcohol or really anything. But if you can lessen that, then you can potentially get some positives out of the legalization.

Person B: Yeah. And also I would imagine that if drugs were legalized, there would also be some kind of an age limit, and if that were the case then, I don't know, younger people trying to purchase drugs probably would have to deal with very dangerous situations, I guess. Or they might be put in dangerous situations trying to obtain the drugs, just because it's legal or it would be legal then.

Person A: Mm-hmm. Yeah. Because I don't feel like it's an exact comparison, but with alcohol, you know, I drank well before I turned 21.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: So I tell my daughter now, "That's an adult beverage, you don't do that until you're older." But that's not what I expect to happen when that day comes. But anyhow, it's something to where -- yeah, if I feel like if it was legalized, there might be that initial -- I don't know if excitement is the right word, but kind of push or "Oh, it's legal, we can go get it."

Person B: Like hype, yeah.

Person A: Yeah. So that might be that first year, two years, six months, I don't know what the time frame would be, but maybe an initial increase in usage and then maybe a tapering from there? At UCLA, where I went to do my undergrad, they didn't have alcohol on campus at that time. That wasn't allowed, and so there was always -- I think at some point since I graduated, they have had some breweries that it is served, but the thought was always if and when they do allow it, there might be that initial increase in drinking on campus, but then, "Okay, it's not some cool, new, novel thing anymore."

Person B: I guess you have to go back. Again, I don't know if this is a useful comparison, but looking back to the legalization of marijuana and seeing those trends and then obviously marijuana is not the scariest drug out there. So I don’t know. You really have to see what kind of psychology has to play into this.

Person A: Yeah. Very true. And then kind of how cigarettes seem like -- that's an addictive thing, hard for people to quit.

Person B: Yeah, exactly.

Person A: You know, it's their choice and largely impacts them alone. I hate the smell of cigarette smoke and all the secondhand smoke stuff but at the end of the day if I pass somebody who's smoking a cigarette, it's not going to do much of anything to me.

Person B: Exactly.

Person A: Somebody tripping out on whatever drug it is, slightly different than someone who's kind of stoned or smoking or even buzzed or drunk, I don't know.

Person B: Yeah. You raise a good point because that also creates a negative externality on others, having people who get easy access to drugs. I guess you just have to really analyze the costs and the benefits and put priorities to what impacts society more.

Person A: Yeah, I don't know enough about the different kinds of -- as far as how long you are impacted by it.

Person B: Yeah, same.

Person A: If it was legalized -- there's kind of the marijuana shops or places -- would you have your heroin shop to where it's a safe place to use it and you can trip out in a padded room? I don't know. But yeah, there are a lot of unintended side effects, consequences, if it were to be legalized to where -- yeah, how would you test it easily if you get pulled over. Those types of things that have to be thought through and readily apparent to where the police officer could tell in a breathalyzer type thing.

Person B: Yeah, yeah.

Person A: So yeah, I don't know.

Person B: Yeah, there was also one part of the prompt that said people are afraid to report anything if anything happens in case of an emergency and stuff. I think that's something that can easily be dealt with by respecting the confidentiality of the person who's calling for help or the person who is receiving help, safeguarding that information.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Yeah, that is a really important aspect.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Nice talking to you.

Person B: Yeah, it was nice talking to you too.
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Person A: Okay. Hello.

Person B: Hi.

Person A: Okay, so I think we're supposed to talk about legalizing drugs in the United States.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Okay, do you want to start with your position, or do you want me to start?

Person B: You can start.

Person A: Okay. So I honestly didn't have a very strong opinion on this topic because I didn't really know too much about it. So I picked agree, but I put one [on the scale] and I put “not super sure.”

Person B: Oh, okay.

Person A: But I just feel like -- what I do agree with though is that there should be more government regulation regarding drugs and stuff like that. And people should be more willing to seek help if they're battling with things like addiction or they have an overdose, because then instead of being worried that they'll get in trouble for it, it's better to have people seek the help they need before something bad happens. And I feel like that part is important. And because of that, it's hard to regulate things if it's illegal because there's a lot of underground trading and illegal things going on. So that's why I feel like it might be beneficial to legalize drugs, but at the same time it's -- like legalizing marijuana is one thing, but then other drugs that are harder, that are more dangerous -- I'm not super sure if that will be the best idea. So that's my general opinion.

Person B: Yeah, okay.

Person A: Mm-hmm.

Person B: So yeah, I think a big thing is [it] depends on what drugs are being legalized. Because obviously something like weed, it's already recreational in I don't know how many states. And that is just equally or less more debatable about how dangerous it is in comparison to alcohol. But versus something like opiates, which only are legal in a certain sense with doctors prescribing them, those are already just a huge issue with people being addicted. And it's like -- I think there's a study that something like a third of heroin addicts, before they were junkies, they were on opiates first. And then they get addicted, they go through withdrawal, and then that's when they turn to heroin. And that's just a major epidemic in the U.S. right now. I think it was like in a year, opiates were killing more people than car crashes and something else combined.

Person A: Oh my God. Okay.

Person B: Yeah. Yeah. So I think what the little survey said -- it was saying something that one of the benefits or the pros was just because, again with illegal drug trade and things like that. But when it's already an issue on a legal sense, I just don't think -- like for prescriptions and things. When it's already an issue for the people who are getting it with permission, I don't think just letting it all go is going to really help anything.

Person A: Oh, for sure. Yeah. Well yeah, I agree with that honestly. But [for] some drugs, I feel like it's okay. Depending on -- there's a certain degree of which it shouldn't be legal and other things that are more okay. And then I just guess it depends on scientific research and things, and if what they determine is safer versus much more dangerous, I guess.

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: And yeah, I think what you're saying in terms of government regulation and things like that, that there should be some sort of pardoning type of thing maybe with getting people help. Versus them getting caught up and worried about getting in trouble and not getting the help they need. Versus just being stuck. Versus having the opportunity to get help and get back on track, so to speak.

Person A: Yeah. Mm-hmm. And also I do feel like this kind of getting help and stuff like that is different for people of different socioeconomic status, because I don't know if you know but the Demi Lovato thing. She had like -- I forgot what it was, cocaine or something, and then she -- everybody was supporting her and it was okay for her to seek help and do rehab and stuff. But a lot of other people -- especially who come from more disadvantaged backgrounds -- they're the people who are more likely to get put into jail for this kind of stuff. And that's a bigger issue that's not about just legalizing it or not, but just being more fair to all types of people regardless of whether they have the money to seek treatment, I think.

Person B: Yeah. That's true, because rehab centers are so freaking expensive. So yeah, really that's another reason why a lot of people don't get help. They simply can't afford it. And yeah, those are definitely resources that need to be looked into and made more available to the general public. That is another thing, because people from different economic standpoints, it's going to affect what they have access to as well. Just like you were saying, Demi Lovato started doing cocaine maybe, versus someone else who has less money and they're doing crack. Or -- but then opioids are just weirdly middle ground where it's both rich and poor because everyone -- yeah, crazy. Yeah, there's just a lot of different things to look at with socioeconomic status.

Person A: Mm-hmm. Yep. Okay. And then so time to -- what did they say? If you run out of topics, you can get to know each other. All right. So my name is [name redacted]. I'm a second year at Cal. I'm a Computer Science major.

Person B: All right. Well, [name redacted], I am [name redacted] I'm a second year as well.

Person A: Oh, cool. Okay.

Person B: And intended media studies.

Person A: Oo, okay.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: That's pretty cool. All right.

Person B: [Name redacted], what bands you listen to?

Person A: Bands? Oh damn.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: I feel like I listen to super basic music. If I'm on Spotify, I'm always on Today's Top Hits.

Person B: Oh, really?

Person A: Yeah, it's horrible. Everybody else is always like, “Why do you have such a basic music taste?” But yeah, how about you?

Person B: Well, I listen to a lot of alternative.

Person A: Oh, that’s cool, that’s cool.

Person B: All right, so describe what -- who's your guilty pleasure then? Like basic artist?

Person A: Oh, damn.

Person B: Are you a Taylor Swift fan or something? Or Ed Sheeran or something? Enlighten me.

Person A: Let me see. Recently I've been really into Halsey because my roommate introduced me to her.

Person B: Halsey.

Person A: Yeah, mm-hmm.

Person B: Oh, okay. I used to really love her. The first album, second one, or just all of it?

Person A: I like the first one more. The one where she sang -- what’s that one called? Shoot.

Person B: I can’t remember the names. I just remember the first one’s blue and the second one’s red, right?

Person A: Yeah, yeah, yeah. I feel like the songs on the earlier one are a bit better. Like her newer ones, Hopeless Fast and Kingdom or something -- I only really like Bad at Love and a few of the more popular ones. But the other ones, I enjoy more pieces from that album.

Person B: Mm-hmm. Okay, okay.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Halsey -- I haven't listened to her in a long time.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Yeah, she's neat.

Person A: Are there any artists that you're into?

Person B: Current obsession is Jack White, the front guy of the White Stripes.

Person A: Oo okay. Wait, what kind of -- I’ve never heard of this -- what kind of music is it?

Person B: That’s rock or like garage rock. They sing the song that goes [like this]. It’s a very common stadium chant.

Person A: Oh okay. Uh-huh.

Person B: Yeah, he’s just a very interesting artist.

Person A: That’s cool, that’s cool.

Person B: Yeah, very rock and roll.

Person A: Mm-hmm.

Person B: Okay wait, so you just started getting into Halsey?

Person A: Like a few weeks ago I’d say. Since the school year started.

Person B: Ah. I was going to ask if you’re caught up to all the G-Eazy drama.

Person A: She went to her concert over the summer, and then she was super into it. And I was like, “Oh, damn, okay.”

Person B: Hmm. Do you like Lana Del Rey?

Person A: I’m not super -- I don’t know her songs too well to -- yeah.

Person B: Okay.

Person A: So what classes are you taking this semester?

Person B: I am taking History of Art.

Person A: Oo, okay.

Person B: Like 190. So it’s an upper div and it’s going to look a little scary. There’s a lot of old people in the class. Not to be ageist or anything but I’m just like, “Oh, that’s interesting.”

Person A: Wait, old as in grad students or old as in seniors?

Person B: Okay like, I tripped out the first day because I felt like everyone either looked like a grad student or a grandparent, that’s what I’m saying. There’s a bunch of people that look older, like they’re 21 and stuff, and I’m like, “Oh okay.” And I was mildly intimidated, and then there’s a bunch of just genuinely old people.

Person A: Oh, so they just come in to listen to the lectures and things?

Person B: I guess so. I had no idea.

Person A: That’s pretty cool.

Person B: So it’s just like, “Oh all right, cool," a very diverse group here. So that class is really interesting. But I’m also in Anthro and Poli Sci and Astro C10.

Person A: Oh, okay. Yeah I heard it’s Filipenko right? He’s a really good lecturer for that.

Person B: Yeah, I guess everyone seems to really, really love him so my friend was like, “Oh yeah, we should take it” and I needed to get my STEM -- not STEM, but my Physical Science breadth, yeah. But oh man, Tuesdays and Thursdays I have back-to-back [classes]. First it’s Poli Sci and then Anthro in the exact same room, back to back, in Dwinelle [building].

Person A: Oh man. Okay.

Person B: And then my next back-to-back is Hist Art, so it’s four and a half hours of class. It’s great.

Person A: That’s a lot of lectures.

Person B: It is a lot of lecture. So we’ll see how the semester goes.

Person A: Good time, good time.

Person B: We’ll see how long I get by without missing a class.

Person A: Wait, are all your classes like mostly lecture, like “you have to attend” type of classes?

Person B: Hmm? I mean none of them take attendance other than section, so that’s absolutely mandatory. I would probably be fine if I missed Poli Sci because he uploads the slides and everything. But Anthro, I was reading all the “Rate my Professor” stuff and they’re like, “If you go to lecture and take notes, you can skip. I never did any of the readings and got an A.” So I’m like, “All right, I will skip the readings and go to class.”

Person A: Wait, what Anthro class is this?

Person B: 3AC.

Person A: Oh, okay. I took 2AC, like freshman year, so. That was interesting.

Person B: Oh really?

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: What was 2AC about? Is it still like --

Person A: It is archaeology.

Person B: Archaeology.

Person A: Yeah, I did it for my history breadth or something. So.

Person B: Nice, nice. I feel like all I have this semester is just full -- I mean with the exception of Astro it’s just history and history.

Person A: Oh my, that’s a lot of reading and stuff, right?

Person B: Because like Anthro and Poli Sci and Hist Art. So it’s just like, “This is how humans work, and this is why art matters.” And I’m just like, “Wow, okay”.

Person A: That’s pretty cool. I only have one humanities class this semester, I think. I’m doing three CS technicals. Fun times.

Person B: Are you doing 61B and stuff?

Person A: Oh no, I did that last year. I’m doing upper div, and then 61C and Data 8. Yeah. Oh.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Is our time up?

Person B: Okay, I think we’re done.

Person A: All right then.

Person B: All right, nice talking to you. Bye bye.
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Person B: All right.

Person A: Sweet.

Person B: So I'm assuming that you support legalization?

Person A: Yes, it looks like that way.

Person B: Yeah. So would you like to go ahead and just start?

Person A: Yeah, sure. So the first thing I wrote down was just my views on what the purpose of criminalizing drugs is, and it’s -- a huge part of the whole debate is, “Why are drugs illegal and why would they be legal essentially?” And the main thing I could come up with in terms of the purpose of criminalizing drugs is, it's supposedly better for public safety. Drugs are a hindrance on public safety, and that's kind of the key process of a lot of justification for criminalizing them and making them illegal. Because that's an incentive to not do them and because the goal is to improve public safety, whether that's public safety of the user or situations they can get into when they're on drugs that could harm others. And the first thing I saw when we read that little tidbit about it is, in certain places where they've decriminalized drugs, the number of overdoses, the number of arrests related to drugs have gone down. So that's a key point against the idea that criminalizing drugs actually makes the public safer. So that's just kind of the first thing I wrote down, I don't know if you want to talk about some of your first instincts and ideas when you first saw this.

Person B: Yeah. Well I have basically three that really came to mind. So the first one is political capital. What I see is if we were to actually legalize drugs, then what's going to happen is just even passing that legislation is going to cost so much in regards to being able to -- I'm assuming if one party were to pass this and the other party is going to be so opposed to it that the political capital needed in order to pass this is going to be so large that we're not going to be able to pass legislation that actually matters, in my opinion. Because I'm not super passionate about whether or not people should be able to use drugs. But I think that the fact that it could stop other legislation from being passed is big. Additionally, I think that if we legalize drugs then I actually have a different view. This is kind of what you're talking about where we have the general attitudes about drugs. I think that it's right to think that they're bad, because I don't think that we should be encouraging people to use drugs. I don't think that we should be supporting it. I think that it causes a lot of harm, and that it could just be a huge detriment to people and society in general if we allow drugs to be used on a consistent basis. And then last, I just want to say I think that in regards to the illegal activities and some of the harm that comes from that, I think that it's going to be happening anyway if we legalize drugs. We see that in places where they are legalized, where it's still cheaper to get them illegally and we still have the negative effects of the industry. We still have sketchy drugs coming in which may or may not be combined with other drugs, and so that's where my opinion comes from.

Person A: Yeah. I guess the idea of “causes harm” is where the whole contention is, if these drugs genuinely cause harm or if decriminalization causes them to do less harm. And the way my view has been formed -- the one-sentence intro the study gave kind of pointed to that -- there are cases where when they're decriminalized, harm has gone down because overdoses have gone down. And that's kind of a counterintuitive thought, but it's one I think that needs to be looked at more in terms of when we're talking about causing harm. Because I agree, drugs can be harmful. But if there's a solution here that's different than our current criminalization and the current justice protocol when it comes to drug addicts, that causes less harm, I think that's something that should be looked at. And that's what I see this and when I've done research apart from this, on the topic, it seems like this is a potential solution that will cause less harm overall when it comes to drug use. But.

Person B: Yeah, for sure. I think the same thing. I think that it is potentially able to do some good, but I think that if we continue to set up programs for people who do use drugs or who have been affected by drugs, I think that those are the solution as opposed to completely just legalizing them in general. Because I think that the attitude about drugs should still be that they're a negative thing. Because I think if we continue to enforce that, then less people are likely to start taking drugs. We're still going to have people agreeing to help people who want to recover from drugs, and we're not going to -- I think that, that attitude is what's driving this help. Whereas if we legalize it, I think that maybe if somebody sought help then maybe people would be less prone to do that.

Person A: Yeah, I think that's totally in the realm of possibility, and I would tend to agree that there actually are better solutions in terms of more recovery or more programs aimed at people who are users. I just do think there needs to be a shift in terms of whether drugs cause harm at the current levels that people think or if they should be criminalized in the way they are right now. Which I think is pretty scary in terms of just the jail time that's associated with drug use compared to other offenses. But yeah, what you allude to in terms of other programs, I think that's an effective means. Just a lot of the other programs that I've seen involve changing -- maybe not specifically decriminalizing drugs, but changing the ideas and beliefs behind drug use from a criminal activity to look towards something that's more of an addiction, which I think is a good step. Which from what you said, you would tend to agree with in terms of programs for drug users. So.

Person B: Yeah. And I do think that it definitely is that type of thing and we should be shifting the attitude towards that. But I also think that the drugs that we're talking about are more serious ones. We're talking about -- I just forgot the name -- like cocaine.

Person A: LSD is an example.

Person B: Yeah. And so, LSD isn't, in my opinion, as bad, but stuff like cocaine or heroin, if we start to view them as something that's almost okay or somewhat -- like something that somebody could potentially use, and I think that that's extremely dangerous. And I think that we should continue to just show people how dangerous they can be. Because with a lot of people, they probably won't get involved with drugs if they just have that image in their mind of how scary it is as opposed to legalization.

Person A: Yeah. I think that that's a slippery slope of using criminalization to influence people's education on something though. Like when you said that, what came to mind was something like base jumping or some extreme sport in terms of like, there's no criminalization over it but there's still education and what not in terms of use and its safety. Which I think could be more effective. I just think it's a slippery slope to criminalize something or keep something illegal just to have people be wary of it, if that makes sense.

Person B: Yeah. I know, but I still think that -- not only that, but we also have to look at the fact that we do lose a lot of innocent people. Because if we were to make it legal, it does have negative repercussions and they do do a lot of harm. Like cocaine, as soon as somebody tries it or it gets into their life then it does cause a lot of problems and there aren't -- yes, there are a lot of problems with the way we enforce the law, especially with marijuana use. And that's where mandatory minimums and stuff really are bad. But seeing as that's becoming legal, when we're looking at the more serious drugs especially, I think that mandatory minimums aren’t in play as much as the fact that it ruins lives. And I think that the impact of ruining more lives outweighs shifting attitudes for people who may or may not want to use that drug.

Person A: Yeah. I guess I'd have to look more into the studies in terms of places that have pursued more higher levels of decriminalization, where that harm is coming from in terms of overdoses and arrests, and I guess overall, medical records of the places there. Because I think I would totally agree with you if the data backs that up, which -- yeah.

Person B: Yeah. I see both sides -- yeah.

Person A: Yeah, totally. And I get what you're saying in terms of -- inherently, I believe I live a more productive and less disruptive life without drugs, and I think most people would agree with that. And I do get what you're saying in terms of the tone shift or the attitude shift that may come with legalization. Yeah. I wish there was a way to lessen the current criminalization and attitudes towards drug users without maybe changing the attitudinal overview of the drug use in general, in terms of health.

Person B: Yeah, I think we kind of agree on most things. We both see that there are negative effects, but there also are -- we should be shifting the tone and everything, and I think it's just the degree to which we think that should happen.

Person A: Yeah, totally.

Person B: I think that's what we differ in.

Person A: And I actually sort of answered that, or I thought of that as I was answering. In terms of, I think a full cold turkey shift to all drugs are legal, isn't probably the best solution. But I do think there should be a reduction in terms of the criminalization of certain drugs specifically that have just been politicized to be dangerous more than they actually are. And then also just the current sentencing or the mindset of drug users. But yeah, I'm with you.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Oh, what year are you?

Person B: I’m a freshman. How about you?

Person A: Nice, nice. I’m a fourth year.

Person B: Oh, so have you been doing this?

Person A: No, this is my second or third study.

Person B: Oh, okay.

Person A: This is my first one that’s like this format, in terms of actually interacting with other people. Usually they’re more singular.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: This is my first one ever. So.

Person A: Oh, nice. Yeah, they’re sweet. You show up -- otherwise I’d be sleeping or eating, and I get to make thirteen dollars. And I can go buy lunch tomorrow with an easy conscience.

Person B: Yeah, for sure.

Person A: Are you studying Politics? Or Political Science?

Person B: Economics actually. How about you?

Person A: Oh nice. I’m an Econ major too.

Person B: Yeah Econ.

Person A: What are you --

Person B: Well you’re declared. I’m undeclared, obviously.

Person A: Yeah, yeah, yeah. Are you thinking of doing Haas or just Econ?

Person B: No, just Econ.

Person A: Good. That’s where all the good people are.

Person B: Okay. Is that what you did?

Person A: Yeah, totally. Same thing. I like the policy side of it more than the business side of it.

Person B: Same, I just -- people are like, “Oh, I’m pre-Haas but if I don’t get into Haas then I’m going into Econ,” and I’m like, “Well, that’s -- yeah, screw you.”

Person A: Those people are the worst. Yeah, you’ll go to Econ classes for the next year, and you can pinpoint the Haas students based on how they interact in section and lecture. It’s really interesting.

Person B: Wow, are they less into it?

Person A: Well either totally tuned out when they’re talking about policy or they’re the ones who will go straight up to the professor after class and ask all the questions and be very into it and try to create that interaction with the professor. You can totally tell. It’s interesting.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Yeah, well, good luck. Enjoy.

Person B: Yeah, you too.
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Person B: So do you want to go first, or me?

Person A: You can go first.

Person B: Okay. So the reason why I would oppose allowing extremely controversial speakers to come on campus, specifically the UC Berkeley campus, is that I don't actually believe that the controversial speakers have a chance to sway our minds. We are a really historically liberal campus, and I think that the intentions of people like Milo and Ben Shapiro, to come on campus and allow them to speak, their intentions are not what their normal intentions are, which is to allow people to understand their point of view. Because they know that here they're just trying to stir controversy, stir violence in the community, and I think that's not really a good thing to have done. I don't think free speech -- everybody uses the free speech argument as an excuse, but I believe that free speech is no longer the same as it was before. And racists are using free speech as some sort of vehicle to get their racist points across. You can go ahead.

Person A: Okay. So I support it, but to a limited degree. I definitely don't support any violence or negative effects, but just allowing certain speakers to speak on campus should be allowed. Because, yeah. It's free speech and it's part of the law. Like, certain Berkeley Law professors have discussed this before and free speech, it’s part of the law. And so part of the university's mission is to allow for the discussion of different ideas, and so silencing certain speakers, it would do more damage than allowing them to speak. And controlling the situation so that there isn't any violence -- even though it's super expensive, like our school spent millions of dollars or something, or hundreds of thousands -- so even though their ideas are controversial, it's part of the job of a democracy to allow for different ideas. And if a certain idea is bad or something, then eventually people will come to realize that. But the expression of the idea should be allowed at least.

Person B: Right. I think expression is okay to a certain extent. If racism is involved, if some sort of shaming is involved, I don't know if that should be allowed or permitted at the campus. I think that people like Ben Shapiro and Milo Yiannopoulos, they're very strategic to how they -- you notice that they come during the beginning of the school year, not towards the end, because that's when students have the time to become more involved in campus and they have the time to stir some sort of controversy. But I don’t know. I think allowing extremely controversial speakers on a campus -- I'm referring to very right-leaning speakers, to have them speak on a really historically liberal campus is kind of -- I feel like it's just instigating some sort of mess. In the past, the Martin Luther King Building was actually destroyed and had a lot of reparations in store just because when Milo came to speak, I think that there was some sort of violence that was involved. I'm not entirely sure, but I just don't understand the point of them coming to campus other than just to stir controversy, stir violence. Because they understand, they're very strategic. They understand that they have no chance in changing many of our opinions, because when you think of a liberal campus, you think of Berkeley. And so they're doing this intentionally just to make us upset. But I also understand that freedom of expression should be allowed in school. I just think that they could be doing this at a different campus instead of ours. Or perhaps even not on campus, but in the Berkeley city. Just, I don’t know, I think keeping the students safe should be a really number one priority. I don't know if you remember last year when Milo and Ben Shapiro came, we were not allowed to leave our rooms. We got emails, we got phone reminders: “Try not to leave your room, because there's going to be a lot of violence." And I just don't think that should be something students should be concerned about.

Person A: But actually, when they spoke, a lot of people attended, right? So.

Person B: Right. A lot of people did. I think it's a good way of also showing your school spirit in a way.

Person A: People who weren't extremely liberal listened to what they said.

Person B: Right.

Person A: And they had some supporters. Berkeley is mostly liberal, but just completely blocking them isn't a good idea and it'll definitely be something big on the media. Also, yeah, safety should be a huge priority, so that's why so much was done with the police and everything. And yeah, I agree that their purpose isn't really to change our minds or anything, it’s mostly to stir controversy. But I think that the effects of not letting them talk would be worse. Especially because Berkeley is such a prestigious university in this country. And most college campuses are more liberal than not.

Person B: Yes, I agree that most college campuses are more liberal than right-leaning conservative. But yeah, that's really all I had on my paper. So if you wanted to get to know each other? Or did you want to continue? Do you have anything else to say?

Person A: Not really.

Person B: Okay. Well, how many minutes do we have left, do you know?

Person A: Oh. I think we have 2 minutes. Yeah. We’re at 10 minutes right now.

Person B. Okay. Well, I guess I shouldn’t ask your name. I don’t know if it’s confidential or anything, but what year are you?

Person A: I’m a rising Junior.

Person B: Oh, cool.

Person A: So I came here -- my freshman year was when Trump was elected.

Person B: Oh, no way! That’s -- wow. I’m a second year.

Person A: Oh, okay.

Person B: What’s your major?

Person A: I’m Computer Science and Cognitive Science.

Person B: Oh, wow. Both. That’s the two CS’s. That’s pretty hard. I’m MCB [Molecular and Cell Biology Major].

Person A: Okay, cool.

Person B: Pre-Med. So, yeah. Rough times. But it’s okay. I’m pretty sure CS is harder.

Person A: I think most things are hard at this school.

Person B: Yeah. I think so too. Where are you from?

Person A: I’m out of state, so not from California.

Person B: What state?

Person A: Am I allowed to say?

Person B: Oh. I don’t know. Okay. I’m from SoCal.

Person A: Oh. Like Los Angeles?

Person B: San Diego.

Person A: Okay. Cool.

Person B: What are your hobbies?

Person A: I play piano.

Person B: Oh, cool.

Person A: Not as much as before. What about you?

Person B: I really like to watch videos of artists singing live. I also like to watch clips from Saturday Night Live. I’m really into comedy.

Person A: Cool. Which artists do you like?

Person B: From Saturday Night Live?

Person A: From like Youtube.

Person B: Oh, okay. I like to watch live vocalists. So I think one of the best live vocalists of our generation is actually Demi Lovato.

Person A: Oh, I saw her a few weeks ago.

Person B: Oh, no way. What songs did she perform? What was her best song?

Person A: I really liked “Sorry Not Sorry.”

Person B: Yeah. I think she’s one of the best live. Her and Ariana Grande.

Person A: Yeah, she’s great. She has a really nice voice.

Person B: Yeah. And I don’t think Selena Gomez can sing very well. Sorry. But I also like to watch Youtube videos. Do you know H3H3 Productions?

Person A: No.

Person B: Oh. Do you watch Youtubers?

Person A: I like Pentatonix.

Person B: Oh. Okay.

Person A: Yeah. A lot of famous stars came from Youtube.

Person B: I know. Yeah. I love Youtube. It’s a really good platform, I feel.

Person A: What is H3H3?

Person B: So they’re like comedians almost. They’re not comedians, but they’re really funny people, and they have these podcasts that I like to watch. They’re from -- I don’t know. They’re just very funny. They’re a married couple and they’re really cool. They have a cool fashion sense. My idols. And I also like to watch James Charles. Do you know James Charles?

Person A: No.

Person B: Oh. He’s really famous.

Person A: Oh.

Person B: Do you watch Jeffree Star?

Person A: No. I guess I only know the mainstream people.

Person B: Oh. Let me think.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# Pair 110, Support P237, Oppose P252, Condition 4 (Long Audio), Agreement 0

Person A: Okay. So would you like to start?

Person B: Yeah, sure. Well I personally oppose legalizing drugs in the U.S., because I think the purpose of drugs is kind of unclear, especially in California. I agree for legalizing drugs, and I support it if it's going to be used [for] a medical use. I think if it’s going to be medical use and it's going to cure people, it's really necessary for some people. But then if it's going to be a personal use, I doubt that it can be used legally. I think there should be stronger regulations. How are people going to use it? Personally? Or where it's going to be used. To whom, to where, and why? And once that's cleared out, I think I would support legalizing drugs. But for most reasons, I would oppose legalizing drugs until there are strict or clear regulations on the use of personal use.

Person A: Mm-hmm. Okay. I basically saw the question more regarding the social issues. So the social aspect of going into using drugs for personal use. Not really medical use because, I don't know, I just think it through that perspective. And I wrote that I oppose of it too as a personal use. The reasons behind it why are kind of different from yours though. I saw it through this perspective because the history that the United States society has regarding this issue is like the War on Drugs and everything. So there's been lots of commotion behind the legalization of different drugs and just recently the legalization of marijuana. So I was saying how it would be bad to legalize all of these other drugs because of the history that the United States has. And because I think that legalizing it will of course make it more accessible. And as a society, there will be an increase in drug use and drug addiction because of the legalization of it, which I think is inevitable. But another point that I made for my argument was that compared to other countries such as Europe, the society is different, and they haven't experienced that much backlash from the legalization of drugs. And like it said in the example, I believe it was Portugal where they have legalized all drugs. And it's interesting because when you compare the American society to Europe, the European society, they have more access to these drugs, but there isn't as much drug addiction. There isn't as much drug abuse within the younger generations or in the streets, because this legalization of all drugs has been common, and it's been passed throughout history. So the society has this -- it’s like a social norm now. So I think that here in America we don't have that. And I think there will be a very huge backlash to the society if we do legalize everything, which I believe we shouldn’t. But -- So we're kind of on the same [side].

Person B: So would you say you would oppose mainly because of the US history and the social norm, that's not, I would say, set in America?

Person A: Yeah. Yeah. I don’t know. I’m trying to think of reasons why you would support it. And I guess the whole reasons of -- I guess health issues-wise. There are people who regardless, if it's legal or not, they're importing these drugs from unsafe environments and they're still taking them. And there's still this drug abuse, but it's just under the table. So it's still there, it's still present. And maybe legalizing it will make it more visible and make it more controlled. How it gets into society. And I think that if you do legalize everything, it's also going to help the economy and everything. Or it's going to be benefiting the government more than just as a society. But, yeah.

Person B: Yeah. And also speaking of the side effects and the backlash, I think this issue of legalizing the drugs can lead to a problem of public health and maybe health insurance of the people who cannot afford it, but for drug addicts. So I think they are great reasons that you would oppose it.

Person A: Yeah. I just think that the United States has had more problems with the legalization and illegalization of drugs. And I don't want to compare because I don't know if it's a fact, but it seems, more than other countries, it's been more of an issue because of incarceration due to drug use and distribution and all that. And I think that's another reason why some people would support it because of so many people who -- let’s break it down. Just weed, marijuana, people who have used it, who have sold it, who have been incarcerated because of it. Now that they passed it, of course there needs to be laws changed, and there needs to be that recuperation from being incarcerated because of it. So I think that legalizing it will eventually also change incarceration rates.

Person B: Yeah. It's not only about legalizing or illegalizing drugs, but it causes more side effects or extra regulations to be changed.

Person A: Mm-hmm. Yeah.

Person B: But the thing is, in America there's different states. So in California, it's legal. But if you are in Ohio or somewhere else in the Midwest, it's still illegal. So, I think it's really difficult.

Person A: Yeah. I think because of the way that the primary government, the overall United States government and then each individual government system in each of the states, because they’re different, I think that also mandates for there to be more requirements.

Person B: It's just hard to be united, because laws are all differently applied in the states.

Person A: Mm-hmm. So, I don't know. I just think if we legalize it here in California,

just thinking it as a state issue, I think the main question to ask is whether the benefits are going to outweigh the negative effects of society, of the economy, of health, of all aspects of it. Because when you make a change that drastic, it affects every generation. It affects every type of person. And whether or not you like it, because let's say they do legalize it. I’m not an Econ major or anything, but I'm pretty sure the economy will change. And the people who even don't use drugs, who never used those drugs or experimented with them, they're also going to have to contribute to the amount or pay for them. Yeah. So do you think the benefits would outweigh the negative effects if we legalize it here in California?

Person B: I think talking about California, it's hard to see more of the benefits that would come along with legalizing drugs. Just from what I've seen around. It's just hard to find good effects of using drugs. And it's not only present, but as you said, we have to think about the future generation and how it's going to last for our generation too. Yeah. So I doubt it would outweigh the benefits.

Person A: You mean you doubt the benefits would outweigh the negative? So you think there's going to be more negative effects or more positive effects?

Person B: More negative effects.

Person A: More negative effects. Okay. Yeah. I think that if we're looking at a time period -- if we legalize it now, there will be a time period where there's going to be a large increase in drug addiction and it's going to be predominantly bad for the society. But I think that after a couple years or a decade, maybe the society will become used to and it's going to become a social norm, like I said in other countries like Europe. But that takes time. And if we legalize it now, us, this generation is going to be the people who have to deal with this negative effect and probably the generation to come. But then after that, then it's going to be not much of a problem.

Person B: Would you say there needs to be a sacrifice if drugs should be legalized in the U.S.?

Person A: Sacrifice in what way? What do you mean?

Person B: Like of the people, of generations. If legalizing drugs becomes a social norm like other countries in Europe?

Person A: Yeah. I think there's always a generation that will have to sacrifice something so that future generations can benefit from it. And I think that's basically how any change is made. The present generation is the one who's going to have to put in that hard work, put in that sacrifice for future generations. The change right now is not really for us, but it's for future generations.

Person B: Yeah, the consequences are going to last longer than we think.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: Well it was good talking to you.

Person A: Yeah you too.

# Pair 155, Support P328, Oppose P331, Condition 4 (Long Audio), Agreement 0

Person A: Okay. So we’re supposed to talk about the campus speakers. So what is your standpoint on this topic?

Person B: I don’t remember exactly what I put on the survey, but I think I disagreed with the idea of allowing extremely controversial speakers to speak on campus slightly strongly.

Person A: Slightly strongly? Okay. You want to give me reasons why you think -- or why you disagree with it?

Person B: In the description of the question it mentioned hate speech. And so that got me thinking about how it creates a non-inclusive environment at school, in our learning space. And so when this comes from a public speaker, it encourages more hate speech because someone in public is endorsing this idea.

Person A: Right. Okay. Well I said that -- I don't have a strong standpoint on this, but I said that they should be allowed. Because even if it's -- but like you said if it's hate speech then I think that that's a different story. But if it's a controversial topic just because there’s a lot of people with a lot of different opinions on it, then I think that it should be allowed that they come to campus to speak about what they think and their perspective. Because I said, just because it's controversial doesn’t mean that their opinion is wrong. It just means that a lot of people have a wide range of opinions on it and the speaker whoever or whatever the topic may be, still has the right to talk about whatever topic that they’re speaking about. And also, because they’re not trying to like get people to necessarily agree with them, it’s just them sharing their ideas and their views on a certain topic. And that doesn't mean that everyone has to agree with them. People still can have different opinions or even opinions that are completely opposite. It’s just letting them speak. But I don't have a strong [opinion], like must. Because I read that in 2017, these two speakers came to Berkeley and there were protests or whatever that happened because of whatever they were talking about. Did you read that part?

Person B: Yeah. It was Yiannopoulos and Ann Coulter, I think.

Person A: Yeah. Do you know who they are? Because I'm not sure.

Person B: I think I know who Yiannopoulos is, but yeah, I think you're right. It's just the word “hate speech” that showed up in the question.

Person A: Yeah. I think hate speech, that shouldn’t be allowed because that’s discriminating. Hate just means discriminating, you know what I mean? But other than that, if it's not hate speech, I think people should be allowed to share their opinions.

Person B: Yeah. The example that I was thinking of was probably abortion versus saying racist comments so the difference there I think is clear. But I think Yiannopoulos was insulting women.

Person A: Oh. Really?

Person B: Something about feminism or the Ghostbusters movie that came out. One of the 4 ghostbusters was an African American lady and she's kind of famous for Saturday Night Live, and he was just insulting her. I think he was saying that she's a loud monkey or like an ape, I think. I think he was the one.

Person A: Really? Oh, wow.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: He said that?

Person B: I think so, yeah.

Person A: Oh, wow.

Person B: I could be wrong. It could be someone else, but I feel like that’s what happened.

Person A: Oh, geez. Okay, well that shouldn't be allowed. Calling someone an ape or whatever, that's crazy. But I wonder, did people know that he was going to talk about that? Or was he supposed to talk about something else and then he just switched the topic last minute? Because if the school knew that he was going to talk about that kind of stuff, and then talk about whoever the girl in that movie is in a certain way using those words, then they wouldn’t have allowed him. Don’t you think? I don't know. Do you think they knew?

Person B: I don't think so. I think this came from a Tweet. It was either a Tweet or he was on a talk show. Either one of those, and I think that was just one of those things that added to his reputation for being extremely controversial. And people were really mad.

Person A: Oh okay. Yeah. So do you have any other opinions regarding this topic?

Person B: No. I think that was all I wrote down really. So you?

Person A: Yeah, I think that's it. I didn't write a whole ton.

Person B: Okay.

Person A: You go to this school right?

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: Okay. I wasn't really sure. What's your major?

Person B: Anthropology.

Person A: Oh, really? That's so cool.

Person B: Yeah. What are you majoring in?

Person A: I’m pre-med, so I'm not entirely sure which major I want to pursue. But I'm thinking about neurobiology, immunology, or MCB [molecular and cell biology].

Person B: Oh. Okay. Yeah. I’m taking some bio classes, like integrative bio classes. Super interesting disease and plagues.

Person A: Oh, wow. So the course is called “Integrative Biology?”

Person B: That's the department I think. But the class is called “Diseases and Plagues.”

Person A: Oh, that's so cool.

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: Are you a freshman?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Okay.

Person B: Are you a freshman as well?

Person A: Yes, yes I am. That's so cool. That sounds really interesting.

Person B: Mm-hmm. Yeah, it is really interesting.

Person A: Is it like a big class?

Person B: I would say it's medium-sized.

Person A: Okay. That’s really cool. What made you choose anthropology?

Person B: Well in school, everything is either hard science, like the math science, and then you have your humanities, your English, social studies, all that. But then there was nothing really that combined it all together like anthropology does. And so yeah, that’s one of the things that drew me to it.

Person A: That's cool.

Person B: Yeah. What made you decide for pre-med?

Person A: Well I like working with people and I actually -- I’m not a lifeguard yet, but I've taken a whole bunch of lifeguard courses. So doing that and we were doing these activities involving people and just treating the -- like not treating the patients but just minor things like concussion or like what if the swimmer drowned and that kind of stuff. We were taught to kind of respond to those situations, and I really enjoyed it and just working with people and just that kind of an area, you know? So yeah that's what sort of led me -- I mean it's not solidified yet. I still don't know if I’m going to change or not, but that's what I have in mind.

Person B: Yeah. That sounds really cool. Like you had first-hand experience already, so you can get the feeling.

Person A: Mm-hmm. How do you like Berkeley so far?

Person B: I love it. I was choosing between Berkeley and another school, but then after being here for a while, I think I made the right choice.

Person A: That's good.

Person B: Yeah. What about you?

Person A: I like it. I have so much stuff to do though, like homework-wise. But other than that, I think it's a good school. I visited Berkeley before, during Cal Day [campus open house], and when I was here, it was before I made the decision to come to Berkeley. I was like, “I don't know. It's okay, I guess.” It's nothing crazy. The campus is pretty, but it's not amazing. So I was like, “Okay. Well it's not bad,” I guess. But then I came here and you make friends, and then you get used to the environment and the area and where you're living, and I guess that's the whole part of the process. That's how you become more attached to the school. Because you get used to it and then you start going to classes and meeting new friends, meeting new people, and getting involved. And I think it's a good school.

Person B: Yeah. Have you made a lot of friends so far, like is it easy for you to make friends here?

Person A: I mean, I’m not super outspoken, but I am social. So I have made friends, but I feel like in classes it's definitely harder. Because you're just sitting there, and you're listening to your lectures and stuff, and then everyone just leaves and goes to their next classes. So it's kind of hard to interact because you can't talk when the professor is speaking, and then after everyone has to rush to their next classes. So I think it's hard, but I've made a couple of friends from each lecture, I guess. What about you?

Person B: That's good. Actually I like going to those larger lectures. When I'm in class, I tend to do better when there's a lot of people and we're just kind of on our own taking notes, that kind of thing. So what I would do, I would just kind of talk to some people after class. Like today for example, I did meet one other anthropology major and so I went up to him.

Person A: Oh, really? That’s cool.

Person B: He's good. Mm-hmm. But I think coming out here on campus and making friends is easier than making friends in the residence halls.

Person A: Oh, really?

Person B: I don't know if you're living on campus?

Person A: Do you like your roommates?

Person B: Oh, yeah. I really like my roommate. I think we’d be friends even if we weren’t roommates.

Person A: Oh, that's good. Where do you live?

Person B: Clark Kerr.

Person A: Oh, really? I live in Foothill.

Person B: Oh. Do you like it?

Person A: I like it, but I mean Foothill is pretty far, but Clark Kerr is far as well.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Okay. Did you hear that?

Person B: No.

Person A: I think we have to finish the conversation. Anyways Clark Kerr is so pretty.

Person B: It is?

Person A: I think so. I think we have to end the conversation.

Person B: Okay, well it was nice talking to you.

Person A: Yeah. It was nice talking to you too.

Person B: All right.

Person A: Okay.

# Pair 156, Support P325, Oppose P324, Condition 4 (Long Audio), Agreement 0

Person A: Hello.

Person B: You can start if you want.

Person A: No, you can go first.

Person B: Okay. So the question is, do you oppose or support legalizing drugs in the U.S. and to me, I generally oppose legalizing drugs in the U.S. but it depends on the type of drug. Specifically, if you ask me about marijuana, I would generally say I do not support that. Just because I’ve seen some devastating things happen to some people. And also, I come from a background of medical doctors and medical researchers, so I’m very educated on specifically marijuana. My brother is doing research in Colorado, and right now he’s looking at the car accidents due to marijuana and they have increased by thirty percent. And before that, the levels were low before the legalization of marijuana occurred. And there’s not enough medical emergency staff to help with those accidents. So there's a low supply of medical staff to assist those people that are under the influence of marijuana and those who have been hurt by the car accidents by those who were consuming marijuana at the time. Also, I have friends who have asthma and walking on campus in Berkeley is very hard for them specifically, because there's a lot of people smoking just cigarettes and marijuana. And I think people are not realizing how much it impacts other people. One of my friends almost died because of the amount of carcinogens in the air, and the fact that there's just so much smoke for that person to handle that she almost died and had to go to the hospital. And so, I guess those are my main two points. I don't know if you want to present your side and then we can go back and forth?

Person A: Mainly the thing I wanted to talk about was that, my thing with drugs is this whole idea of why drugs became such a political hot topic is because of the 1980s war on drugs. And that whole purpose was for a political agenda of one specific party and at that time, drugs were not even a concern or considered a violent thing. Sure, there was the AIDS epidemic, but that was to a very specific community. It’s just it was sensationalized so that it could fit the political agendas of whoever was running for office. So that was my biggest thing about it, like you’re incarcerating people who are essentially just needing help, right? Because why are you spending money on militarizing police and local sheriffs and giving them these grants and this money instead of what you said, why don’t you give it to the medical emergency staff? That's my point number one, about the war on drugs. Point number two is that, I feel like if you were to legalize things, the government can control how it gets used better. For example, I was saying you could always use it for tax and that kind of thing could be used towards getting people help. Or you can control how things will get used. You can dictate laws of where you can use it, how much, where it should be banned like on a school campus or whatever. And my thing is that, if you say that specific drugs are bad -- I honestly think the prime example of America is sugar. I don't understand why that's not illegal. I mean it's not great for health purposes either, but it's because there are so many corporations that are in the food industry that have basically branded us to need it. So I guess those are my two biggest things. And then I’ll counter yours in a sense of, you were saying with the medical emergency staff, I completely agree with you. That I'm sure there are things, car accidents, that are -- I didn't know about that. So for you to have such specific data, you convinced me on that. But that's what I'm saying. It's like, if you just legalize this you’ll have a source of income to be able to provide for these things instead of just incarcerating people to go to jail. Second thing is like, for asthma -- yeah it is a very toxic thing in our air, as you already know America has pretty bad air quality too. So I guess the only thing I could say to that is that you really just have to control the area. Because if we were able to be strict on cigarettes -- now it's kind of socially shunned to smoke cigarettes. I just think that over time with the decreased desirability when it's legalized, then those could become a socially-shunned item too. Okay. Your turn.

Person B: I completely agree with you on the war on drugs aspect. I totally do not believe in incarcerating people just because they were using something so non-violent. But like to think of it in a broader sense, I don't believe in just putting people in jail because they smoked marijuana or something like that. That’s just completely ridiculous. But I just want more people to be aware of their actions. Like, “Okay, I smoke marijuana, or I did cannabis, or I did all of these other drugs,” like what is the impact on other people? And so that's why my general topic is be cautious of what you do because you need to -- it’s a little bit selfish just to be like, “I'm doing this for the sole purpose for myself.” But if you have a problem, if medical marijuana is the way to go, then I find that totally fine.

Person A: Can I draw a parallel here with something else, what you're saying about marijuana?

Person B: Sure. Yeah.

Person A: For example, I feel like if you were to legalize this, then you can talk about it. Because before it was legalized, you don't even talk about it because, “Oh, you shouldn't even be thinking about that.” Right? Because it's against the law. But now if you do that, you can open channels to educating. It's the same idea of like, “Oh, let's just not talk about -- let’s just always preach abstinence.” When, in reality, the problem will still be there, of teenage pregnancy. So why not just focus on the education of trying to get people to understand what they’re getting themselves into? Do you get what I'm saying?

Person B: Yeah. I agree with that completely. Also, I don't really like the idea of business creating these products to get these people addicted to these drugs specifically, and so they can earn revenue. And obviously you can tax those, but if you're looking at a broader sense of humanity, I just feel like that's so unethical and that's so morally wrong on a whole level. And yeah, maybe it would generate revenue, maybe we could create education programs. But I feel like we could be doing these education programs without just legalizing it. There are so many organization that have backings for this. So perhaps the government should be focusing on uplifting those programs instead of establishing new ones, because there's already so many out there. It's just the matter of how they’re outreaching to communities. I feel like that process needs to be better, if that makes sense. I'm not sure if I'm making sense right now.

Person A: I get what you're saying. That we could do the same thing of trying to educate people, without the addendum of legalizing the drugs. My thing is, it’s not that I'm all for decriminalizing all the drugs and stuff. But it's just -- in Portugal and some parts of Argentina and stuff, if the studies already show, very recently too, that they are successful when they legalize it, maybe we should consider something like this. Or I guess not being so extreme with decriminalizing all of it, but maybe having lesser sentences on drug-related offenses. California especially is really harsh on first time offenders. And sometimes people are experimenting and sometimes they get into the wrong path. I think it should be proportional to the type of drugs you’re using as well.

Person B: Yeah. I see where you’re coming from. I think we can learn from what you said, from Spain and Portugal. But we can obviously not make it so –

Person A: Accessible?

Person B: Applicable to the U.S.

Person A: Oh.

Person B: Because the U.S. is so –

Person A: Large?

Person B: Large. And so diverse. In Spain and Portugal, they're diverse in their own ways. Maybe those practices wouldn't work as best, but we can definitely learn from those. So I see what you're saying there. Like I said before, I do not support incarcerating people just because they consumed a product. I mean, if I'm taking it to an extreme -- I don't really like thinking like this, but if someone smokes something and then a person with -- like you could apply this to any situation. I’m just saying, if we look at it on a broader sense, what if someone smoked a cigarette or marijuana or cannabis or anything like that, what if the person next to them had asthma? And that person died because of that? You know what I'm saying? That’s just one scenario. There are so many scenarios with peanut butter and you know what I'm saying. You can't criminalize everything.

Person A: Right. But then that drug just becomes like a murder weapon basically.

Person B: Yeah. Yeah, so what I'm trying to get at is, how can we educate people to be more aware of their surroundings? It's very tough to do that because once you teach someone once it's like –

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: It takes time to break their habits, right?

Person B: It takes a lot of time and a lot of energy to break. Yeah. Exactly. I have no idea what she's saying.

Person A: I know.

Person B: What did she say?

Person A: Oh. I guess this is it.

Person B: Nice discussing with you.

Person A: You too.

# Pair 64, Support P135, Oppose P133, Condition 4 (Long Audio), Agreement 0

Person A: Hi.

Person B: Hi.

Person A: So, I’m [name redacted].

Person B: I’m [name redacted].

Person A: Okay. So we’re talking about the government giving possibly reparations to African American populaces as -- not as a compensation, you cannot compensate what they did -- but as some sort of reparation for the long period of time when they were slaves.

Person B: Sorry?

Person A: Oh, you couldn't understand what I said?

Person B: Oh, so it’s time to -- you'll say your opinion?

Person A: Oh, okay. So, according to me, it's history. It’s not even debatable that for a long period of time, the American establishment or the government or whoever was in power systematically oppressed or hindered the growth of or exploited African American populaces, which at the time were not considered Americans. They were just considered -- not even human -- like property, and they exploited them systematically for a long period of time. And then, when it comes to supporting their growth by giving reparations, there's a reluctance, there’s debate, which to me is troubling because there shouldn't be such a reluctance in giving reparations for what they created in the first place.

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: What do you say?

Person B: In my opinion, this action will increase tax, which means [it] will make burden of the public. So the slavery -- as they get used to their position, they may think this is what government should do. So they may not feel grateful [to] the government or the public, which gives their support.

Person A: Oh, so you're saying offering reparations would mean that you'd have to increase taxes because that's where the governmental budget comes from, right?

Person B: Yeah, yeah.

Person A: But don't you think the American budget is being used in a lot of things which are not in the benefit of any segment of the public, and it could be used for something like this?

Person B: Mm, I'm not sure because I don't know where is government's action, but if actually some ordinary people may feel some burden --

Person A: Well, so I feel like the ordinary public, which is usually worried about taxes and stuff, goes from upper middle class to upper class. That's the one that are most vocal about their taxes and stuff, and I think a large percentage of them are White Americans. And they should understand that, in a world historical point of view, their ancestors benefited from the oppression of Black ancestors. So they should understand their position in a world historical point of view where they are in a position because of someone else's oppression.

Person B: Oh, yeah. Do you think once slavery got reparations, they may be grateful or show zero gratitude?

Person A: No, I think they shouldn't show gratitude. I think they should not be showing gratitude because, for a long period of time, they were hindered, like their growth was hindered. They were basically slaves that they were ripped of all their capital in every sort of way. So when they were not given a sorry for that, why should they be grateful if they’re giving reparations?

Person B: Do you think -- what benefits can [be brought] to the society if they take up these actions?

Person A: Well the benefits will obviously be that the Black population that, to this day, are suffering because of the historical trauma, like in every way they were subjugated to -- obviously the goal is that they would move to a higher economic standard. So if that happens, then obviously there'll be more people who would be generating enough income. That will be like a general rule of the society, because everyone would be making enough to sustain themselves.

Person B: Yeah. But I think that slavery is a historical problem so we don't have to bring it into now.

Person A: So, okay. So I mean that is -- that's a good point. It happened in the past, and why should we talk about it? Or why should we give reputations for it now? But the thing is that, although it happened in the past, its effects continue to exist in the present as well. So when you make someone a slave, you’re basically ripping them off of all their capital. They don't have any money. They don't have an identity even, right?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: So, but then at a point when you give them -- like during the time of Abraham Lincoln, they were given the status of like human being. They were not slaves anymore. And then after, like in the 1960s, they were given their civil rights and stuff. But in that process, they were never given reparations. So basically, they didn't start from zero, they started from minus whatever as a starting point. And that continues to show that they're still trying to build themselves up from that minus something position. And if its effects continue to exist, then I don't think it's a historical problem if its effects still exist today.

Person B: Okay. Mm, let me see.

Person A: Okay, so if you think that -- so you're saying taxes will be a problem if reparations were to be offered, right?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: So, if reparations are not offered, like as they are not being offered right now, who do you think benefits from it the most?

Person B: Government? Who do you think?

Person A: I feel like obviously people who already have enough money to be paying taxes are going to be the ones who are going to, quote and unquote, suffer if they have to pay more taxes. And a large population of them, like I said before, are basically White bourgeois Americans. So. God, I want water. Okay.

Person B: Do you know [if] before government has [taken] similar actions like this?

Person A: As in the U.S. government had to take similar actions like this before?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: I don't think it has. I feel like the U.S. government is generally very lazy and -- No, I think it doesn't accept its shortcomings easily or at all actually. It doesn't. It doesn't.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: That's crazy. So you can tell me something about yourself while I think about it.

Person B: Yeah. My main points are [the] two [that] I talked about before. One is tax and the other is the slavery’s attitudes. Yeah.

Person A: Excuse me. What was the second point?

Person B: Slavery's attitudes.

Person A: As in do you mean the African American population of America?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Their attitude towards what?

Person B: Towards the government, the public, and especially the White American.

Person A: Oh, I would really like to disagree. I personally do not think that their attitude is like something in the lines of civil disobedience. And even if it is, even if it was at certain points in time, it is a result of a sense of historic anger. When you know that your position and your situation in the world, in the economic sphere, is what it is because of -- I sound like I'm repeating myself -- but because of historic oppression. Like you lived off all of the things that you had. They are aware of what happened to them [and] what continues to happen to them in the form of racism, in the form of institutional discrimination. They’re aware of that, and because of that, if they have an anger inside of them, I think that's justified.

Person B: Do you think this action will make society offer order?

Person A: Order in what way?

Person B: Social status?

Person A: The social status of the people who will be giving reparations?

Person B: I’m not sure.

Person A: So I feel like if this action –

**[Experimenter says time is up]**
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Person B: Hey.

Person A: Hey.

Person B: How's your day going?

Person A: Not too bad. How about yours?

Person B: Really slow. That's why I'm here.

Person A: All right. Do you want to start?

Person B: I assume I was assigned to you because you support legalizing all drugs?

Person A: To a certain degree, yes.

Person B: Yeah, I only don't support legalizing them to a certain degree. There are nuances to this issue.

Person A: Yeah, I agree. Could you expand on your nuances?

Person B: Yeah, sorry. So like obviously there are some drugs that aren't hurting anyone, right? Like marijuana, they've done a ton of studies. It has medical benefits. It isn't giving anyone lung cancer. That's fine. But like, it's incredibly hard to overdose on marijuana. I support legalizing that. But there are drugs that are legal that I think should be further restricted, because they are causing so many deaths. You know?

Person A: Right.

Person B: Fentanyl should not be as available to the American public as it is.

Person A: Right. And even painkillers.

Person B: Yeah. Sorry, that's what I meant.

Person A: Yeah, I see what you're saying there. In terms of -- the example they gave was marijuana, LSD, cocaine, and stuff like that. I guess I would be fine with those being legalized, as long as the government has some sort of way to tax it, track it, and make sure that the drugs that are on the market are regulated. And if they can use those taxes to fund some sort of rehab mechanism instead of incarcerating them, overall it'll be cheaper for the taxpayer is what I've seen studies say. But I do see your point in terms of those drugs that are very addictive that really can destroy someone's lives, that those drugs should still be heavily regulated and not as readily available as they are right now.

Person B: Oh, and I absolutely support reforming the punishment system for illegal drugs. Mandatory minimums are wreaking havoc on families across the country because you can go to jail for 10 years for a fraction of a gram of cocaine.

Person A: Exactly.

Person B: I definitely support more rehab in place of a punishment system, but I think that [because of] the way the government's mechanisms for enforcing that are currently laid out, they have to remain illegal. You have to go through the court system to force someone into a rehabilitation program. And that does exist. That sort of mechanism is underutilized, but it exists. So yeah, I think that they need to stay illegal. Well first, it keeps the drug's expensive, which keeps them off the streets so much. It keeps usage down, because when they're illegal it costs more to produce them. It costs more each trip to transport them, so it keeps costs high and therefore usage down.

Person A: But it also keeps the market going, though. Doesn't it? If it's hard to -- at least the black market at the very least, people are -- there'll be some sort of demand, and then people are going to have to -- not make it domestically, but maybe traffic it over borders and cause them to get material that may not be as safe or more dangerous.

Person B: Right, so your argument is that the high price increases supply?

Person A: Not exactly, but “high price” as in?

Person B: It encourages people to manufacture it.

Person A: Right, right. Exactly. So it might not be as safe or you don't know where it's coming from. People might bring it from other places and it leads to drug trafficking, which just leads to more issues of just people's lives getting wrapped up into that.

Person B: No, and I absolutely understand where you're coming from. Keeping it illegal means it stays unregulated. That's definitely an issue.

Person A: In terms of which drugs you're talking about for legalizing, where would be the line you would say?

Person B: Right, amphetamines used to be legal to the general public, but then they became prescription only because they have bad side effects. And marijuana is the only drug I've heard studies on that say it should actually become recreational [and] legal. Alcohol, I would argue, is a drug which has been legalized. There's nicotine, which should have -- I don't know if this is relevant, how do you feel about California raising the age to buy tobacco to 21?

Person A: Personally, I turned 18 and I could buy at that point, and I was like, "Oh, well.” I didn't buy it at that point. It was available to me, but I found that kind of ridiculous at this point to take that option away. It was just like, "Oh, okay, I had that option before and now I don't. I don't really care.” But I go by the philosophy, “Old enough to die for your country, you're old enough to smoke or drink," even though that's not the way the laws are set up.

Person B: Yeah. I have the opposite perspective. You shouldn't be old enough to go die for your country until you're old enough to go drink.

Person A: Yeah. I mean that's also very valid. Yes.

Person B: I'm 18. I don't think we should let 18-year-olds go die. That's not a good idea.

Person A: Unfortunately, that's how it's set up. But yeah, if that was the way that the age -- if we were at 21, more fully developed people getting sent into a battle and whatnot, yeah. And obviously there's probably a lot more studies that need to be taken a look at in terms of how -- because brains aren't fully developed at 18 in that fashion yet. Yeah, I agree that kids shouldn't be smoking and all that, but now when we have middle schoolers Juuling.

Person B: Yeah, I don't support that either.

Person A: Which I would not -- what do you feel in terms of how drugs are now marketed to people? I feel like that also has a big effect.

Person B: I am totally against advertising prescription drugs directly to consumers, to marketing nicotine products to children in the way the Juul does. I know they say they don't, but they have Snapchat filters. You can't say that it's not aimed at children. That sort of thing. So yeah, I want to avoid marketing nicotine products to children. You've seen the cigarette packages -- oh, that was in a different country.

Person A: Yeah, I think it was Thailand. That was one of those -- they have the full thing on the carton.

Person B: Yeah, they have -- I think I was in Scandinavia. They have terrifying pictures of lung cancer and people's jaws missing and stuff on cigarette packages. I don't know if we have to go that far, but nicotine products that aren't cigarettes should fall under that category.

Person A: Yeah, it would be interesting to see how that affects very much the smoking, right? Maybe that will bring social smoking down to point, but maybe the regulars are still just like, "Packaging doesn't matter." Right?

Person B: Yeah, I’d have to check the studies.

Person A: Yeah. But that's a very interesting point. Let's see.

Person B: Obviously that only comes into play once drugs are legalized though, which is an interesting argument in favor.

Person A: Huh. In terms of the type of drugs I would look at legalizing in the first place, I'd say one, marijuana because even Canada is doing it at this point. You have Trudeau up there legalizing marijuana now. Maybe a bit of psychedelics, because psychedelics have effects for people who have gone through PTSD and have therapeutic effects for them. But I want to draw the line at some like ecstasy, cocaine. Stuff like that where it's just purely like party [drugs] that [if] you can have too much of, it can be pretty detrimental to your health. There needs to be some sort of line. I don't believe in full legalization, but that line, you know?

Person B: Yeah, I'm with you on that. I've run out of things to say about illegal drugs. They just don't come up in my life that much.

Person A: Yeah, I mean there's nothing much else to say. I think we pretty much came to an agreement in terms of -- we were pretty similar in the first place.

Person B: Yeah, some drugs but not all.

Person A: Which is a good, nuanced opinion about how to go about things of this nature.

Person B: Yeah. I had never heard someone suggest that LSD should be available by prescription before.

Person A: Oh, I've taken a class at Berkeley that -- they brought up in that class a study on how LSD has helped veterans deal with traumatic events, because they get to relive it through psychedelics apparently. And psychedelics help to reshape certain memories and certain ways you associate memories with emotions.

Person B: Oh, interesting.

Person A: So in terms of [whether] you're with a professional in a safe environment and using psychedelics, I'm totally for it.

Person B: Yeah. Okay, I can see that.

Person A: So, at least from those studies that I've read and heard of, it seems to be beneficial. Other than recreational use, I'm not too sure on how that works. But I believe in the therapeutic effects of it with careful supervision, that's for sure.

Person B: Fair enough. If someone suggests to me that cocaine has therapeutic effects, maybe I'll change my mind.

Person A: That would be an interesting -- I would want to read that article.

Person B: I would want to read that study.

**[Experimenter says time is up.]**

Person A: Good talk.

Person B: Good talk.
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Person B: Hi.

Person A: Hi. So do you want to go first?

Person B: Sure.

Person A: Sure.

Person B: I wrote down that I'm for drugs remaining illegal, or certain drugs, and the reason is because I've never used illegal drugs before, so I don't know much about its effects, but from like the general painted picture of it, it seems pretty bad. Whether it leads to a life of drug abuse or however. Yeah, it's just kind of negatively painted in general. And then I know life can be hard, so people choose to do drugs or even just for fun. But if it's because life is hard, I feel like a life full of constant escapism is not a life at all, and it's just kind of sad. But then again, I don't know what life is supposed to be filled with anyways.

Person A: All right, cool. So I'm for legalizing it. So I guess I'm going from a health standpoint as well in the sense -- well, I guess, an incarceration standpoint. So, in the sense that if you make a lot of drugs illegal, certain populations who, like you mentioned might not have great lives, use these drugs to escape or to make themselves feel better. And this, I would say, disproportionately affects people of color, people who are underprivileged. And oftentimes, these people are thrown into jail, which doesn't -- maybe it helps some people, but for the most part, it's probably not a place you really want to be. By the way, can you hear me?

Person B: Yeah, I can hear you.

Person A: Okay. So I think that's one. So I can see both sides from that, in the sense that, maybe if those drugs are legalized, the -- I don't know if this is the right term, but the jailing system, those companies lose money. So that's one side. I guess there's also -- not necessarily legalizing the drugs, but there should be less enforcement and [more] options. Like European countries, what they've done is free needle exchanges, or places where they can do the drugs if they're intravenous. So what that does is, you don't force it, you don't put them in jail, you give them resources. They give resources to these individuals like, "Hey, once you're addicted, you really don't have a choice to do this. You have to do it. Otherwise, it's either that or feeling really sick.” And people oftentimes view drug abuse or drug addicts as [if] it's a choice. Maybe initially it's a choice, but after a while, it's not a choice. So what they provide are resources to get sober [and] clean needles so they won't get infected. They won't provide the drugs, I don't think at least. But it provides kind of a safe environment. I think something towards that might be a better step. So, I guess I'm not really arguing my position too well, but from a public health standpoint, that would be the best transition to something in the middle. Maybe with the hopes of legalizing it. And using marijuana is a false equivalent, because there haven't been adverse health effects from marijuana as far as I know. Whereas [with] other drugs, obviously you can overdose and die. They're associated with not just overdoses but cardiovascular effects. That kind of stuff.

Person B: That definitely makes sense. I really like that: having a safe spot [or] a safe place to do it and clean needles. It makes sense.

Person A: Yeah, I think it's a good middle ground. But, in this country, the U.S., we're all pro-profit. I don't know how we could swing that, because a lot of these public health programs [are] already thin. So I don't know how we'd be able to fund that. Especially currently, but something in that sense would be good. And I'm sure in the long term those programs -- again, I'm not an expert in this -- but a lot of those programs help save people's lives. Probably in the long run they help save -- incarceration is expensive for taxpayers, so in the long run it would save the country money. It wouldn't line the pockets necessarily of these companies that own these prisons. But yeah, why not?

Person B: I feel like it's really sad that you said America is very pro-profit.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Yeah, because of that, I feel like in the end -- I keep on saying "I feel" but it's because I don't know much, or I don't look into a lot of things.

Person A: That's okay. I think feelings are valid.

Person B: Yeah, but I feel like it'll lead to our demise. Or in the end, it will just kind of whip us in the back or something.

Person A: Yeah, I think capitalism has its limits to a certain point. I don't know where they are, but I think -- I don't know. Anyway, do you have any other point? I'm kind of out of ideas here.

Person B: The part where you were saying, "Oh, they would have to provide their own drugs?”

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: I think -- oh, and [that] the drugs would have to be legalized by then, how would that -- I feel like -- or when you think about it -- then that would boost -- never mind, I give up. Sorry.

Person A: Oh no, that's okay. Where were you going with that idea?

Person B: So whatever the sources, wherever they get the drugs, it can more openly provide the drugs after. So.

Person A: I think I know where you're going with that is that you're saying once they're legalized, what does that mean for -- who are the sources of these drugs? Like with the U.S., would we create -- like with the cannabis industry, would we have suppliers that are legal that can make their own that you could buy at dispensaries or something, or would this boost the cartels even more? Or stuff like that, you know?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: That'd be really interesting to see, because I think -- that's a good point, because I think, with a lot of these things, people are so polarized. But really, it’s somewhere in the middle where you could do that, but there's so much gray area like, “Okay, well how does it affect this? How are we going to implement that?” It's a wedge topic, you know?

Person B: Yeah. You were going to say something?

Person A: Oh me? Actually, I was going to go into that point, too. It's like, “What happens when you legalize this drug? Who's going to be providing this? How does that disrupt the market?” It's not like we're going to open up a corner cocaine store or something. I think it's probably just on the enforcement side. And we don't technically have to be like, "Oh yeah, all drugs are decriminalized." We could just be like, each state could adopt it like, "We're not going to prosecute these individuals differently in this state compared to another state, because we believe that putting these individuals in jail isn't really the solution." Yeah, maybe they get sober for a little bit, but is that the long-term solution here?

Person B: Yeah. So, yeah.

Person A: So, I think there's a lot of takes on this that need to be considered. So I guess I'm not really on the, "Oh yeah, let's legalize it” side, but more like what I think is good about this is that we're having discussion like, "Hey, there's other things besides that." And again, this is just based on the 10 minutes. I haven't really thought about this, nor am I an expert.

Person B: Yeah. But I like the way you go about it. It's like you're looking for a solution or looking at the solutions, or what people have done or governments have done. And I think that's the stance everyone should take when it comes to any political issue.

Person A: Yeah, I agree. I think we should follow the models that work or try towards those model, because progress is slow with a lot of these things. And doing it in steps like that can be very beneficial for the public. It's kind of similar with healthcare in this country. We had the Affordable Care Act, but soon we might have Medicare for all because -- increments are good. Yeah. Cool, so what’s your background? What are you studying?

Person B: I am studying Linguistics.

Person A: Linguistics, nice. Are you studying a specific language or -- I guess I don’t know too much about it.

Person B: I kind of chose it out of interest, but I recently chose Linguistics. I was trying to do Pre-med and Bio.

Person A: Oh, nice.

Person B: But yeah, I found a lot more interest in languages. So I was learning Arabic for a while.

Person A: Oh, cool. That’s a hard language, I hear.

Person B: It’s a beautiful language.

Person A: That’s true, absolutely. That’s cool.

Person B: Yeah. How about you?

Person A: Me? So I am studying at the School of Public Health, and I study workers’ exposure to chemicals and biological compounds. So how much are they exposed [to]? Why are they exposed? And then using that data and reports and what-not to hopefully influence policy changes so that those workers are protected. I guess that’s a good sound-bite version. It’s more complicated than that. But, yeah.

Person B: Oh, wow. What made you want to study that?

Person A: Oh, well, I am a doctoral student. So my undergrad was in physiology and I had some work experiences that were kind of related to it. And I kind of stumbled upon it here. But, yeah, it’s a pretty cool field. I recommend public health with linguistics.

Person B: Wow. Thank you. You are a doctoral student. That’s cool.

Person A: Yeah. I just finished my Master’s, so I am a first-year PhD student now officially.

Person B: Was getting there really hard for you or was it quite enjoyable in a sense?

Person A: The Master’s?

Person B: Yeah, just getting up there or all the way?

Person A: Oh, yeah. Grad school is just way more enjoyable for me. Undergrad was a slog. It was a lot of work. Are you an undergrad?

Person B: I am.

Person A: Oh, well best of luck.

**[Experimenter says time is up.]**

Person B: Thank you. Same to you for you PhD.

Person A: All right, cool. I think we are done. Good chatting.
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Person A: Okay

Person B: Okay. So how about you start first?

Person A: Okay. So in all honesty, I don't remember exactly what I said on the survey. But I mean, I know what I believe, so I'll just assume that that's how I answered on the survey. Basically, I don't think it's a great idea to legalize all drugs. Although I do completely agree and believe that certain drugs should be legal for sure. And two, that the focus should be more on how addicts can get treatment rather than prosecuting them. Because putting an addict in jail is, in my mind, one of the worst things you can do.

Person B: Okay. So I’m actually against legalizing drugs but the definition is a bit hazy so I just clicked against. Because first of all, I think it's called drugs for a reason. It isn't like smoking or something like that. So first of all, it does damage to one's body and health. And once legalized, it could be highly addictive in causing a person to -- someone may not have the access to drugs may now have the access –

Person A: Have access. I don't mean to interrupt, but can I just ask one question?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: So by the standard definition, alcohol and cigarettes are also drugs. Where do those fall? Because if you're against legalizing all drugs, I'm just curious what your thoughts -- do you think alcohol should be legal? It's been illegal before and that obviously didn't work so well.

Person B: I think there is obviously a line here that you have to draw the line between. There is still this line and alcohol -- or if you're not 21 years old, I believe you cannot buy alcoholic drinks in America. So we allow people to buy alcohol because it's not so addictive and also because we believe grown-ups have self-control so they can actually -- they know what to do. Although in this case it doesn't work so well. We still have a lot of drunken people going around. This is another reason that I'm opposed to drugs because some of them are a lot more addictive than alcohol. So.

Person A: True, how do you -- yeah. So I understand what you mean by degrees of addiction. Although to an addict, I think alcohol would be just as addictive as maybe, to a non-addict, nicotine or heroin could be.

Person B: Yeah. Yeah it could. Yeah, so actually I have a little problem here is whether is it enforceable. So if drugs were ever legalized, who will be selling the drugs and where would the profit go?

Person A: Yeah, so let's think about Oregon or states where weed is legal. Because that for me is really the one thing that's classified as a drug that I think should be more widespread legal. Because in Oregon for example, it has to be sold in a registered dispensary. And when you're in a dispensary you have to be accompanied by a person who works at the store, who knows about dosages and how much you should take based on your weight and size and gender and the context and they kind of get a full picture. And so from that you have -- not a trained professional because there's no, like, weed school, but you have someone who theoretically knows what they're talking about, who can guide you through it which I think is something you don't even get with alcohol which is a shame.

Person B: Yeah, but the black market is still there, right? There's still a thriving black market because of the profits. So my question about this is if the profit goes to the government, means they're playing taxes upon them. The black market won't be stopped because it's so highly profitable. So the drug –

Person A: Fair. But would you say that there's black market alcohol sales?

Person B: Yeah, but the problem with drugs is that they also transmit some kind of diseases, which I believe when we're legalizing drugs, people are in the hope of stopping them or at least curb them efficiently. I don't think this is working even if it is legalized.

Person A: I would just argue though that not all drugs cause diseases to be spread. Obviously, narcotics do, so that's a huge problem. And that's one of the reasons I don't think narcotics or really anything in that category should be legalized. I think that is a huge epidemic. But just smoking a joint with a friend isn't going to transfer HIV.

Person B: Yeah, but if teens around you starting to get cool and get alcohol, that is another thing I'm talking about. If you're saying that certain drugs should not be legalized, yeah, I totally agree with that. But I'm also worrying that when people start to do this as a trend, it could be very dangerous. Because trend is something that people imitate and they think it's cool and when this is legalized, it's a huge waste to the money and also the labor force, I should say.

Person A: Okay. Yeah, I agree that the whole things becoming trends and kids hopping on the bandwagon is a serious problem. I completely agree with you on that. But I would just say that in some respects, alcohol is just as dangerous or even less dangerous of a bandwagon to hop on. Yet we're not claiming that that shouldn't be legal. So if you look at weed, for example -- and if you make it legal, sure it might become the cool new thing. Although typically legalizing things makes them less cool. But I don’t know, I just have a hard time wrapping my head around that argument when we have things that are already legalized.

Person B: Yeah, I think so. It's really hard to draw the line. And also, I do think if -- yeah, sure that alcohol is legalized. That doesn't mean legalizing things that could be dangerous should be a wise idea. I mean alcohol's legalized probably because a lot of taxes come from them and people in government rely on this and it could be a relatively harmless outlet for people to relax. It's not all harmless though.

Person A: Yeah. No, I completely agree. I think it's just kind of a slippery slope when you start making the argument that certain things shouldn't be legalized because it's dangerous. Yeah, so I guess it's just a question of where you draw the line and I draw the line a little bit further than you. But even so, the vast majority of drugs, I think -- I come from New Hampshire, I'm used to seeing a lot of people who are addicted to narcotics and what that can do to people. So I, by no means, think that those are good or should be accessible.

Person B: Yeah, I know, yeah. It's really hard to draw the line as well. I believe some medical drugs are also -- I mean they can be used in operations and medicine for some purposes.

Person A: Oh, yeah, yeah, yeah. Like codeine and morphine and stuff post-surgery.

Person B: But in daily life they are de-legalized. I don't think there's a very clear line about that. So.

Person A: Yeah, I would just be curious -- this is tangentially related and this is something I have stronger opinions on. If you don't think that legalizing drugs is a good idea, what are your thoughts on how people who are caught in possession should be dealt with?

Person B: Well, it is really hard. So I come from China. I'm an exchange student. And in our country, it matters how much of drugs is in your hand and also what are you using them [for]. For example, if you're just storing a little amount of drug and you're not a drug seller then I don't think you will be seriously penalized, but you will anyway. But if you are say a drug dealer, then in our country you'll be sentenced death by --

Person A: Oh, my goodness.

Person B: Yeah. We are extremely strict on that because -- yeah.

Person A: Wow. I was going to say I know drug laws here -- again yeah, there's a distinction here between possession and intent to sell. And if you have a kilo of cocaine, that's going to be a lot worse than if you just have a little baggie.

Person B: Yeah. And I think my country defines drug as a more serious type. It means that those are really destructive to persons’ health. And once you are exposed to them, you will quickly get addicted or something like that. So yeah.

Person A: Yeah, again, it all boils down to -- it's so tricky because so many substances are highly, highly addictive, but they're a fact, they’re a part of our everyday life. I remember I was in high school once and we had this ridiculous speaker come and he was like, “The most addicting drug out there is food.” Okay, you're being absurd. Yeah, sure, food is addictive but it's not a drug. We literally need food to survive.

Person B: Well it fits every definition though.

Person A: Yeah, no, it really does. So I agree with what he said in that food is a drug, but I'm not going to cut food out of my life.

Person B: Yeah. But we can try that though.

Person A: No, thanks. Yeah, I guess I think if you -- things are already illegal and I think because of that people are -- I think the prompt said this, that people are more hesitant to get help, because they're afraid they're going to get caught. And I think that with the opioid epidemic that we have going on in the States right now, it should -- people should not -- it’s like they’re fearing for their life in two respects. They’re fearing for their life because they're a drug addict who can't stop using and they're fearing for their life because if they're caught, especially if they're a person of color, they're very likely going to end up in jail.

Person B: Yeah, exactly.

Person A: It's absurd.

Person B: And also I think in my country, when you go to rehab, it's open to everyone and you could go there without being penalized. So I do support that we should strengthen the construction of rehabs and go help those addicts and for sure, but yeah.

Person A: Yeah, yeah, yeah. Yeah, I think it's just tough because if you -- let's say you get caught in possession, even if you're not selling, you get caught with possession, you will be prosecuted in some point or another. I don't know what the jail time looks like. But regardless, I don't think putting someone into jail which is a very hostile environment -- and especially if you're an addict, you're going to be going through withdrawal. You're going to be facing a whole host of physical problems within your body and then you get thrown in jail where you don't have any psychological support to be dealing with that. That's wrong.

Person B: Yeah. And you're basically just ruining a person.

Person A: Right. Exactly. And so one of the reasons where I think at least certain kind of more low key drugs, which I know that's a very gray area, but if you legalize those, then you can change the conversation from, “How do we punish these people who were caught just with some drugs?” to, “How do we help these people get themselves out of addiction?”

Person B: I do think that makes sense.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Oh wow.

Person B: Okay.

Person A: It was good talking to you.

Person B: Yeah, you too.

# Pair 203, Support P425, Oppose P426, Condition 4 (Long Audio), Agreement 0

Person A: How’s it going?

Person B: Good. How's it going with you?

Person A: Good. It looks like we've matched differently on this issue.

Person B: Yeah, so I suppose you're opposing? Or no, you're supporting?

Person A: I am in support of allowing controversial speakers.

Person B: Okay, cool, cool, cool. I'm opposing, obviously. Cool, so why don't we go over your first point, I guess? I don't know.

Person A: Definitely. Before we begin, I just want to emphasize, even though we have different opinions, hopefully we can understand each other and where we're coming from.

Person B: Yeah, we’ll see.

Person A: The first point I had -- first of all, you should know that I’m a very liberal person, meaning I, first of all, registered Democrat. I definitely support Obama over Trump. I'm a liberal person and --

Person B: Cool, me too.

Person A: Yeah. I just wanted to get that across just because me being opposed to this might seem like I am as controversial as some of those speakers. I don't necessarily agree with what they're saying. The first point that I wanted to just get across was about freedom of speech. And I know that in the topic that they had asked us about, it said, “This freedom of speech can sometimes be classified as hate speech.” That I agree with. Sometimes their words can be hateful. While they could be hateful, my first point is still we have a duty and an obligation as people to just uphold freedom of speech. And later on, I'll talk about even if that that speech is harmful or hurtful, we have an option ourselves to take that information and analyze and make a choice for ourselves to either have that influence us or not. But yes, first point, freedom of speech. What do you think about that?

Person B: Yeah, I totally agree. I feel like that's an important point. And it's also a very important law to get across to people honestly. But honestly, my first point to counter that kind of is just saying, especially on such a -- going on a college campus, extremely controversial speakers aren't really -- it makes a certain group probably feel targeted if they're extremely controversial. And I'm not into making people feel uncomfortable for any reason necessary. I want everybody to feel welcome on this campus. We’ve all got acceptance letters. We all go here. We all pay tuition. We're not paying tuition to get freaking targeted on the campus. So that's just my point. But I do agree freedom of speech is very important. And yeah.

Person A: Yeah. I liked what you said about having a welcoming environment for everyone and I know that there are lot of different people on this campus. I myself am of an immigrant family and I am really appreciative for the fact that we are here in this country, in this state, and I go to this school. To what you said, you wanted to welcome everyone, and everyone -- this is a really skewed topic, right? It's a really weird, distorted topic because we can also target the minority of conservative people here by silencing them. So my second point is I think we as students at this major world university don't give ourselves enough credit. My second point is we have the freedom to choose what to do with the information we receive. We are influenced in every which way by our professors, by our friends, by the people who speak here. But we need to give ourselves credit for the ability to analyze that information and make a decision for who we are because of that information. And obviously if there are people that are targeting others, we should kind of chuckle to ourselves and be like, “That is ridiculous.” Again, to the first point though, there should be a freedom of speech and the freedom for us to choose based on that speech.

Person B: Mm-hmm. Well, I'm not about silencing anybody, and I do recognize that there's a population on campus that are conservatives or whatever. But it's not that big of a deal to -- I mean they can listen to it on a podcast or something. But I just think inviting them here, having Carol Christ [the Chancellor], spend a bunch of money on police escorts and barricades and blockades and things like that, I think that's just not a good use for the budget at all. Especially when it's just like a majority of people oppose for that. So it's just all about -- there's different factors going into financial things like that. And just ultimately how it makes everyone feel. And I'm saying, even if the conservatives, they invite an extremely controversial person on campus and they say no, it should also be the same for liberals. They invite an extremely controversial liberal person on campus. It should be the same where the response will be no. But yeah, I'm not into silencing people. They could get in a group and listen to a podcast together if it’s really that serious. But just inviting that presence on campus, that does a lot of psychological damage and it's just not a good use for resources at all. Especially what they did last year, that wasn't a really good use of resources.

Person A: Yeah. I totally agree with a lot of the -- I believe there's some hundreds of thousands or something spent on way too many police and way too much security, for something that didn't really happen the second time just cause they over prepared. Which was good to be prepared but still it wasted a lot of money. You mentioned something about resources though. The fact that these people are coming to us and causing a stir really has to do a lot with the people who are listening that are causing the stir. If I said something offensive to you, I have every intention of getting punched in the face by you. But also if someone said something rude to you, you have every intention to really control yourself. It's a shame that I said something offensive to you and that's a shame on me that I need to be accountable for. But still you wouldn't want to put yourself at harm. I think we -- my third point is how we affect other people is definitely not by violence. It's not by silence. It's not by controlling. The resources that we spent obviously were a lot of money, but I don't think those resources need to have been spent if we as liberal people or pro-freedom of speech, pro-welcoming, pro-freedom in general, react in a way that is civilized and a way that is not violent. Then speakers can come here and they can say their thing and they can be silenced after because they said their thing, we don't react and that's it.

Person B: Yeah. But I mean, just like you said, if someone says something offensive to somebody else and they get punched in the face, these things -- it incites violence. So wouldn't it just be good to like avoid it altogether? Like on all bases?

Person A: Yeah, that's -- I don't know that word. But this goes back to your other point about that podcast though. You said that, “Why don't they just organize it in a nonpublic way over podcasts? Anyone who wants to listen can listen.” The fact of the matter is maybe we should be saying no to extremely liberal people coming to campus. But this campus, lo and behold, is a liberal campus. Our professors are generally liberal. I can hear that when I agree with them, when they make fun of the presidency or make fun of conservative things. I agree with those things, but that is what we have here already. Again, back to the second point, we have the freedom to choose what we're listening to from our professors, from our peers, which we -- you and I both believe similar things. We have the ability to choose and to analyze and to investigate what we hear and then move forward from there. We shouldn't be afraid about opposing influences coming in and opposing thoughts and hateful ideas when we as a people know what we stand for and value. We should reflect that too when we listen to them.

Person B: Okay. Yeah, that makes sense. Honestly, at the end of it all, I don't really care that much. I mean, I do care about my position. I will always oppose extremely controversial speakers coming on this campus in the case that it incites fear, violence, psychological things, whatever, and it spends resources that aren't necessary. So yeah, at the end of all, I feel like I'm always going to oppose this and you could support it. I don't really care. There's always going to be somebody that's going to support it. It's not really in my position -- I don't really have the position to judge you on that. And yeah. Honestly, I really don't – yeah, you did make some thorough points and they're good points. And I appreciate your perspective, but I don't have anything else to say. So you know, that's it.

Person A: Super. Yeah. I appreciate talking about this. This relates back to -- I saw a counselor recently for some mental issues that I was going on with and the counselor really helped me to understand how people really change or can change. People changing, meaning me and you think the conservatives or people who are hateful in their speech or hateful in their ideas --

Person B: Not all of them.

Person A: All they need to do is to be heard. You know, if any of us are going through an issue or if we're going through something -- if I broke up with my girlfriend for example, I just want to be heard. And then after I am heard, then I'll listen to someone else. And then from there, that's when the adjustment happens. And so I believe that we can really do a lot to change these people if we welcome and show them how much stronger and more committed we are to truth. But thanks for talking to me.

Person B: Yeah, thanks for talking to me too. All right.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**
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Person A: So, what year are you?

Person B: I’m a junior. And you?

Person A: I am a freshman.

Person B: Oh, well then, welcome.

Person A: Thank you. Are you a junior transfer or have you been here?

Person B: No, I’ve been here for two years.

Person A: Oh, nice. What are you majoring in?

Person B: Mechanical Engineering.

Person A: Ooh, so you’re a MechE, huh?

Person B: Yeah. How about you?

Person A: There are not a lot of people that are. I’m undecided.

Person B: Ah. Have fun deciding.

Person A: Yeah, that’s what I’m trying.

Person B: Do we start the conversation?

Person A: Well, we can get to know each other first.

Person B: Oh, okay.

Person A: It’s not like we’re just telemarketers just talking to each other.

Person B: Okay.

Person A: Do you have any hobbies? What do you like to do?

Person B: I don’t know. I’ll have to see what clubs I’m joining this year.

Person A: No, like just hobbies. Like what do you like to do in your free time?

Person B: I don’t know, too many. I guess I’ve been watching anime lately.

Person A: Oh nice, me too. What anime do you like?

Person B: I started binge-watching My Hero Academia.

Person A: Ooh, I’m about to start that.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Do you like Death Note? That one’s my favorite.

Person B: I haven’t – I’ve read the manga though.

Person A: Oh, I don’t like reading manga.

Person B: Huh, it’s opposite for me.

Person A: I used to be the biggest fan of Attack on Titan, but I haven’t watched the last two seasons.

Person B: Mm. Yeah.

Person A: But yeah, okay. So we got to know each other a little. Would you consider yourself a Democrat?

Person B: I guess so. I voted Democratic last election.

Person A: Oh, nice. Me too. Me too. Okay.

Person B: I feel like a lot of people here are liberal.

Person A: Yeah, but people usually take that with – oh, okay, the twelve minutes haven’t started. Okay, you see I feel like it’s better if we get to know each other first so we’re not like strangers debating.

Person B: All right, is it okay if I go first? Just because my argument is really short.

Person A: Oh yeah, sure, no problem. I mean it's not really -- we could just -- it's a conversation of friends. We’re just having a conversation. So okay.

Person B: Mine’s really, really short.

Person A: Okay. So you're against the legalization of drugs. Right?

Person B: Yeah. In general, I support legalization of drugs. It's just the wording of the topic is that it supports legalizing all drugs. And I think that's just too dangerous. I mean I'm not an expert on drugs obviously, or what constitutes a drug or its effects on society or anything. But just based on media reports and what you hear on the news, I feel like there are drugs out there that are just too dangerous to be legalized. Not like marijuana, not like cocaine, but I mean like fentalyn? I don't remember the name of the drug.

Person A: Right. It’s fentanyl.

Person B: Fentanyl? Yeah. So I feel like it's just too dangerous to legalize. That's really it. That’s my entire argument.

Person A: Right, I get you. No, yeah, I get you. Okay, I have a few things to say. So the legalization of drugs, if you legalize something -- so right now people who are under addiction, being a drug addict has such a negative stigma right now. So you're automatically -- you know how like when the AIDS broke out. So if you had AIDS you were just shunned from society, you were seen as like a whore. And obviously back then they thought it was only homosexuals, so stuff like that. But if you legalize drugs, I feel like it would take away the stigma and encourage people to get help more. And in my opinion, it would lower the addiction rates. And also, you hear stories of people wanting to smoke weed and the weed turns out to be laced with fucking -- Oh I'm sorry, I cursed.

Person B: It’s alright. It’s Berkeley, come on. I’m older than you. I should be the one cursing.

Person A: Okay. But it’s laced with like crack and stuff, the weed. But the legalization of drugs, at least, I'm going to use it for lack of a better term, the small ones like weed, I feel like they can be FDA approved. And it will be able to completely erase stuff like that happening and allow people who actually need the weed to smoke it comfortably without having any fear. Or people who just want to explore weed had -- studies have shown that it's not addictive, it's not a gateway drug. It helps with, this is person to person, but personally -- I wouldn’t say personally, I’ve only done it like -- okay, I shouldn't say anything about my personal experience.

Person B: It’s cool. You’re at Berkeley. Everyone does it.

Person A: But I feel like it helps with creativity or anxiety. Of course, for some people, it makes them paranoid but if you feel that way you can always just stop. It's not addictive. So legalization will help with stigma and it would help make the ones safer. And for drugs like crack or like freaking bath salts or whatever, obviously those shouldn't even, people shouldn't consume those but they're going to find a way anyway. But if we legalize it, I feel like it'd be -- if it was government regulated, I feel like many people would get more resources, find out more information about them. I feel as if it wouldn't cost us any money to sort of legalize it, but --

Person B: It won’t hurt to legalize it. It's not going to be some big financial burden or --

Person A: I don't even know. I feel like bath salts or crack or something like that --

Person B: Are bath salts actually a thing? I thought it was just a term.

Person A: No bath salts are a thing. But I feel like those should still have penalties for using them because I feel like those inevitably make you lash out onto others. But I feel like if you legalize them, you would have more resources to go into rehab and stuff like that. So I feel legalization would help with just helping people cope through their addiction. Legalization in my opinion isn't a definition to support people using those drugs, but help them get out of it. And then help people that use weed do it safely.

Person B: Okay. So I guess I have a few things to talk about. I might completely go out of order. The first thing I think is that on the sheet of paper we have now, it doesn't say supporting legalizing all drugs. The thing is I think we had originally said all drugs, and you can't generalize. You can't say every single drug is like weed or as benign as that. I'm not an expert but I know that the government categorizes drugs based on their toxicity or how dangerous they are, you know like title one, title two. Right?

Person A: Mm-hmm.

Person B: And if you were to just have a blanket legalization of all the drugs and not just weed, I feel like that’ll wreak havoc. It would just hurt a lot of people's lives. People will get hurt. And also the next thing is, I don't think you have to legalize drugs in order to remove the social stigma around using it. Obviously I guess, there’ll still be social stigma, but it won't be social stigma in the fact that like, “Oh, because I do this drug, it's a shameful thing and I can't get help.” I feel like you don't need to legalize a drug in order to provide social services to allow people to go into rehab and get themselves weaned off their addiction.

Person A: Right. But social services will always be there, but just the opinion of society, it usually falls to legality. So if you legalize drugs, I am almost positive that there will be more people -- it will be more acceptable to come out as an addict and to be able to get help that way. Also on that, have you ever seen the film, it was with Matthew McConaughey? It was The Dallas Club. Have you seen The Dallas Club?

Person B: No I haven't. You want to tell me about it?

Person A: Yeah, sure. Okay. So Matthew McConaughey -- so basically the movie's about -- it's based on a true story. Basically, he gets AIDS and then the film goes about him -- basically insurance won't -- you know how insurance is horrible here. They won't cover what he needs. He doesn't want to do chemotherapy and they're trying a new drug on him that is absolutely bad for him. So he goes to Mexico and tries a few drugs that are not legal in the United States. So he tries the drugs and he finds out it works for him and then he realizes -- he basically becomes a narc, right? He starts selling these drugs to other AIDS patients that ends up helping them with their lives. And then people find out and then he goes to a court case where he loses. But he fights for trying to get people with terminal illnesses like AIDS -- he says they should be able to try whatever helps them the most. So I feel like if you legalize all drugs, that blanket would also cover -- obviously this whole being general about any law is really bad, but just on the topic of legalizing drugs, I’m full in support for people with like cancer, with AIDS, that they’re able to have access to experimental medication that might not necessarily be FDA approved. But if they have a terminal illness, it should be up to them. They should be able to decide if they want to have experimental medication on them.

Person B: I guess. So you're saying that basically by legalizing drugs you can help people who have these illnesses that they might not be able to --

Person A: Yeah, so if people don't want chemotherapy, they should be able to request and be able to get whatever medication they feel helps them the most.

Person B: Hmm. I feel like that's a valid concern, but drugs are sometimes not FDA approved -- I mean drugs aren’t -- I have to think about how to word this. But basically, the FDA doesn't randomly approve any experimental drug. The process to test it out and everything is really rigorous for a reason because if it doesn't work, then you are only hurting people more.

Person A: Right. But, two things. Sometimes it's just for money. Sometimes they want their own brand here, you know how corrupt pharmaceutical companies can be. Secondly, if you have a terminal illness where you're going to die in six months anyway, those side effects -- if it helps you live a happy life, even for those last six months, you should be able to take it. There should be an exception for people with terminal illnesses.

Person B: I feel like the issue here isn't whether or not the drug is legalized. It's whether or not they have access to these experimental drugs, in which case the issue here in this specific case with people with illnesses is the actual drug approval process and not the fact that the drug is illegal in the first place.

Person A: Well, it is illegal if they can't get their hands on it in the United States. That's technically what I'm going for. If it was legalized -- for me, legalized would mean it would be available in the United States for them to get.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Because, well, at least in the movie they didn't allow him to use any of those medications here because they weren't FDA approved.

Person B: Yeah, I guess.

Person A: It's a good movie you should watch it.

Person B: All right. All right. Also I just want to point out the reason why AIDS has so much stigma around it was more of a social stigma, less of a -- this is a bit hard to argue. It's not like it was --

Person A: Isn’t all stigma social stigma?

Person B: No, that’s not it. Basically what I'm trying to say is that the stigma surrounding using drugs is different from the stigma of from being a homosexual.

Person A: Right. Yeah. I guess sexually transmitted diseases do have a different stigma than others. So I guess we're not going to come to an agreement, right?

Person B: Well, look, in general I support legalizing drugs. I just don't think you should legalize all of them like, “Oh, I have Fentanyl for everyone,” basically.

Person A: Right. But I mean legalization doesn't mean the government is going to come here giving it out like candy. It just means there are resources available to get it safely, you know.

Person B: But do you want people to get these drugs safely? There's also exceptions in which people with terminal illnesses, obviously they can get drugs safely. But if you're talking about, say, the average person and they want to do some recreational drugs, I mean you probably shouldn't do a drug if it’s dangerous. There are some drugs that have been legalized and they've been legalized for a reason, like weed's been legalized for a reason. It’s been proven to be safe and not a gateway drug or anything. But if a person wants to go ahead and try out something that might harm them on their first try then I don't think it should be legal. It’s not something you should do recreationally.

Person A: Right. In my opinion, it's up to every person, obviously if they're desperate enough they will find a way. So, that's what I'm saying, you know.

Person B: And also you argued before that, “Oh, people are going to find a way to get these drugs anyways,” but then why do we outlaw firearms if they could get the guns anyway? I feel like your argument that, “Oh, they're going to get the drugs anyway,” it's not valid enough to support legalization of these drugs.

Person A: Right. But --

Person B: Because in that case we might as well legalize everything. We might as well legalize murder because you know, people who want to kill are going to kill anyway, so I mean, what on Earth?

Person A: Okay. I guess that's not a good --

Person B: Exactly.

Person A: Yeah. Well I guess we didn’t come to an agreement.

Person B: All right.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: But make sure to watch that movie. You know, Matthew McConaughey actually got an Oscar for that movie.

Person B: Oh, I don’t usually watch non-cartoons.

Person A: Oh, okay.
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Person A: Hey.

Person B: Okay, do you want to start?

Person A: Yeah, sure. Which one was this [topic]? “Do you oppose or support allowing extremely controversial speakers to speak on campus?” I somewhat agreed with the idea of allowing them to speak. Well, based on the last few speakers, banning them outright has not particularly been beneficial for our campus body. As well, there has been a lot of physical damage and full-on riots to property. Beyond that, I feel that addressing these views and how they’re problematic I think could be a big step towards allowing people with opposing viewpoints to engage in discourse and it would help the political divide in this country thus far. And I also genuinely believe that students should be able to identify nuance and think for themselves. At the end of the day it is what it is, you know what you’re getting with these controversial speakers. And if we were to view their viewpoints with that filter on, I think it could help the people who would feel -- it would prevent people from hopefully feeling whatever trauma or fear that might have been incited by this type of hate speech. And at the end of the day, I don’t think we are forcing anyone to listen to them. So those are my arguments. It’s mainly that outright banning it doesn’t solve the problem and I think that healthy discourse can come out of this if we approach it with the right mindset.

Person B: Mm-hmm. All right. But if that’s an extremely controversial speaker how would that be healthy?

Person A: See, yeah. So like not entirely discourse with them but understanding this person’s viewpoints and what’s problematic about it will either challenge whatever beliefs we currently have or just consolidate our viewpoints.

Person B: All right. I agree with your opinion though, but for me, my main argument is that this type of speech shouldn’t be happening on campus. I don’t think college is a place for us to have political speech, especially if it’s such extremely controversial [speech]. And it can cause traumatic effects for some other students that are not a part of this, right? So what I’m thinking about is, we can have these controversial speeches but not on campus. Maybe you could find another place downtown or anywhere else if you want to participate, we can just go there. Now, college for me is a place to study and focus on the thing that I want to grow out of this place, but sometimes I think these kind of things that can be distractful for some students.

Person A: Right. See, I agree with you on the trauma end of it. I can’t speak much about trauma because I am not personally a victim of this. However, I do believe that students should be given the chance to be involved in activism and be involved in pressing issues of today through these political discussions. Because at the end of the day, the youth of today will solve the problems of tomorrow and college should be a very -- I view college as a place where students with different viewpoints can come together and discuss them and form a better view of the world before they enter it. Something like what we’re doing right now, right?

Person B: Right, right, right.

Person A: And I think that controversial speakers -- I think it’s an eye-opening experience honestly. I was there during most of whatever happened then [when Milo Yiannopoulos came to Berkeley]. What went down was arguably worse than letting anyone speak so --

Person B: Mm-hmm. I agree that different people should come together and talk about the controversial things and discuss about it. And it’s like a really eye-opening experience but I remember last year. I don’t know. Were you here last year?

Person A: Yeah. For Milo?

Person B: Yeah, like that thing. It kind of shocked me because there was a lot of hateful speech everywhere on campus. We should talk about this in a more healthy way and that’s acceptable. But when you go down streets and there is hateful language written everywhere, that’s kind of -- yeah, it’s bothering me a lot.

Person A: Yeah, I agree with you one hundred percent. And a lot of these people don’t even feel that strongly about it but do it just to incite something and that would be inflammatory. So in that regard, like with -- have you heard of Alex Jones?

Person B: I’m not familiar with that.

Person A: So he was one of the alt-right’s controversial speakers and he was spreading fake news and very inclinatory comments. And big social media companies have decided to come out and ban them on all social media platforms because that -- and I can get behind that. My only problem is that when Berkeley has tried to ban these speakers we’ve ended up [with] things being so -- riots literally start and things start getting destroyed to the point where I’m thinking like, “Wow this might actually be causing more harm than actually allowing him to speak.” So obviously I don’t think these people have anything good to say, or I wouldn’t want to actually listen to it because I’ve heard enough of it. But my only problem with banning them is that right now it hasn’t been working for us. And maybe perhaps an outright ban isn’t the answer. Maybe we can hold a panel or something like that to field more healthy discussions.

Person B: Yeah. I feel like our viewpoints are almost the same.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Yeah, okay.

Person A: Yeah. But it’s crazy. I mean, I don’t think you find things like this in many places in the world. This is a very Berkeley thing, huh?

Person B: I know. I’m kind of getting used to it.

Person A: Yeah. What year are you in?

Person B: I'm a rising sophomore.

Person A: Right. I’m a rising junior. How do you like it so far? Oh wow, you experienced that as a freshman, huh?

Person B: Yeah, I was completely shocked right then.

Person A: I experienced the elections as a freshman. That was interesting.

Person B: Oh. How was it?

Person A: Yeah. I don’t know. Like people were just like -- some people were tearing up in the dorms and everything. My friends and I just decided to start drinking or something to cope with it somehow.

Person B: Were you guys still having classes back then?

Person A: Actually, the day after I think some professors moved their lectures and moved their exams and everything. Some of them extended deadlines for homework and that kind of thing. But I remember going to class the next day.

Person B: Yeah, I was actually an international student. I was in my country when I heard the election.

Person A: Wait, where are you from? I’m international too.

Person B: Really? I’m from China.

Person A: I’m from Malaysia.

Person B: Oh. Okay, how do you feel about this?

Person A: Well, what do you mean?

Person B: Like hearing the election, and I don’t know.

Person A: Well at the time I mean, obviously my first thought was how does this affect me, right?

Person B: Yeah, definitely.

Person A: And at some point, there was this article about the U.S. embassy requiring more documentation for people from a list of countries and Malaysia was on there. So with that I got kind of scared but it didn’t go through. So no, honestly, I don’t think Trump is a good president, but it hasn’t affected me directly. I mean like with trade wars with China and everything, prices go up maybe a bit here and there. But I don’t feel miserable because of him, you know? So because of that, I don’t really --

Person B: Yeah, I didn’t feel anything until last year when the war started. Yeah. And I don’t know, I feel like some American people might think he’s a good president. Honestly, I don’t see that at all. Yeah.

Person A: Yeah. It’s bad.

Person B: I know. And even for me, honestly, I don’t really care about political issues. I’m interested in and I try to get involved in it, but I am not that involved you know?

Person A: Yeah, of course.

Person B: Yeah, even for me, I feel like this is a big deal and it’s just -- I can’t do anything about it but it just feels uncomfortable.

Person A: Yeah, politics is very interesting. But well I think his presidency tells a lot about politics in America and how it needs to change. The only reason someone would be willing to overlook all of Trump’s flaws to vote for him is because inherently they decided that he would be better for them than the establishment. Which says something about the establishment. So Democrats are going to have to rethink everything and I think this is necessary for good growth in the country so.

Person B: Yeah, but isn’t Trump decreasing the taxes for the Americans?

Person A: Decreasing?

Person B: Like he’s lowering the tax rates for Americans?

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: So how do you think that will be affected?

Person A: See, the majority of people who voted for him and the reason he won was that because he appealed to poor White people who felt like they were forgotten by the previous government. And their anger is deserved and rightfully so. But they just put their faith in someone who gave them false promises. Trump is not going to solve their problems. But he told them -- but the fact that he acknowledged their problems as problems was enough to make them vote for him over Hillary.

Person B: Yeah, I remember on the media, they were all about how Hillary's going to win and suddenly Trump won and like nobody’s expecting that. So I read an article about how the media can be affected. How the media can affect the political like – okay, time’s up.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Do we hang up the phone?

Person B: Okay. Nice meeting you though.

Person A: All right. It was nice talking to you.

Person B: Yeah, same.

Person A: What was your name?

Person B: [Name redacted].

Person A: [Name redacted]. My name’s [name redacted].

Person B: Okay, nice meeting you.

Person A: Nice meeting you.

Person B: All right, see you.

Person A: See you.
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Person A: Okay, do you want to start with your basic position?

Person B: Sure. You can hear me, right?

Person A: Yeah, yeah.

Person B: Okay, so I said that I was against legalizing the drugs. Should I go into why or should we just --

Person A: Yeah. Go ahead. I said that I was for it, so go ahead.

Person B: Okay. So I said that -- essentially my thought process is that, although I do believe in rehabilitation over incarceration for sure, I think that the United States is one of the most capitalistic nations in the world. And I think that a lot of the corporations in this country have already proven throughout history that they lack a moral compass. And I think that a lot of them would take advantage of people being addicted to drugs and make profit off of it. Because drugs in general is a really profitable industry, already seen with over-the-counter drugs. And I think they would exploit people’s addictions in order to make a profit on a large scale. I think that although legal drugs are already available now, it can still be relatively hard to get some of the drugs that are super highly addictive like heroin or meth or something.

Person A: Mm-hmm.

Person B: So, yeah. So basically, I just think that the risk in mass addiction is too high based on corporations for profit.

Person A: I completely agree with your thought process in terms of exploitation and especially by corporations and stuff. I'm trying to think where to start with my points. Sorry, I’m not good at debating.

Person B: Oh, no worries.

Person A: Well, I guess my thought process is that, while you make the point that it is still difficult to get and stuff, I mean people are going to do whatever they want to do anyways. You have that instance with, in places where abortion is illegal, people resort to underground methods that are not as safe. So I think that if drugs are legalized -- I mean not all of them are innately harmful. Of course some of them like you're saying, like heroin and crack cocaine and stuff are different stories, but things like LSD or other psychoactives that aren’t necessarily innately harmful by nature -- people might have safer access to that, and a better understanding of how to use them safely rather than getting them from not safe sources or not using them correctly I guess.

Person B: Yeah, I actually agree with that. I think drugs -- and I mean I support legalization of marijuana too because like you said drugs like that aren’t super harmful. I just think that if we’re looking at drugs like coke, heroin, meth, drugs like that that are super harmful, I wouldn’t legalize those.

Person A: Yeah. At the same time though I just think that the people who are addicted to those sorts of things -- being in prison just perpetuates the cycle of poverty especially because it targets low income communities and communities of color. Because people are put in prison, but that’s not necessarily rehabilitating them. So I wish that there was some way that, say, it was illegal, but punishment was not going to jail. Punishment was going to a medical facility for rehab. Of course, that’s expensive, but also keeping people alive in prison is expensive. And hopefully, I mean I’m sure this isn’t the case, but you would hope that at least taxpayers would be willing to value people’s well-being.

Person B: Yeah, I actually totally agree with that. I think that instead of legalizing drugs I would propose reforming our criminal justice system, in many ways but especially within [the] terms of this topic, to having our federal government fund more rehabilitation facilities that aren’t expensive and are state sponsored. And that way when people are caught using harmful and illegal drugs that they would be sent there and hopefully that would offer them the chance to be rehabilitated. Because I agree that if people are using drugs and aren't killing people or doing something that’s actually harmful to society that they should be given a chance to get well, because addiction is a disease, and to go back into society and succeed. And I think going to jail really prohibits them from doing that and, like you said, reinforces that cycle of poverty.

Person A: So I have a question. I'm curious what you think that might look like? What these medical facilities might look like in terms of, you know, what if you have the same people who keep coming back? Just like how often that is with prison and everything. How can we reform that, do you think?

Person B: Yeah, I was actually just thinking of that too. The thing is people that continue to keep coming back. But for example, if someone overdoses and they call the paramedics, they have to revive them. No matter how many times that they’ve been called, no matter how many times that persons’ been overdosed, the paramedics have to revive them. And so yeah, in some degrees it really is on that person to get better. And you’d hope that [a] majority of people would get better but that’s the one conflicting thing is, yeah, what if someone -- because people would be upset if they’re using taxpayer resources to just continually put someone in rehab just for them to over and over again get out, do drugs, get arrested and come back.

Person A: Yeah. I mean the same thing happens in prison I guess you could argue.

Person B: Mm-hmm, yeah.

Person A: But when you’re talking about calling an ambulance, that’s unless of course you’re on like Medicaid or something. It is a private sector thing, I mean you pay with health insurance. So I wonder if that’s something that could be included with medical insurance. Although, I also get that probably a lot of people who are using these hard drugs aren’t maybe covered.

Person B: Yeah, they usually don’t have insurance.

Person A: Hmm, this is so rough.

Person B: I know. It’s a hard topic because they use the example in the question of Portugal and how they legalized drugs and they saw a reduction. But at the same time I think that the U.S. is a completely different thing just because of, like I mentioned earlier, the way that this country works in terms of corporations being so prominent. And I could just imagine -- because weed is one thing, but drugs like cocaine for example are so highly addictive. And if someone continuously wants to keep coming back for more and they’re always available -- because if its legal they’re more likely to be available on a mass scale -- a lot of times people will resort to other crimes like robbery and stuff in order to get money for that. And I think that’s kind of a slippery slope waiting for people -- and they’ll get in jail for other crimes.

Person A: Yeah. I’m curious how Portugal has regulated everything and what the context is there. Because, obviously, they’re free market too. I’m not sure. I don’t know much about Portugal or their government or whatever, but yeah, I'm curious how that would work in the American context.

Person B: Yeah, me too. I mean it’s interesting. This is a really hard topic because you also have to look into the fact that a lot of people, especially people from the Republican Party, would probably not be okay with tax money being used for stuff like rehab. Because we see people -- our own president that went on record and said that people who sell drugs or people who -- I think he said people who are non-violent drug dealers deserve the death penalty.

Person A: Yeah, that’s actually ridiculous.

Person B: I agree. It’s completely ridiculous. It’s not reasonable but when you have people like in our government now spewing that rhetoric, I think that that would create a lot of controversy within our nation over people agreeing or not agreeing. But at the same time, if we use the taxpayer money we use now to fund prisons and just shift that to rehabilitation centers.

Person A: Yeah. I think that could be more effective long term. So even people who are concerned about, “Oh how much money is this all going to cost, taxpayer money?”, I think long term that does seem like a better system. I mean rehab obviously isn’t guaranteed to cure addiction but neither is prison.

Person B: Yeah, I totally agree.

Person A: I think another one of the challenges too, because I know even California is struggling with the weed legalization, is regulating legal limits and smoking in public, drinking in public. Are the laws the same, like DUI's? Because I guess when you’re high you really are driving under the influence? But also, at what point -- we don’t have yet a way to measure that. So I think that that’s a lot of complications and a lot of money and policy that would have to go into that as well with legalizing drugs.

Person B: Yeah. I mean what happens if someone’s on the sidewalk of a school snorting cocaine or shooting up heroin? You know what I mean. How do you regulate that? Because if it’s legal it’s like, “Oh, well if it’s legal you can just go out in public and do it, right?” But --

Person A: Yeah, I assume that would follow the same sort of laws that we have for drinking. Probably like not in public places or something.

Person B: Yeah. Like I said, it's a complex topic but I think we both are meeting in the middle of the minds. I guess in the sense of -- it could be a slippery slope but at the same time we agree that the status quo now is not okay.

Person A: Yeah, definitely.

Person B: Because at this point, all we see is more and more drug use and throughout the nation, and especially how it targets minorities and people that are impoverished and how they resort to drugs. And you know the criminal justice system is hard because a lot of times when you’re incarcerated for drug use, it’s hard to get a job afterwards and if you can’t get a job you resort back to using drugs and then you’re stuck in the same cycle.

Person A: Yeah. And I mean being incarcerated for anything, I think that’s also hard. I think there needs to be a policy change with how companies are held liable. Because my family owns a small business and their issue is they can't hire previously incarcerated people because there [have] been lawsuits in the past with other franchises of our company or of the business where people who were previously incarcerated committed a crime during work time and then the company’s been sued. So it's like the company shouldn’t be held liable because then that just promotes not hiring previously incarcerated people. So they shouldn’t have to be held accountable legally for that.

Person B: Yeah, I totally agree. And honestly, in my opinion, I’m totally against people going to jail for non-violent crimes like -- I mean, actually, I don't know, because then there’s also things like fraud and tax evasion. I guess in that sense I don't know, it's complex. But I think if someone’s violent they definitely should be in jail because they shouldn’t have the ability to continue hurting people. But when, in terms of drugs, a lot of people that are on drugs --if addiction’s a disease why do we treat it like it’s not, right? Because if you have another disease you go to a medical facility and you are given the opportunity to get better. Yet when we look at something like drug abuse which is also a disease, people aren’t being given that same opportunity.

Person A: Yeah. It seems like addiction is kind of treated the same way as mental health, just not respected -- or not respected, but given the same priority as physical illness.

**[Experimenter says time’s up]**

Person B: Yeah, all right. Oh, stop.

Person A: Okay.

# Pair 116, Support P250, Oppose P247, Condition 4 (Long Audio), Agreement 0

Person A: Hello.

Person B: Hi.

Person A: How are you?

Person B: Good, how are you?

Person A: I am fine, thank you.

Person B: Do you have an accent? Are you from somewhere?

Person A: I’m half Turkish, half Finnish.

Person B: Wow, that’s so cool.

Person A: What about you?

Person B: I’m full-born American actually. My parents are from Hong Kong though. I guess there’s some ethnicity there.

Person A: Yeah, definitely.

Person B: How is your day going?

Person A: It’s good. The food is getting better so I’m happy.

Person B: Nice. What year are you?

Person A: What?

Person B: What year are you?

Person A: Freshman.

Person B: Oh, wow.

Person A: Yeah. And you?

Person B: I’m a second year.

Person A: Cool, how is that? How is the first year? How was it?

Person B: It was good. I was kind of sad though because I didn’t have late night [dining] but you guys have it. So.

Person A: Oh, cool. Yeah.

Person B: But you’ll be fine. Are you excited?

Person A: Yeah, kind of. But the [Golden Bear Orientation] was so long, so we’re kind of tired.

Person B: Oh, yeah, I am sure. It’s like a whole week, right?

Person A: Yeah, yeah exactly.

Person B: Awful.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: What dorm are you living in?

Person A: Unit 1, Deutsch [building].

Person B: Oh, nice.

Person A: Are you staying at a dorm or a house?

Person B: No, I’m staying at an apartment now. But I was in Unit 2.

Person A: Oh, cool.

Person B: Yeah, I saw all the new dormitories by Bancroft that were so pretty.

Person A: Yeah, yeah. Like there’s somewhere called “Blackwell” [dorm] which is super new. People from there are super happy. So.

Person B: Yeah, they have every right to be honestly.

Person A: Yeah, yeah. It’s super cool. All right, cool. So are we supposed to start debating or?

Person B: I’m not sure yet. I don’t think we have to yet.

Person A: Okay.

Person B: I guess we’ll just wait. How did you hear about this as a first year though?

Person A: Yeah. One of my friends signed up for it, so I heard from him.

Person B: Oh, nice.

Person A: Yeah, yeah. I was looking for jobs around, then they told me I can’t work this year because I’m an international student or something. Yeah, I was like, “Crap, how am I going to get money?”

Person B: Yeah. I’m hoping this would be good for income too. All right, do you want go first?

Person A: Okay, so we talk about the campus speakers and I said that I’d support allowing extremely controversial speakers to speak on campus and I put a one [on the scale]. And I said I’d support it because I think we should have different voices even though if they’re reflecting something extremely controversial. And I said this by believing that the necessary security is good, no violent attacks will be triggered. Somehow it should be managed. And when the security is okay, then the speakers could come up and tell about their ideas. And then that will be it. That’s what I thought. Yeah, and what about you?

Person B: I actually said no. But also I think it’s because I was here last year when they had those controversial speakers like Milo -- I don’t know how to pronounce his last name. But when he came, it was crazy because the chancellor had put so much of school funding into security that it was kind of too much. We had helicopters and we had a picket fence with a bunch of police officers carrying those plastic shields that make a wall kind of deal.

Person A: Oh my God.

Person B: Yeah, so it was -- I understand why people wanted to have a kind of forum for everyone to share their views but just I guess the disruption, and then the all of the drama, that was not necessary. And all of the money that could have been put somewhere else would have been better. And I understand that Berkeley is known for being a place where people share their opinions but it's just, you don’t want to jeopardize the students is what I’m thinking.

Person A: Yeah, yeah. So maybe they could make people read his articles or watch a video where he then speaks about his extremely controversial topic instead of having him come to campus and then having him make a speech in person.

Person B: Yeah, that’s true.

Person A: Yeah, maybe that will be more, financially and security-wise, safer.

Person B: Mm-hmm. Yeah, that would be a good idea, a good alternative for sure.

Person A: Yeah, yeah. What did he talk about? How was it?

Person B: I know, the guy, he’s really conservative, like super -- I want to say very brash, kind of like Donald Trump where the opinions that he has, he has nothing to back it up kind of deal. And they’re very super all White American conservative ideals that can be perceived differently. But I don’t know, I just feel like it was very -- he was a really poorly chosen speaker because Berkeley is such a rainbow and liberal campus that maybe it wasn’t the smartest idea for him to come. But I mean he spoke for some of the students that have those views, so I guess that works.

Person A: Yeah, so was he the only one that came?

Person B: He was the only one I actually remember, I’m sure that there [were] other people. But he had a whole bunch of security around him and then they blocked off part of campus, so students had to walk a long way around Sproul [Plaza] because that entire avenue was just a bunch of police officers. And then you would just hear helicopters overhead and then -- it was crazy because I feel like half of the people that were there to protest or support weren’t even Berkeley students. They were just --

Person A: Random people?

Person B: Yeah, people just in the Bay Area that have a lot of opinions as well and feel strong enough to come say something about it, but yeah. I think it’s a good way for people to communicate ideas I guess too.

Person A: Yeah. Was the security to protect the guy? Or like --

Person B: Oh, yeah. I guess it was to protect the guy and the students but it didn’t really feel that way. You just saw a bunch of officers that had beating sticks ready and like that kind of stuff and I was like, “This is straight out of a movie.” But yeah, so you’re from -- oh sorry, do you have anything else to say about this topic?

Person A: No, not really. I guess I’d also prefer -- I’d like to hear his ideas but not in person of course if it’s such a big deal and if it’s going to be financially a heavy thing to handle and if it’s going to disrupt the environment of the campus then yeah like --

Person B: Yeah. Cool, cool. I might be overdramatizing it but I know people that were going around telling like --everyone was shouting different numbers that the chancellor spent on security so I have no clue but --

Person A: But helicopters, come on.

Person B: Yeah. Yeah, right? I feel like that’s a pretty big deal. Cool, okay so I guess we reached a consensus about using the internet.

Person A: Yeah, yeah. I guess.

Person B: Cool, so you’re from Finland?

Person A: My dad's from Finland and my mom's Turkish. And I studied high school in Istanbul, Turkey and now my parents moved to Finland, Helsinki and my brother's continuing to study there.

Person B: Wow.

Person A: And I’m here, yeah, so it’s super complicated, but yeah.

Person B: Oh no, that’s awesome though. That’s really brave too, to travel super far.

Person A: Thank you. Yeah, it’s quite far.

Person B: Yeah. Are your parents still here or did they already go back?

Person A: They didn’t come actually.

Person B: Oh, you came by yourself? Oh my gosh.

Person A: Yeah, yeah.

Person B: Dang.

Person A: Yeah, because they were moving at the same time, packing for Finland, and my brother had to start high school at approximately the same date. So, yeah.

Person B: Okay. Oh, wow. So you’re all moved in though, and you’re able to navigate?

Person A: Yeah, yeah. That wasn’t the problem, but the problem was that I had only one luggage to put my stuff and I definitely did not fit. So if they would come then they would bring some of my stuff so that would be cool, but yeah. Next time maybe.

Person B: Next time, yeah. Wait so if you -- well I'm kind of curious what languages they taught you in school then if you were in Istanbul?

Person A: Yeah, so I studied [International Baccalaureate Education], so I was in an English school and we had Turkish, English, and Spanish.

Person B: Wow. That's awesome.

Person A: Yeah. I learned Finnish by speaking to my father and going and coming back to Finland and visiting my other relatives there. But I didn't really take a Finnish education, it was just naturally learning the language, yeah.

Person B: Cool. How do you like -- oh so did you have any friends come with you here? It’s a really far distance, so.

Person A: Yeah, yeah, yeah, I had. There are around 30 new Turkish people coming.

Person B: Oh hey, that's awesome.

Person A: Yeah that's a lot. And I knew from before two of them and I met the others from -- we have a WhatsApp group, so from there. So it's kind of nice and my boyfriend also came here from Turkey.

Person B: Oh, that's so sweet.

Person A: So yeah, I'm not all alone. I don't know what will happen, we are in a rollercoaster, so I don't know if we'll stay together or what happens. But it still feels more comfortable when you have someone you know super well.

Person B: Yeah. I hope everything works out. I don't want to ask for the details, but yeah.

Person A: Yeah, we’ll see.

Person B: What’s your major?

Person A: I want to major in Neurobiology and also follow pre-med.

Person B: Oh, wow. You go, man.

Person A: What about you?

Person B: If you had Asian parents, they’d be so proud of you. I'm studying Electrical Engineering and Computer Science.

Person A: Cool.

Person B: Yeah, I’m a nerd.

Person A: That’s good. My boyfriend also wants to major in [Computer Science] and Neurobiology, so double major. But let's see. Yeah, it's his first year so he's like if it becomes boring and too much then he'll just do [Computer Science] he says, but yeah.

Person B: Yeah. It's good to try all the different courses.

Person A: Yeah, yeah, exactly, I guess.

Person B: So are you roommates with someone you requested to be with or --

Person A: No, so most of the Turkish people wanted to pair up but I didn't want to pair up because I wanted to have roommates from different places, different cultures that I didn't know. So it would make this experience better. I already know the Turkish guys and girls. I can meet up with them anytime. “I don't have to stay with the same room,” I said to myself, so yeah.

Person B: That's awesome.

Person A: They are both from California, my roommates. So I'm in a triple.

Person B: Oh man oh, I was in a triple last year too. That’s a fun time.

Person A: Yeah, it's a small room with three people.

Person B: Yeah, you get real close, real fast.

Person A: Yeah, exactly.

Person B: What part of California are they from?

Person A: One is from Tracey, it's a small town I think two hours of driving. And the other one's -- oh wait is the other one from California? I'm not sure, I think she's from Dallas.

Person B: Oh, yeah, that's in Texas.

Person A: That's in Texas, yeah.

Person B: Oh, that’s so cool though. And you guys are all random assignment.

Person A: Yeah, exactly.

Person B: Oh, that was how my room was last year too. Yeah, I actually got an international roommate too from Indonesia which was pretty cool.

Person A: Oh, wow, she has a long flight too then.

Person B: Yeah, definitely. So how was [Golden Bear Orientation] for you? I heard it was okay, not as good.

Person A: Yeah, it wasn't perfect, but it was okay. Most of the activities were quite interesting and my group was fine. I got super close with them kind of.

Person B: Oh, that’s nice.

Person A: Yeah but the bad thing I’d say was we didn't have free time. It was like from one to the other thing and the other and the other. And from the morning to midnight we had always something. So mostly when we felt tired we just skipped and then it became a habit sometimes. So if they would have put some time for ourselves then we’d attend more events and have even more fun probably, but yeah.

Person B: Oh, I'm sorry. That sounds draining.

Person A: And also I think seven days was a little too much. Maybe five or four would be better. I don't know.

Person B: Yeah. I know that before -- I think -- I had [Golden Bear Orientation] too when I was a freshman, but I knew before they used to have just a weekend for --

Person A: Yeah, yeah, before.

Person B: Yeah, that would have been nice but also a little bit tight too.

Person A: Yeah, yeah. I feel like four days would be the ideal but I don't know.

Person B: Got you. So is this your first time in the States?

Person A: I've been to New York two times and once to Boston but not to California so not this coast, this place. And I had prepared my luggage for warm weather but I heard that that was [Southern California] so not this side. So it's super cold.

Person B: Uh-huh. Yeah, the weather's pretty temperamental here.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Hey, well at least you have an excuse to go shopping which is nice.

Person A: Yeah, yeah.

Person B: Cool.

Person A: So why did you choose Berkeley? Do you have a story or?

Person B: Oh yeah, so actually surprisingly I was going to try -- I almost went to San Diego.

Person A: Yeah?

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: Yeah. Oh, never mind. How about you? Why did you choose Berkeley?

Person A: Just because I thought it’d be cool to study in the States. And Berkeley was one of the best, so yeah.

Person B: Cool. I’m going to hang up now, but it was nice talking to you.

Person A: You too. Bye.
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Person A: All right. Hi.

Person B: Hi, how are you doing?

Person A: Doing good. How are you?

Person B: I’m good. Do you want to go ahead and start?

Person A: Sure, yeah. So I have some pretty strong feelings on the subject. I assume, since we got partnered up, we have opposing views. But the main place that I’m coming from -- so I support legalization of drugs in the United States for two main reasons. First is that there are some drugs that are classified as Schedule 1 or controlled substances that really could potentially have therapeutic or medical uses. Specifically, the use of shrooms or psilocybin mushrooms have been shown to be able to treat PTSD in some cases, and MDMA or ecstasy has been shown to treat some symptoms of depression -- actually I might have gotten those backwards, but the fact that those are federally scheduled and illegal drugs means that there’s not a lot of research available on the subject, which I think is setting the medical field backwards. And then the other reason is that for other narcotics like heroin and methamphetamine, the fact that those drugs are illegal actually is harming the health of people who suffer from addiction. Just because, first of all it sort of dehumanizes people to be treated as criminals for an addiction which is really a mental health problem, in my opinion. And also because it’s illegal, the efforts to make drug addicts safer are hindered because none of those efforts are legal -- like getting life-saving measures to addicts is illegal because addiction is basically illegal. So I’ve got more thoughts specifically, but I would be interested to hear your general ideas.

Person B: Yeah, sure. So I don’t think I feel as strongly about opposing this as you do supporting this, if that makes sense.

Person A: Uh-huh. Yeah, yeah.

Person B: So the reason I said no for just general legalization of drugs is simply because of the dangers that would come with that. I think I agree with your points about the benefits for the general public’s health with the legalization of drugs, but I think there should be some sort of a limitation to who drugs can be accessible to.

Person A: Mm.

Person B: For example, if you have a medical license, I support the legalization for the use of medical studies for the help of bettering people with mental illnesses, like what you mentioned. But I think because such a large population of the U.S. -- if it was legalized, I feel like a majority of these people who do take part in drug usage might take advantage of it. And that’s a risk that I think the current state of -- I think the current resources for support and for addiction and stuff like that is still pretty scarce. And so if drugs were to be legalized I don’t think the U.S is currently in a state where they’d be able to help such a huge influx of people in case they were to develop an addiction. Because I think something different between maybe alcohol and drugs -- I think with alcohol you have a little more control of how much of that substance you can intake into your own body. But I think with drugs it depends from person to person, like even just a little bit -- drugs, like the way the chemicals in drugs are actually addictive. And so I think even if you don’t mean to, you can be -- suddenly just become addicted. Maybe just you wanted to try it once or twice and because you weren’t aware of the effects it could lead in a downward spiral. And I think just an overall -- maybe in the long run with better health resources and better education about the dangers of drugs and other things along the lines of that, I think I wouldn’t be as opposed to legalizing drugs. But I think with the current state of how things are as of now, I would say no simply because I don't think enough people are aware, are educated. And I don’t think there are enough resources to help people if drugs were to be legalized, if that makes sense.

Person A: Yeah, no, that makes perfect sense. I totally get what you’re saying. Yeah, I have a couple of thoughts on that. First to the point about these drugs being addictive, I mean alcohol is also addictive, and so is nicotine and caffeine, and those are all legal. But I think I see your point about things like heroin and meth being more immediately addictive after shorter time of use so --

Person B: I think my main concern is just because drugs -- there’s so many different classifications of drugs. If you were just to legalize drugs in general I feel like that would require a ton of complications. Because with alcohol and with nicotine, I think it’s not all the same, but it's generally the same chemical make up of those. But with drugs they’re so different depending on what you take. And so, I think they all have different effects whether it be good or bad, and I think that’s just kind of -- it’s difficult to regulate all of those. It's just so different.

Person A: Yeah, definitely. Yeah, I think it would be difficult, or probably impossible, to regulate all of them in the same way that alcohol or cigarettes are regulated. I think my main point actually goes to your point about there not being enough structure for education, for support. Where if things were legalized, there wouldn’t be systems in place to help people who got addicted. Where I think my position is legalization would actually help those systems be in place. Because one actual, concrete thing that saves lives, helps people who develop addictions, is the distribution of naloxone which is a -- I don’t know if you’re familiar with naloxone?

Person B: I’m not.

Person A: Okay. It's basically a drug that counteracts heroin overdose. So if you administer it to someone who’s having an overdose it immediately sends them into withdrawal and saves their life, basically. I actually -- a lot of my knowledge comes from personal experience. One of my best friends has been addicted to heroin for some time and has had a couple of overdoses herself. And so naloxone is something that’s really immediately life saving to addicts or to people who overdose, even if you overdose your first time doing it. And it's not something that’s widely distributed because heroin is illegal and so naloxone is -- I don’t know if naloxone is actually illegal or just not widely available, but if it was legalized and we also put in place systems to distribute naloxone, it could wind up saving a lot of lives in the future. And I think on a broader scale a lot of our drug education is focused on -- a lot of the drug education, that at least I got in middle school or whatever, was police coming to your school and being like, “Drugs are illegal and drugs are bad. Don't do drugs.” But it wasn't a lot of like, “If you find yourself in a situation where you’ve tried drugs, because you were bored, or because you were depressed and trying to self-medicate, or because you were coerced into it, and now you find yourself addicted, what do you do? Where do you go from here?” There’s no programs for that kind of education. And I think maybe if we legalized it, we could pave the way to have that kind of education. I’m not sure it would happen, but I have hope.

Person B: Yeah. I totally see your point, actually. I think that for me I'm not completely opposed to the legalization. I think more so just restricting who has access.

Person A: Mm-hmm.

Person B: Because I just don't think adolescents, people who are younger than college students, for example, should just be going around with access to, I don't know, heroin. That just doesn't seem very safe for them. But I definitely see your point with -- to improve medical research, to improve these resources for helping those that are or have been addicted before. I definitely see your point where the legalization could definitely help improve those systems. And I definitely do agree, actually. And I think that -- yeah, legalization but with a lot of little things in place where it’s like, “Oh, only these people should have access. If you have a history of blah, blah, blah, you should seek medical help first before trying to,” -- I don't know, it's very complicated. But I do see your point.

Person A: Yeah. I think that one thing that kind of speaks to where both of us are coming from here is safe injection sites. Those are a thing in -- I want to say Portugal, is the country that’s gone full legalization. And there’s also some people trying to set up safe injection sites across America. I think Seattle is supposed to have one soon. And those are places where people who are addicted to drugs can go to basically shoot up, but in a supervised setting with trained professionals there to make sure they have clean needles. And there are, I don't know, maybe testing kits to make sure whatever they’re taking isn’t laced with anything. And in theory the people who are working there are also trying to offer mental health assistance to those people. To be like, “Okay, you have access to safe needles, safe injection here. But I would encourage you to also seek help at these other places.” Maybe there would be resources for like, “Here are some rehabs,” or “Here are some education programs,” or stuff like that.

Person B: Yeah, for sure. Yeah. I think that’s definitely -- my kind of wrapped up thoughts from this would either be legalization but with a ton of restrictions, or it would be keep it illegal but then there are loopholes where a lot of medical people would have access to it is what I'm thinking. I think that ultimately, I feel like my biggest worry is a lot of people use it for recreational purposes and things can get out of hand really fast. Especially if it’s with people who don’t know what they’re doing. And I think that's just the main concern, because that's the same thing with alcohol and nicotine. You get to a point where you just can't control yourself and it’s not your fault or anything, it’s your body reacting that way. And even though it's an unfortunate incident, it happens to people and it’s -- yeah, when they need help they definitely should be able to reach out and have the resources available. And so I think the biggest concern is just making sure if we were to legalize these drugs they were in the hands of the right people. And not people who would be taking advantage of it and using it for --

**[Experimenter says time is up.]**

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: But yeah, it was nice talking to you.

Person A: Yeah. It was good talking to you too.

Person B: Yeah, yeah.

Person A: Yeah, no. This was a really cool conversation, thank you.

Person B: Yeah, sure. Have you done Xlab [lab studies] before?

Person A: No, I haven’t.

Person B: Oh, this was my first time too.

Person A: Cool.

Person B: Yeah. I think we’re supposed to end, but it was nice talking to you.

Person A: Yeah. You too. Bye.

Person B: Bye.
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Person B: All right. So I'm assuming your angle then is that the speakers should be allowed to speak on campus?

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Cool. So, all right. My main reason for not wanting that is mostly because of resources and money. It also trickles down to just image and also generally finding other people that are less inflammatory, but I think most of it comes down to money.

Person A: Okay, okay. Is that your only reason, basically?

Person B: No, it's a couple different things, but I want to hear your thoughts on what the main proponent is.

Person A: All right, so I decided to choose supporting allowing extremely controversial speakers just because I was there when Milo [Yiannopoulos] came over, and when Ben Shapiro came over, and I've read a lot and I've listened to their speeches online and I think it provides very valuable thought and it allows you to see multiple perspectives. And especially at a college campus, we're in college to learn and to immerse yourself in new ideas and everything. And I think without being able to see on a bigger scale and listen to multiple ideas, you won't ever be able to get a bigger picture of what's going on. And I know money is an issue. We spent millions on the police and the SWAT team making sure everything was okay. So I do see your point that it does cost a lot of money, but there's a trade-off. They don't come to every college campus and the fact that they did come to Berkeley and talk, I think that was a very good idea.

Person B: Okay. So I think the idea of getting different perspectives is exactly what my main -- that's the only reason I would support something like this. But I think the issue with it is that when these speakers are coming, it's not a debate. The whole platform that these people take on is the idea that they're provocateurs and they throw opinions out that are designed to perturb the audience and offend them into giving a response that makes the college campuses that they selectively visit look bad. So it's almost like a weird sideways ambush because it's trying to discredit the base that they're speaking at rather than start a discussion. And I think that type of thing is really dangerous, because it's getting the support of the university to discredit their own students while not giving them a different viewpoint. If it was a debate, I could see that as totally valid, but the way that these things are, it's just set up as more of an attack.

Person A: I do see your point. I do see your point. But have you ever seen when Ben Shapiro or Milo calls on different people in the audience to kind of debate the topic? That is a form of exchanging ideas, wouldn't you say?

Person B: Again, I don't think so. Because I think they're really skilled, and I'll give them this credit, they're really skilled at being able to turn it into an attack. It's not so much of a debate because they throw around a lot of name-calling and issues that they know will make people really angry. Because it's not a discussion where they invite them back on stage. It's them on the stage yelling things and then getting people to laugh. Whereas if it was two people on stage, discussing the one idea, with a time limit and stuff like that, it makes sense because then the whole structure is based off of two opposing viewpoints. But I think just the way that they operate currently is meant to do something that the university shouldn't support.

Person A: Could you say again why is it dangerous? Why do you think it's dangerous?

Person B: Well, I think it's dangerous because one, on a base level, it just inspires a lot of hateful ideas. And then it also just disrupts campus life. In addition to money and resources, it brings security on there. People don't go to classes and it becomes a whole thing where then the media focuses on that, and then you lose money because of just general support for public education for whatever schools are involved. And then just general public support, like when there's people saying that they wouldn't hire somebody coming from a school like Berkeley because they see what a general student view of the students is, even if it's not entirely true. So I think it's dangerous in terms of both inspiring small factions of hate within the group that's actually being talked to, and dangerous in terms of warping public image.

Person A: Mm-hmm. Okay. I see your point, I see your point. But honestly, I don't know, I just feel like if the people were more open-minded about the topics that were discussed, I feel like all of this could be mediated. But there are very opposite ends of the spectrum of people out there. So I think that's what creates the problem. Do you know what I mean?

Person B: There are people at the opposite ends of the spectrum?

Person A: One side is very liberal, and the other side would be very conservative. And if you see the protests and stuff, it oftentimes isn't really the students doing it. It's people who aren't even part of the campus inciting the protests. So I feel like they're the very closed-minded ones and -- I don't know. I don’t know.

Person B: Mm-hmm. Yeah, I agree with the general notion that on a college campus you should aim to be more open-minded and try to have thoughtful discussion and that whatever outside groups that are coming in with a direct opposition, especially angling towards violence, I can see how that's -- or I agree from the get go that's just bad in general. I think open discussion in general would be good. I'm all for having conservative speakers that come and play by the rules and will have some type of informative debate and stuff like that. And I think that would be important, which is kind of sad why there isn't that already.

Person A: Yeah, yeah.

Person B: Yeah, I think that type of thing in general is what allows something like this to happen. Because if there is a vacuum then people can push the desperation to say that, “This is our option.” I don't -- it's not like we're given the option as students to have a conservative speaker who just will talk normally, even if it's not a debate, and just give a debate or give a speech as just any other leftist speaker would. Because it's not like we have an option to choose those directly. It's more like those speakers that were mentioned to us in this study are particularly inflammatory. If you Google them, the thing they're known for is creating chaos. So I think that's just not particularly helpful in a community that's supposed to iron that out.

Person A: Mm-hmm. Mm-hmm. Yeah. Honestly, personally though, I just find their topics of discussion very interesting. I just enjoy listening to what they have to say. It's not even about being open-minded. I just think – I don’t know, I love the way they talk and present themselves. I think they're very good and manipulative. So I think it's pretty interesting.

Person B: Sure, sure. And I think it's fascinating too, the fact that they can do that and they have the ability to. But I just don't think that necessitates having a platform that's funded by public money in replacement of other things that should be going towards education, that we as students and we as California taxpayers pay for. They can have their own blog where they can have their own speeches that are private, and those will get shared around, as they already have, incredibly well, especially if it's inflammatory.

Person A: Mm-hmm. So which speakers would you want Berkeley to invite over to talk? Like what kind of people?

Person B: What kind of people?

Person A: Yeah. Instead of very extreme controversial speakers, would you just rather them not come at all to Berkeley?

Person B: Like those ones specifically [in the prompt], or controversial speakers in general?

Person A: Speakers like Milo. Very controversial, yeah.

Person B: If Milo were to come on campus on a private invitation that didn't require any public funding whatsoever, I wouldn't have a problem with it. But I think the fact that it just costs us money and changes the whole campus is the difficulty. If it was a conservative speaker that didn't come with all of that baggage, I also wouldn't have a problem with it. But I think one of the issues is also that's not something -- I couldn't even name one of those people because that type of thing doesn't get as much attention as provocateur type of advertising. So I think that's another problem in general. I think people like Milo are smart in that they realize that there's that vacuum that's there, and they're taking advantage of it, and I think the wrong thing to do is to give into the exact button that he's pushing. I think it's worth addressing by addressing the weakness that we have inherently, rather than following through his lead.

Person A: Mm-hmm. Mm-hmm. Yeah. I think your side's pretty interesting, pretty good. Like your points are -- I agree with them. I don't disagree.

Person B: Oh, well, thank you. I'm glad we can come to some form of agreement. Let's see. I'm wondering if there's any other parts of this. One thing I think is really interesting with Milo, particularly, is his book sales went up like 2000 percent. Or that's just the number that I'm carrying in my head, but whatever amount that it actually went up, they skyrocketed right after he came to our campus. Which I think is including -- and that was at the same time as when he left -- or when, I don't know if he made them right after or they resurfaced, but they were pedophilic remarks that were pretty horrible. And yet his sales were still going up, and that's direct monetary profit which is disappointing to say the least. So I think that's why I see stuff like what we're talking about and find it kind of disheartening, personally.

Person A: Mm-hmm. Yeah. I don't know. I don’t have much more to say on this topic to be honest. Is there anything else you want to talk about?

Person B: I don't know. I don't know how much more time we have. One thing that I think is interesting actually --

**[Experimenter says time is up.]**

Person B: Okay. Never mind. Well, good talking with you.

Person A: You too.
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Person A: Okay.

Person B: So do you want to start?

Person A: Yeah. Sure. So I guess the question is do you support or oppose legalizing drugs in the U.S. And so I said that I oppose legalizing drugs in the U.S. And, if you want, we can go point by point. Do you want to do that?

Person B: Sure. I also said that I oppose it.

Person A: Really?

Person B: Yeah so I don’t know how we’re going to debate this. Should we ask [the experimenter]?

Person A: I don’t know either.

Person B: Maybe we should tell them.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: We both said we’re going to oppose. Unless I did something wrong. Maybe I misunderstood this.

Person A: Or unless I did something wrong.

Person B: Yeah. Do you remember putting negative or positive [on the scale]?

Person A: I’m pretty sure I should’ve put negative. I could be wrong too though.

Person B: But you think you did put negative?

Person A: I think I did.

Person B: Okay, I also think I put negative.

Person A: The other thing they could have us do is we could just go over our points still.

Person B: Yeah, we could just still do that.

Person A: Did [the experimenter] say anything?

Person B: [The experimenter is] coming to you.

Person A: Okay my B. Apparently I accidentally put yeah.

Person B: No worries.

Person A: But they said that we could still go over and have a discussion on the points that we have. So do you want to start then with one of your points and we can go back and forth?

Person B: Mm-hmm. Sure. Yeah, yeah. So I thought that -- the main point that I had was that I thought that it should be not legal because it's dangerous. That's really my overarching point. And specifically I think that the United States is a highly regulated country. It's definitely a developed country with an influential government that dictates laws that overall are pretty respected, differently from maybe some developing countries. And I think that whenever the government says it's legal or illegal, it's a sign for what we think is safe or unsafe, good or bad, as a society. And so I think that legalizing drugs will give the wrong idea that drugs are -- that the government thinks that the drugs are safe to use, while this is, in my opinion, not true. I think that they're very dangerous. And while it's true that some drugs are legal, for example, alcohol, I don't think that that should be a point for then all other drugs also to be legal. I think that it should be as illegal as possible.

Person A: Yeah, I definitely agree with you on that. I think that was also my overarching argument, though actually my bigger point was that if you legalize drugs that means more people can get it because more people will have access to it. And then I was kind of expecting people to say, or my opponent to say like, "Oh, but they'll still go behind people's backs and there are still illegal transactions going on between them." Right? I was kind of expecting them to rebuttal with this. But then I also thought about, you have an age limit on alcohol. There's always an age limit on at what age you can buy alcohol at. And then I was just thinking about the effect that that was having on that, because essentially by having a law preventing you from actually buying drugs, by having that, there are restrictions just like this age restriction for alcohol. And I said even though it's not completely effective, it's still effective to some degree. Because people don't want to spend money to get a fake driver's license, or they're scared of getting caught illegally, being sent to the police, getting into jail. And also some people just don't have the money to buy things illegally because they're super expensive, right? Also not being able to even get it if you don't have the connections to begin with. So that was kind of my rebuttal to what they would have said about the fact that people are still trading or exchanging money for drugs behind our backs.

Person B: Yeah, I agree one hundred percent. It's both the fact that they would be scared of the consequences because it's illegal, so being punished, and also the fact that it's harder to get if it's illegal. And as well as I think the signaling itself that I was mentioning earlier, by making it illegal, you signal that you shouldn't do it and probably influence behavior that way. So I think all three points are valid.

Person A: Mm-hmm. And then another one of my points actually was kind of on the topic of overdosing. Obviously, most people would say there are a lot of deaths that happen because of overdosing, a lot of medical accidents and all of that. But one of my points was actually the fact that with people overdosing, you would actually fill up more hospitals and you would be taking away those spaces that could really go to someone who's actually having a real emergency.

Person B: Mm, what do you mean? Because that's also a real emergency.

Person A: Yeah, no, but I mean it's an emergency that they can prevent if they don't actually overdose on drugs, which I know is really hard once you start. But I feel like when you start taking drugs it's more of a choice, versus someone who's having maybe a heart attack at that moment or obviously they don't choose to have that kind of medical emergency. So then I was kind of just thinking about it in terms of well, if you're overdosing, that was kind of your choice to begin with. But you could be taking away a bed from someone who did not choose to have a medical condition when you could have prevented it from happening in the first place. I don't know if that makes sense, but --

Person B: Yeah, yeah. Of course, it makes sense. It's filling up spaces in the hospital when you don't need to. I think that I agree with that point, but I think that one who disagrees with this policy could say that -- I don't know, I was reading earlier, it said that in Portugal cases of overdoses decreased. Yeah that's what it said when we were reading the question [in the prompt]. It said that in Portugal they made it legal -- I think it was Portugal. And the cases of overdoses decreased because of that. I mean, I can see that it's a possibility, but I also think that it's still a risk and it's still possible that the number of overdoses increases, which will bring about everything you just said, which is a very serious issue. And on top of that, I also think that as of right now with drugs being illegal, the people who are subject to this risk and this problem of overdose are usually people who already are having other problems with the law. People who maybe are homeless, criminals, or people that are not the normal abiding citizens. Whereas if you make them legal, I think that these problems of overdose could become more prominent amongst, for example, students and even young students who are doing it not to escape society or escape their problems but just as an experiment and they just do it too much. And we're all familiar with the problems caused by alcohol and overdosing on alcohol -- imagine if it was just as easy and as feasible to overdose on cocaine or heroin. That would create huge problems amongst the youth that we would have to deal with.

Person A: Mm-hmm. Yeah, I mean I was definitely thinking about my future children. I wouldn't want them to go through something like that.

Person B: Right, exactly. I think you would have repercussions both in economic terms, like having to deal with overdoses, and also having to deal with educating the youth at not abusing all these drugs. Everything is basically -- all the costs that alcohol has, it would be times ten, if you let all drugs be legal. But also I think it would have repercussions under a social lens because I think that the interactions between people, once more people have access to acid and all this stuff on a regular basis, will change substantially the way that people interact. Which I don't know if it’s something that we want.

Person A: Right. Right. I'm just wondering how you would rebuttal that argument though, because you know how you mentioned about Portugal, and how it was actually in the news -- because that's pretty solid evidence right there. So then I was just wondering, I don't know, how I would go about countering that point because while what we say, I think, at least in our opinions, obviously makes sense, there's no solid evidence for what we're supporting.

Person B: Mm-hmm. Well, we don’t know if there is no solid evidence. We were just presented with that specific one evidence about the case in Portugal, and we also didn't get a chance to explore exactly what it said and how the research was carried out.

Person A: Right, right.

Person B: But taking that as true, let's say, and solid evidence, I think that there's still a point to be made that the United States and Portugal are not the same thing. And so for example, whereas some countries -- like I come from Southern Europe and where I'm from, you can get access to alcohol at clubs or bars when you're 16 years old. And then in the U.S., you can't. And while different people have different opinions on lowering the legal age for drinking, it is still true that the way people deal with alcohol here is different than the way that they deal with it in Southern Europe just because of the cultural factor.

Person A: Right. Right.

Person B: And so, I think that one rebuttal that you could have on that piece of news is exactly this, is that the fact that it worked out in Portugal doesn't mean that it would work out in the United States.

Person A: Mm-hmm. Mm-hmm. Yeah, that's definitely a good point. That obviously culture affects the way that people look at things. And in the case of America right now, it's just that there are illegal drugs. So obviously, there are plenty of people who do this, so people do approve of it.

**[Experimenter says time is up.]**

Person B: All right, well it was good talking to you.

Person A: Yeah, it was good talking to you too.

Person B: Bye.

Person A: Bye.
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Person A: Okay so I'm assuming that you put that drugs should be not legal?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Okay, so why do you think that?

Person B: I think they're of a more addictive nature. A lot of people, they try it and then their lives kind of spiral downwards. People try to exercise self-control but a lot of times that doesn't work and it just ends up kind of taking your life. So I don't know. I feel like generally it should be not legal, but I do think under certain circumstances, like medical reasons or other nonmedical reasons that are approved, you should have access. But I don't know. This is just what I think.

Person A: Mm-hmm. Yeah, yeah. Okay. So I thought that drugs should be legalized and I think that's because I think that, if you do legalize them, there are going to be more ways to be educated with them. And so, no one's teaching you like, “Oh, this is how you shoot heroin,” but if you do legalize them, because there's more education, it would be safer. And then also it would be, I believe, easier to do research about drugs and the benefits of different types of drugs and also how to counteract if someone overdoses. There'll be better ways -- research better ways to counteract those overdoses. And then I would also think probably less people in jail. Because I know a lot of people go to jail for drug abuse, but if they were legal, they would be sent to a rehabilitation program or something like that. And yeah, that's why. I don't know.

Person B: That makes sense. Yeah.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: I don’t know. Oh well.

Person A: Yeah, this is like -- well it was really fast. I have nothing else to say.

Person B: Yeah, but California is one of the more free states, I guess, legally. Marijuana has been legal, so that's been a big thing.

Person A: Yeah. I think for me though, just personal experience, I've had one of my -- I knew someone that died. Well, I'm from Texas so a lot of things are not legal there, but I think he was rolling or something and he drowned because he couldn't function to not drown basically. And I feel like if it was legalized, maybe there would have been a better way. And also, I know a lot of my friends who go to raves and stuff -- there’s always the chance of buying a roll that's laced with something and that could really mess you up.

Person B: Well that's true, yeah.

Person A: Yeah. So if it's legalized, it'd be easier to buy testing kits and things that. It would just be generally safer and probably more expensive too. But I think that's something you have to sacrifice just to be safer about it.

Person B: Mm-hmm. That's true.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: I feel like drugs are so prevalent around Berkeley, it doesn't matter that much whether it’s legal or not because it’s already here.

Person A: Yeah, I think so too. But it's interesting because, here in California, marijuana is legalized, and so my boyfriend, he was visiting me from Houston and he was coming up and he was like, “Oh, can you get us marijuana?” I was like, “Yeah, you can just literally buy it anywhere. You just have to be 21 or just buy it from friends and stuff. It's not a big deal.” And he was so shook because it's a big deal in Houston. But here it's such a normal thing.

Person B: Yeah, I think everyone just talks about it casually.

Person A: Yeah, I know.

Person B: Interesting, all righty. Hmm.

Person A: So do you have any plans for the rest of the day?

Person B: I just try to finish work and then sleep. I’ve been super exhausted lately. Yeah, because I’m a senior so I have to find jobs.

Person A: You’re a senior. Oh my God.

Person B: Yeah, I have to recruit for jobs. I need a job next year when I graduate so -- it’s hard because I feel like everything in Berkeley is so competitive and --

Person A: Yeah. Yeah, are you from the area?

Person B: I’m not actually, but just coming to Berkeley, the fact that I thought that after you get in it’s going to be okay, but we apply for clubs even.

Person A: Oh my God, yeah.

Person B: It’s like, “Uh, what is this?”

Person A: Did you see that meme on Facebook? It was -- oh, sorry.

Person B: The baking DeCal [student-run course]?

Person A: No, not that one. It was another one. It was a club rejection email. It was like “Oh sorry, we’ve had a really competitive pool of applicants.”

Person B: Oh.

Person A: Do you know what I’m talking about?

Person B: Yeah, I saw that one too. Yeah, yeah, yeah. I saw it. It was hilarious. That’s true though.

Person A: It was so true.

Person B: Oh my God actually, yeah. I was so shook when I came here and clubs require two to three rounds of interview. As a freshman I was just like, “Excuse you, are you Goldman or Google?”

Person A: Yeah, exactly, it’s ridiculous. You have to go to the little info sessions and stuff, and then on top of that it’s like, “Oh we’re also going to interview you.” It’s like rushing a frat basically, but professionally.

Person B: Actually yeah.

Person A: What are you majoring in?

Person B: I’m an Econ and Haas [Business School] double. What about you?

Person A: Oh. I’m -- what am I doing? Oh, I’m intended data science.

Person B: Oh, perfect.

Person A: Yeah. I just switched over, but I have a career fair at six o’clock after this, or an info session. And I was pre-med before this and so this is my first time doing recruiting stuff, and I’m so nervous and I have no idea what to do.

Person B: Wait, what firm is this? Or is this a general career forum?

Person A: No, it’s not. It’s for, I want to say Deloitte?

Person B: Oh, Deloitte Consulting?

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: That’s the one at I-House [residence hall], right? I might go to that one.

Person A: Yeah, it is. You should go.

Person B: Oh my God.

Person A: Yeah, it’s that one. It’s at I-House and then there’s also the career fair on Wednesday. It’s the Cal career fair on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday?

Person B: RSF [Recreational Sports Facility, the Cal gym]?

Person A: Yeah, the RSF one.

Person B: Oh, it’s this week? Oh shit, oh my God.

Person A: There’s so much. And I’m like Jesus Christ. I was literally buying professional or business casual clothes at H&M before this. It was so tiring.

Person B: Oh my God. Yeah. Dude, I totally would have done data science if I had time, because I came in in 2015. They didn’t have anything like data science.

Person A: Oh. Oh, yeah.

Person B: I think they started it Spring 2018? Or something -- I don’t know. It was too late. I’m too old.

Person A: Mm-hmm. Oh, it’s okay. At least you have the Haas [Business School], I know Haas is really hard to get into too. That’s what I heard.

Person B: Yeah, I feel like it’s not as useful because the stuff isn’t really hard or anything. It’s easier to pick up. So I came in wanting to do CS [Computer Science] and Haas but then CS was wild. I took two CS classes my freshman year and then -- without having had any sort of CS experience. I was just like, thrown in the deep end. It was just not a very good experience.

Person A: Yeah, I feel that. I’m a sophomore this year, and so last year I took all my pre-med classes and I hated it. I didn’t like the people because I feel like pre-meds are snake-y honestly. People joke about Haas being snake-y. I feel like pre-meds fuck you over for their own GPA.

Person B: Oh shit.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Dude, that’s wild. Yeah, I heard the three snakiest populations on campus are probably one, pre-law, two, pre-med, and three, pre-Haas, or Haas. But --

Person A: Yeah. It’s okay. But yeah, I took them and then my second semester I was like, “Oh man, I don’t even like the classes I’m taking. I don’t even think I could do this for the next ten years of my life.” So I just was like, “You know what? Data science just came out so this would be an ideal major.” Because it’s uncapped.

Person B: It’s uncapped?

Person A: Yeah. You just need a 2.0. A 2.0 GPA in three classes or something to be able to declare. That’s the GPA requirement.

Person B: Wait, oh my God. No, CS wanted a 3.3. I’m just like -- I could do it, but it’ll probably be a struggle.

Person A: Yeah, I would die. Yeah, no, data science right now is a 2.0 because it’s just a new major that no one’s really in it so I was just like, “You know, this is ideal because there’s no chance of my GPA not being able to do this,” like a 2.0.

Person B: No, yeah. You came at a good time. I came at an unfortunate time. But yep, yep.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: That’s tough, Berkeley’s tough.

Person A: It is. It’s definitely harder than I expected because I thought it would be like, “Okay, the hard part was getting in and now I’ll be happy. I’ll be a happy college student.” But then I got in and I was like, “Oh my God, this is worse than high school.”

Person B: Actually yeah. Because a lot of my friends are considering grad school and the fact that Berkeley has grade deflation in every class – well not every, but most of the classes are graded on a curve. It just hurts your application overall. What good does this do to professors who are grading students on a curve? Like what do they get? It just hurts us, I feel like. Recruiting-wise too, because some companies ask for your GPA or they have a GPA cap, so yeah.

Person A: Oh, oh I know what you mean. Okay, yeah. It’s ridiculous. Doesn’t Berkeley have grade deflation though, or?

Person B: It does.

Person A: Yeah, so it’s like -- yeah, exactly. What good is a professor gaining? No one is paying you more if your class has a lower GPA. They should be paying you less because you’re a bad teacher then.

Person B: I know. When grad schools look at an application for someone from Berkeley with a 3.6 and someone from Stanford with a 3.9 it’s just --

Person A: Yeah, it’s so much better. I think med school too. When I got here I thought that going to Berkeley would be like, med schools would be like, “Oh, they went to Berkeley.” They’re a little more lenient. But then second semester I did my research, and med schools don’t care. It’s just GPA. They’re like, “Oh, if you have a 3.6 at Berkeley versus a 3.9 at Stanford obviously some person from Stanford’s going to get in,” and they don’t care where you went. And I was like, “Jesus Christ.”

Person B: Yeah, no, yeah. Ugh. Sad life. It’s fine. I’ll be done in a year.

Person A: Yeah. You’re almost done. Holy crap. All my friends are seniors too and I’m like, “This is so sad, they’re all leaving me.” And like, “why would you do this to me?”

Person B: Oh, are you a junior?

Person A: No I’m a second year but a lot of my friends, I met them through AAA [Asian American Association] and stuff so they’re all -- a lot of my closest friends are seniors and so when they graduate next year I’m like, “I’m going to have no friends.”

Person B: Oh, oh no. That’s -- oh my God. I was just at the AAA info session.

Person A: Oh, are you going to join?

Person B: I might. I might not, I don’t know. You don’t have to become part of a family, right? Is that a requirement?

Person A: You do, but the family is no commitment. They’re just like, “Hey, we’re going to have this event or this party and then you can come if you want. You don’t have to go or anything.” That’s what I think it is. If you’re going to do a committee that’s more commitment. Every week you have to do a meeting and you fundraise for the club as well, but committees are cool. I mean, when I did it last semester there were only three families and the families were huge. They were forty, fifty people each. And so this semester they did a better job and made the families smaller and so its I think only 6 families, or more – they made the families smaller so there’s more families but less people in each family. And so you probably get to know people better that way. So yeah, last semester every party they threw, like the first little parties were frickin ragers because there were just so many people that are invited. So it’s just ridiculous. But it’s a fun club for low commitment anything. It’s not a lot of commitment.

Person B: Mm, yeah. That’s true. Is it mostly social and parties and stuff?

**[Experimenter says time is up.]**

Person A: Yeah. Oh.

Person B: Oh, okay. All righty.

Person A: Bye.

Person B: Bye.

Person A: Do we hang up?

Person B: Yep.

Person A: Okay.
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Person A: Did you want to begin?

Person B: Sure.

Person A: All right.

Person B: Basically, my stance is that we should not legalize drugs because I don't think legalizing drugs would solve the underlying problems causing epidemics of addiction. I think certainly with drugs like marijuana or LSD or drugs where their effect is minimal or their effect is not as bad as the enforcement actions are, I think those kinds of drugs it would make sense to legalize. But drugs like heroin, methamphetamines, oxycodone pills, I don't think legalizing them would solve the underlying problems. Like the heroin epidemic, a large contributor to that was over prescription of opioids by doctors and pharmaceutical companies pushing opioid prescription for illnesses that wouldn't really be helped by opioids. And methamphetamines and oxycodone is usually an epidemic in rural areas that used to be in the former manufacturing belt and that's caused by poverty and economic anxiety. So I don't think legalizing those types of drugs would really help anyone.

Person A: Yeah, I totally agree actually that it doesn't necessarily solve the underlying problems of addiction and also I totally agree that the underlying causes do include a lot of the things that you just listed. My perspective I guess is that the goal is not necessarily to solve addiction and completely solve the opioid epidemic because I think that that's a really complicated issue and there's a lot of different realms that we need to work in to make that happen. But it's about a few things, first of which I think would be harm reduction. And I think that there's multiple ways to go about reducing the number of people that overdose on these kinds of drugs that would get into scary situations because they're under the influence of these kinds of drugs. But I think that this is one option of doing so and that to legalize these drugs would make it easier for people or less frightening for people to seek help. It would also potentially -- ideally there would be a lot of money that could go out of the incarceration system, which I just think is colossally unjust and oppressive and ultimately shouldn't exist at all. And I mean, I think that we shouldn't have prisons, but if there are going to be them, I think that to divert people from that system would be -- as many people as we possibly can -- would be positive. I also think that legalizing a lot of these drugs would potentially have the effect of, you know, prosecuting less people of color and incarcerating less people of color, which is, I mean drug prosecution is just a weapon of oppression against these communities. And I think that if we were to eliminate that -- and then there's also the fact that these drugs would be ideally more regulated and safer and potentially less -- obviously they're not going to be, they're not -- ideally no one would be using these hard drugs, but if they are going to be, which -- we're not going to stop everyone from using anytime soon, so to accept the fact that they're going to be and to make sure that they're doing it in the safest way possible, I think is a good idea.

Person B: Okay. I definitely understand where you're coming from. I think I should clarify my position. I don't think that drug users should be prosecuted. My opinion is that only people who provide drugs or traffic drugs should be prosecuted. I think you're definitely right. Prosecution for drug offenses like possession is definitely a tool that is used against minorities and the poor. And I think that is something we should eliminate, prosecuting just a drug user as long as you're not distributing. And I definitely understand what you're talking about -- harm reduction, more regulated and safe. So I can see that we could get these same benefits by not prosecuting drug users, but if we still made distributing and trafficking drugs illegal, I think it would also help to control the supply available that is for use. So I think my stance is sort of a mix of your stance and a complete illegalization of all drug users and drug suppliers.

Person A: Mm-hmm. Yeah. That's cool that we're on the same page about that and I actually -- that doesn't surprise me that you think that, from the first things that you had initially said. I just wasn't clear on exactly where you stood on that.

Person B: Yeah, I agree with a lot of what you're saying.

Person A: Yeah. Yeah. And then actually the last -- I didn't quite catch the last thing you said about -- as far as the supply. Could you repeat that possibly?

Person B: Oh, I meant for heroin, I think the heroin supply is more to do with doctors overprescribing opioids and Pharma pushing for opioids. But with things like methamphetamines and oxycodone, these methamphetamines are a rural problem. It's manufactured at home in mostly rural areas. So if you still prosecuted the manufacturers of methamphetamines, the poor people that are preyed on by the suppliers, I think they would get some benefit if you prosecuted the suppliers. And things like oxycodone pills, which are pushed by especially a lot of rural doctors, especially in Florida, who provide oxy and other pills in large quantities to suppliers who then go out to rural communities and push pills onto the poor and the rural communities. If you prosecuted the suppliers and the doctors providing those pills, I think it would reduce the supply of drugs in the market and I think it would be ultimately more beneficial.

Person A: Mm-hmm. Yeah, I totally understand that. I guess what's interesting is the way -- and I guess the regulations that would come with this legalization are kind of unknown to us. We're just talking about broad legalization and I think there's definitely some incarnations of that that I would think are problematic and I would hope that -- and it's complicated, so that's why I do have semi-mixed feelings about this issue because I think that setting up the rules for a country in which these drugs are legal could be complicated. Ideally it would -- I don't really know what this would look like and maybe this is kind of idealistic -- but the preying upon populations who are susceptible to this kind of addiction in rural areas, like you're saying, would somehow be regulated. I'm not exactly -- that's the thing, I'm not exactly sure what that would look like.

Person B: I guess like the marijuana industry? It would be legit dispensaries.

Person A: Mm-hmm. Yeah, yeah, exactly. Yeah, that's what I'm imagining as well and that's why I'm imagining the supply would be cleaner and people would only be taking what they have signed up to take and that these spaces would be safer as well. They'd be connected to harm reduction facilities and there would be safe rooms for people too, injection rooms, which I know exist in other countries. The thing though is that those things can and should exist, just without legalization. That’s another alternative that I would be open to. I don’t know what -- I think that actually is more likely and also perhaps more what would be my ideal situation is just that -- services to help people who are using would just be -- and like the other thing is that I noticed on one of the -- I think it was in the survey we just took -- they were saying it would take a lot of money that goes into the prison system and have it be allotted to go more into social services and whatnot. And I'm supportive of that, but the likelihood of that happening, I don't know how realistic that really is. So I mean ultimately what I support I think is just the increased safety of users. And I don't know, I do have complicated feelings about this. My thing that I -- on the scale -- that I put wasn't at the end extreme for either one of the two questions.

Person B: Mm. Yeah, I think what you're talking about exists in Canada and some European countries.

Person A: Yeah. Australia.

Person B: They seem to be doing a lot better with dealing with addiction, opioid epidemic and things like that. Better than the U.S. at least. So I definitely know what you're talking about. It makes sense.

Person A: Yeah. Yeah. Did you have anything else that -- is there anything that we haven't -- I'm trying to think if I had any questions. Things I haven’t added. It's interesting because also I think that, in my mind, it’s hard for me to -- if there's an opportunity to incarcerate less people in general, I'm generally for -- and deal with that population in a different way and a more helpful way -- I’m definitely more drawn to it. So I think that this issue is very linked in my mind to -- oh, they're saying something.

**[Experimenter says time is up.]**

Person B: Okay, they’re telling us to finish.

Person A: Yeah. Yeah. That was -- I didn't catch that last part, but it was nice talking to you.

Person B: It was nice talking to you.

Person A: Bye.

Person B: Bye.
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Person A: Hi.

Person B: Hi.

Person A: Okay, so I have a very strong opinion on this.

Person B: Uh-huh. Okay, you go first.

Person A: Okay. Do you want me to list all my arguments or just go one by one?

Person B: Yeah. You can list all your arguments, yeah sure.

Person A: Okay. So I feel that structural inequalities in our society lead to disadvantages, and one way that people escape from the realities of those disadvantages and the hardships is by using drugs. And the paradox of that is that the vast majority of incarcerated nonviolent drug offenders are minorities, and white offenders are often either let off the hook or given more minor sentences, such as community service or less jail time. So it's almost a double disadvantage for minorities where they're probably often more likely to use drugs as an escape from the structural inequalities and xenophobia and racism and things like that. But then they're actually given more jail time, and legalization I feel would level the playing field and create more equality. The other thing is that when people are jailed, they take up really precious space in our already overcrowded prison system in America when they could be helped instead. Just because we have such a big problem with prison overcrowding and it's really expensive to keep prisoners who like -- a lot of them are just jailed for marijuana possession when that space could be used for people who truly need to be jailed. And then my last point -- sorry I have so many points.

Person B: No worries. It’s okay, go.

Person A: So people are still going to use drugs, but black market drugs are more dangerous. So legalization would create a market for drugs that are -- they would maybe be more readily accessible, but they'll also be safer. So fewer people would probably be dying of drugs that are laced with other more deadly drugs, as well as synthetic drugs that are sold as real drugs.

Person B: Mm-hmm. Right.

Person A: Okay. That’s all.

Person B: Okay. Thank you for that.

Person A: Sorry.

Person B: So in contrast, so for me, I don't really have a very strong opinion about this one because first, I'm not really from the U.S. so I’m an international student here. So yeah, I’m just learning things. This is my first year, so I’m just learning things here at Cal, like in the U.S. basically. So.

Person A: Where are you from?

Person B: Well I'm originally from the Philippines.

Person A: Oh, what's your policy in the Philippines in terms of how does it work there with drug offenses?

Person B: Well currently, the current administration is really against drugs, so it's really a big issue that he has a lot of propaganda or -- they're doing a lot of killings towards the people that do drugs.

Person A: Wow.

Person B: Yeah. It's a big issue, because sometimes it's not really that just -- because you do it in kind of a wrong way. They just can kill a random person holding -- if they have an intel that the person has drugs. Yeah, it's a big issue there right now.

Person A: Oh my God.

Person B: Yeah. But I think in the U.S. it’s -- yeah, I know that here in California it's legalized.

Person A: Well, some drugs.

Person B: Yeah, some drugs. Yeah, but in the Philippines it's a total no-no. Right. So yeah, I think here you can -- I support only to legalize certain drugs. Yeah. I don't have a very strong opinion about that. So, yeah. Because some have certain benefits, especially if medicinal.

Person A: I support legalizing all drugs personally because -- I mean okay, I don't know if I’d legalize like, meth or heroin. But things like LSD, MDMA, even cocaine they’re -- I think it's difficult to say, but I'm definitely on the side of legalization, because of the effects of incarceration, especially on minority communities and how minority communities are targeted. Whereas white communities are generally just like, “Oh, you need help.” But the viewpoint that I just gave you and all the arguments I gave you are more common in progressive cities like Berkeley and California -- states like California and Massachusetts where people are more liberal. And there are clinics that are called needle exchanges which actually distribute clean needles to people who inject drugs on the streets rather than letting them use dirty needles. So it's not supposed to be approving of drug use, but rather it's allowing people to get clean needles so they don't get hepatitis or HIV. And it's just more of an approach to like, “This person is addicted and we're going to help them” rather than criminalize it. And also they have -- I forget what it's called, but the drug that reverses overdoses, a lot of clinics just distribute that.

Person B: Mm-hmm. Right.

Person A: Like they give it to the public.

Person B: Because I think I remember there’s somewhere in Colorado that -- I think most of Colorado approves selling of drugs, legalized drugs, but there's only a certain part of it -- I think one town that doesn’t legalize selling of it, but using it is okay. So I think a lot of people just buy from other towns and just use it in their town instead. So it doesn't make any difference.

Person A: Well I think you're talking about just marijuana. So there's been a push to legalize marijuana. It's legal in California now too. But basically, all other drugs are illegal. But what's frustrating is -- I don’t know -- alcohol is more dangerous than marijuana in terms of like, you can't overdose on weed, but you can get alcohol poisoning, you can die. And just -- ugh. The government has these strong principles that drug use is bad and that was propagated a few decades ago with -- certain presidents were tough on crime, tough on drugs. And I think the Bush administration was really tough on drugs -- like zero tolerance. So that mindset has kind of stuck around.

Person B: Mm-hmm. So for you, what would be the best thing to do?

Person A: I think we should -- this is really radical, but I think we should legalize most drugs because -- I’m saying -- okay, so there's a drug called fentanyl that's used usually for anesthesia and more than a tiny pinch of it will kill you. And a lot of times heroin is cut with fentanyl, so drug dealers will put a little bit of fentanyl in it. Sometimes they don't even know there's fentanyl in it and people will die thinking they're taking heroin when they're actually -- there's some fentanyl in it and they die, and that's become a big problem lately. And so that's what I was saying about the black market drugs, like if it were legalized people would be buying pure heroin, they wouldn't be -- they’d know what they were getting. And I know that sounds really radical, that people can just go and buy heroin, but I think you'd have -- it’s more like, not that people could go buy it, just that they wouldn't be criminalized for -- I don't think it should be sold at like any kind of store.

Person B: Mm-hmm. There will be certain limits like, “Yeah, I can only buy this much?”

Person A: Well I don’t think it should be sold, but just that if a police officer catches someone with some heroin and a needle, they won't be sent to jail, they'll be sent to a rehab.

Person B: Oh yeah, right.

Person A: I think that's how it should be.

Person B: But currently here in the U.S., in most states, the only legal drug is marijuana?

Person A: Marijuana is only legal in like ten states. So most drugs -- the only drug that's legal in the entire country is alcohol and in most states.

Person B: Marijuana you mean?

Person A: No, alcohol. Alcohol is the only drug that's actually legal in all. But marijuana is only legal in ten states? I don't know.

Person B: Oh, okay. But how has legalizing marijuana has affected here in California? Or maybe around Berkeley or Cal?

Person A: I think it's helped the economy. I've definitely seen a bunch of dispensaries, which is where they sell marijuana, pop up. There are three within walking distance of my house.

Person B: Okay.

Person A: But you have to be 21 or you have to have a doctor's note, like a medical marijuana card that tells you that you can use it for medical use. And that you have to be, I think, between 18 and 21 for. So most dispensaries only serve people who are over 21, because that's the legal age you can use it. And you can only buy a certain amount and you can only grow a certain amount in your home if you want to grow it. So it's very regulated and people still -- most of my friends who are 21 just buy it from drug dealers anyway. They don't buy it from dispensaries just because it's more expensive in dispensaries, but -- not actually most -- some people. Some people still buy it from dispensaries, some people buy it from the street. But I think it's definitely helped the economy. It's helped people who have medical conditions be able to more readily access it, but I don't think it's done too much damage because it's a relatively harmless drug.

Person B: Well I think it's approved for recreational purposes as well, right? And not just for medicinal medication purposes?

Person A: Yeah. It’s approved for medication purposes in a lot more states. But then I think it's about ten states that approve it for recreational and medical. Yeah.

Person B: Mm-hmm. Interesting. So yeah, I'm learning a lot from you.

Person A: There's also something called classes of drugs. So it's like, class one, class two, class three. Class one is considered -- by the US government -- class one is considered the most dangerous and is said to have no medical properties, and marijuana is in that list. So it's one of the most heavily criminalized, and considered the most dangerous. Even though people know it's not that dangerous, for some reason, law-makers haven't moved it to the other category. So there's kind of a misconception about marijuana as being this scary drug. But I think we need more education also. I think that would help. About how marijuana is not that bad, but alcohol is actually more dangerous and it's legal.

Person B: Mm-hmm. Oh, do you have any idea what made the government of some states come to like --

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Oh, well it's called “tough on crime.” It was a couple of presidents including Ronald Reagan that decided they wanted to be really hard on drugs. Yeah.

Person B: Mm-hmm. Alright, sorry I wasn’t able -- I wanted to ask you something else, but yeah. Thank you.

Person A: You can ask me later probably. Nice to meet you.

Person B: Nice to meet you, bye.
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Person A: Yeah, do you want to go first?

Person B: Do you want me to go first?

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Okay, first I think that drugs shouldn't be legalized in the U.S. because one, I think that people can't handle this freedom and legalizing it in all of the states will likely result in a lot of people getting addicted to drugs. And it's especially true with some of the more hard drugs such as LSD or something of that sort where people would likely get addicted to those drugs if they were much more accessible. Other than that, I believe that it will lead to more experimentation in general. If the whole stigma or the taboo around drugs are removed, I think it will lead to a lot more experimentation with hard drugs. And I think that could be a problem, because it will result in sort of a mass addiction of people across the country. Yeah, do you want to add anything right now to this?

Person A: So yeah. I kind of agree, I guess, with parts of that, because opposing -- yeah, because if you do legalize it, there could be a mass opposition to it. But then for this question I kind of believed in -- I guess even though there is an oppose and support kind of situation for me, I answered that I would go with supporting legalizing drugs in the need of -- I was thinking like those individuals that do need certain drugs for medical reasons and stuff like that. Sometimes for epilepsy, they have to use different drugs to help them. So then, I was thinking even though that there isn't a big population of those that require drugs for medical reason, if we oppose legalizing drugs completely, we shouldn't punish those that really do need it.

Person B: I get your point, but at the same time, I think there's also this concept of medical cards that are issued to people who actually need the drugs. And I think that a lot of the people who actually have issue with epilepsy and issues with coping with anxiety and stuff with marijuana. I think they have medical cards, right? I'm not too sure about it.

Person A: Yeah. I'm not sure how that works, but yeah. I understand what you're saying. But also there's also the point of alcohol. I don't know if that classifies as a drug and stuff, because you know how in that situation, how some people -- because it is, I guess, in the term legalized so everyone can have it. And then there are people that overuse it, and you know how they can't control it. But then there are also people that can handle it and stuff like that. So then in that case, even if we do legalize drugs, I mean it is bad because then people can take advantage of that. But then on a wide stance, maybe it could kind of be like alcohol where it kind of becomes the norm, maybe. And then while some people do take advantage of that and then utilize that in bad ways, I don't think that the majority, hopefully, has it in a bad way, I guess. But I do understand that that's also bad.

Person B: No, no, I get your point when you say that we could likely make it into a cultural thing of having drugs similar to -- is that what you’re trying to get at?

Person A: Yeah, yeah.

Person B: Make it a cultural thing of having drugs instead of -- you are suggesting some groundbreaking stuff, man. But yeah, I get what you're suggesting. But from what I know about drugs, I think all of them affect the neural pathways in your head in a much stronger way than alcohol, because drugs -- I don't know. I've read somewhere about drugs affecting your mind in different ways than alcohol.

Person A: Mm-hmm. Right. Oh yeah. Because neuro and everything else. Yeah. Because it's probably different.

Person B: Yeah. On that note I had a couple of other points, one of them being that, similar to alcohol, but the fact that people would now spend money on drugs instead of -- a lot of their salaries, instead of actually spending on their household and stuff, they’ll probably spend on drugs since it’s now legal. And that might result in households splitting up and a lot of household conflicts and stuff, because of whoever the breadwinner in the house is, he's spending the money on drugs. That could potentially be another issue.

Person A: Mm-hmm. But then also how can you guarantee that if we legalize drugs and then, in your case point, they're going to spend all that money on drugs and stuff? In today's society, how can you guarantee -- people are already doing that with other things, they could be doing it on other kinds of substance or anything else that we see today, and that also breaks up families. So then how do you guarantee that because it's legalizing drugs that it's breaking up the families? If that makes sense.

Person B: Yeah, I get your point. All I'm saying is that legalizing drugs will make them more accessible.

Person A: I see.

Person B: Which in turn will result in people being able to spend more money easily on them, and as a result of people spending more money on these drugs, it could result in potentially in social problems. Yeah.

Person A: Mm-hmm. That's true, yeah.

Person B: Actually, another thing off the top of my head is that potentially it could make the workforce a lot less productive, because people might just start mass-snorting coke or something before going to work every morning. And some people might argue that drugs make you more, whatever, creative and stuff like that. And maybe that might be true for some drugs, but I think for the vast majority of drugs they render you kind of in the state of dizziness, and just in a state of elation and potentially they could make you less productive.

Person A: Mm-hmm. That's true. That’s true. Yeah. Because the effects of drugs does -- it's a common thing. It will affect everyone. It's not one symptom. That's true.

Person B: Wait, have you lived in California your whole life?

Person A: Yes. Yeah.

Person B: So how widespread is the use of marijuana? I know it is, but how widespread has it been in your experience?

Person A: So are you from California?

Person B: I'm actually not, no, no.

Person A: Okay. Oh, I see. Yeah. Because I guess for -- yeah, California was, I guess, one of the early states that we finally legalized marijuana. So I think it just depends on the neighborhoods and which part of town you are. Because for me, since I'm not from the Bay Area or SoCal, that's completely a different scenario because from where I'm from -- I’m from a small town, so that was never really an issue unless you go to the worst neighborhoods where that's a problem and stuff. But then I visited and mostly stayed around the Bay Area and stuff like that where that is kind of a common thing. Even in Berkeley, you go around the streets and you literally smell marijuana everywhere. And it's like every street -- because now that it's legalized, you just see streets so confidently selling them, and you will see that. I think because California -- I don't know how long it's been since they legalized it, but for me -- I don't know how much it applies to everyone -- it just became the norm. And since it's not affecting me personally, I wouldn't be concerned or anything, because it's just happening. Like if there's someone on the street doing it, you just kind of ignore them and move on, because that's kind of like a daily life thing. But then since it is such a normal thing to see, it's also kind of bad because you just accept that people are doing drugs and it's affecting their lives. So it's kind of bad too. But I guess it just depends.

Person B: Yeah. So an example just popped into my head. Have you heard of this place called Amsterdam?

Person A: Yes.

Person B: So I think in Amsterdam, most of the drugs, which you and I can think of from common knowledge, are actually legal.

Person A: Oh yeah, that's true. Yeah, yeah.

Person B: One of my friends actually stays in Amsterdam, and she told me about how in a lot of these streets you just have people just lying down on roads and you have needles poked into their arm and stuff like that. And it’s really shady in general because of the drug culture.

Person A: You're right. Yeah. I think that's also in San Francisco too, because I think in the past year or something, there were articles released how San Francisco, like it's gotten worse about how people are just on the street shooting up or something. And it’s like, the city doesn't really do anything to them. So I don't know if that's also the people's fault too, because you could legalize it and if you maintain a set of rules or even know how to control it, it wouldn't be as bad as just letting everyone do whatever they want.

Person B: Yeah, that's true. I mean potentially, a model might work where you legalize it, but you have a very high prices on the drugs.

Person A: That's true.

Person B: But then again if you have high prices on drugs, that would facilitate a black market where people would sell it at low prices.

Person A: Yeah, that’s true. Because then that would just create a whole different problem of people trying to obtain illegally and then going through that. But yeah, going back to the idea where you said about the Amsterdam, I know a friend who went there and she spent a summer there, and literally she was telling me about that because there is a term --

Person B: Was it a “lit” summer abroad?

Person A: I’m pretty sure it was, knowing her. But she would tell me how she was surprised just how different it was, because there's a thing where it's like you go to a coffee shop and a cafe which is completely different. And I forgot which one's which, but it's like one is for drinking coffee obviously and the other one is literally just a shop to get drugs and stuff.

Person B: Yeah, I think you’re right. I think the cafe is where you get the drugs and stuff.

Person A: Yeah, it's such a normal thing over there. So it's like -- I don't know, I would like to see how these countries that are accepting more -- how would it be, how are they doing? Because we don't really hear about that. We just hear about it being bad in the U.S.

Person B: So we have ten seconds left. What’s your name again?

Person A: Oh, I'm [name redacted].

Person B: Oh, yeah, I'm [name redacted].

Person A: [name redacted]?

Person B: Yeah, yeah.

Person A: Oh, okay, nice to meet you.

Person B: Yeah, nice to meet you. But yeah, what's your major again?

Person A: I'm CS [computer science].

Person B: Oh, shit, how was your 61A [class] midterm?

Person A: Oh, I'm not -- I'm taking CS 10.

Person B: Oh, okay.

Person A: So then 61A would be next semester. What about you?

Person B: I'm a data science and econ major.

Person A: Oh, wow.

Person B: Hopefully double majoring. Since it's all intended at Berkeley.

Person A: That's true.

Person B: But yeah, so what other classes do you have?

Person A: So I have English R1B and then Math 1B.

Person B: Oh, that's pretty cool. So you have only 3 classes?

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: And a DeCal [student-run course] let me guess.

Person A: Yeah. Or not a DeCal -- I got enrolled into a -- l guess it's kind of like a DeCal. Like a computational bio thing.

Person B: Oh, okay, that's pretty cool.

Person A: Yeah, what about you? What other classes?

Person B: I have an African American studies class, I have an astronomy class, I have an entrepreneurship class, and I have my data science class.

Person A: Oh, cool, okay. Are you -- what year are you?

Person B: I'm a freshman. You?

Person A: Oh, same.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Oh, okay, well it was nice talking to you.

Person B: Nice talking to you too. Bye, [name redacted].

# Pair 242, Support P514, Oppose P511, Condition 4 (Long Audio), Agreement 0

Person A: Nice. Okay, so do you oppose or support legalizing drugs in the U.S.?

Person B: I think I oppose them, but -- yeah.

Person A: Okay. Yeah, that makes sense. Okay. So do you want to start with why you are against it? Maybe your points?

Person B: Yeah, my primary reason was personal experiences. So I've lived around the world, so most recently in Singapore, and then before that London, Amsterdam. And all those places, drugs are not legalized, right? But they still have a very good -- the government or whichever body regulates the drugs has good control over drugs not being -- there's no illegal sale of drugs. So I think the survey we filled out, the main point was that if drugs are legalized, they won't be trafficked at all, that they won’t be abused that much. I think what governments can do quite well even though drugs are illegal -- I think the control, it's more of a function of regulation than legality, whether it's legal or not. And obviously again, going back to personal experiences, I'm a freshman so I have a few friends who have gone to Canada for university. And Canada again is a place where marijuana is legal right now, and they’d never done marijuana before, simply because it was illegal in Singapore. But now actually they do it really often. So I think moving to a place where it's legal made it worse.

Person A: Yeah, maybe it allows more access to it.

Person B: Yeah, yeah.

Person A: Yeah, you raised some good points. I think for me, after hearing the Portugal argument in the prompt, I was thinking that possibly decriminalizing the drug industry allows us to have more control over the black market and regulate the levels of drugs in the U.S. and be able to track it. And also, I was making the comparison to -- I don't know if you know that much about prostitution, but there's a lot of arguments whether people should legalize or keep it illegal. But the proponents of legalizing it is that a lot of the people that work in the black market or the industry get criminalized if they come forward. So even, let's say, gang members here in the U.S., if they really want to get out of selling drugs, they can't. They're stuck in this, I guess this circle, and I think by maybe bringing the government involved -- I guess I would have to look at the statistics on how well the marijuana industry now has gotten rid of the black market, or is it still the same level? So I was thinking that was a reason why maybe legalizing it is a good thing, but I don't -- I'll agree with you where I do not support heroin. I really don't -- I don't know how they expect that to work out because heroin is obviously the most addicting thing ever. So that's not something I'm for, but I do think that there's potential to help maybe the gang epidemic and help people throughout the process get out and maybe tackle the whole industry that's making a ton of money off of this. Yeah.

Person B: Yeah, I think so. Yeah, that's a good point. So I think it's just contrasting goals. So are you looking at, as you said, just stopping that whole industry that's making a lot of money out of it? That's definitely a huge benefit. But at the same time, as you said, yeah, stuff like heroin is way too addictive.

Person A: Yeah, I'm like, “Wait, how are we going to legalize heroin?” First of all, that shouldn't exist. But then I do think it might also help recovering addicts or drug lords or people that are in the -- I'm not sure, because you said you have some experience living around -- if you know people who do a ton of coke or who are addicted to meth and then sell meth. It's like a vicious cycle and they can't really come clean because if you come clean, then you have to admit that you’ve been selling drugs. It's kind of like, “Oh, I can't get out of this.” It's so insane. They live a completely different life than we do.

Person B: Oh yeah, that's true. I was thinking -- wait, so marijuana is legal in California, right?

Person A: Mm-hmm.

Person B: Do you know anything about if that’s helped or made it worse?

Person A: I know, I'm trying -- for me, it seems as if it's become better just because it's more transparent. I think the people that I know used to illegally buy it, now they're just going to dispensaries and now I think the government has this information, but it doesn't seem like -- you're not going to some drug lord in some basement with the potential of getting killed. You're going to a business to buy this. Does that make sense?

Person B: Yeah, that does.

Person A: So there is a level of safety that comes along now with these companies doing this because you know your marijuana is not laced. I don't know, this might be a little too personal, but if you've ever gotten high, sometimes your marijuana is laced with PCP or all these unknowns. And I think by legalizing it you have these company standards that are like, “Hey, whatever, your Molly? It’s going to be legit. You're not going to have some meth in there.” And then there's so many toxins that people put themselves at risk because they want to get high.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Yeah. There's definitely a lot to think about.

Person B: Yeah. So I mean, I guess, reading the prompt, “Do you oppose or support legalizing drugs in the U.S.?” I guess we can reach a common ground that there are different degrees of drugs. So marijuana is one and then heroin is a whole new level. So I think based -- you can’t -- it's not a black or white answer like yes or no. Definitely going to be degrees of what can you legalize, what can you not legalize.

Person A: Yeah, yeah. I think doing another, maybe, thorough study of the different types of drugs and their effects and -- I honestly would need to do more research on Portugal and how that's worked out for them because I know it said that -- do you remember what it said [in the prompt]?

Person B: Not exactly. I was just about to ask you. So was it all drugs or was it a specific set?

Person A: I don't know. It said legalizing drugs, but it says the result means that there's been less convictions, or I don't know, there was something positive about it. So I would have to do a thorough study. Are they actually legalizing heroin? Or coke? So -- there's so many different drugs. I think maybe I could agree on decriminalizing it, meaning that people who want to come forward saying about their drug lords or whatever won't get in trouble for previously selling it. Because that's something that happens in our country. It's that, if it's illegal and now you admit it, you're going to jail. So we want people to feel comfortable and feel safe to be like, “Hey, I want to get out of this industry.”

Person B: Yeah, I think that's a fair point.

Person A: Yeah. So I think when you make something illegal, it's almost hush hush. Which --

Person B: Yeah, it also creates unwanted hype around it. Like, “It's illegal, so there’s got to be something about it.”

Person A: Yeah, you probably know this too. So I have some family that -- they live in Austria and my sister, we’re the same age, and she's been allowed to drink since she was 16.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: And then here, the legal drinking age is 21. But I personally, and most of my friends, started so young because it was -- we just had to hide it. We did all this illegal stuff just to get it. There was so much hype around it. Whereas this girl, my sister, she learned to responsibly drink and she doesn't really have problems. She says people in America, they get really trashed. She said people in Europe -- yeah, we drink, but it's so social. There's not the depression and the beer cans and the football stuff. Here, people -- there's, I don't know, a new element because everything's illegal.

Person B: I think I can probably link that back to my friend. So since marijuana has been illegal wherever he's lived throughout his life, suddenly when it's legal now it's like, “Yes, let me try that, let me do that.” And it just gets too much, as you said. You start doing too much probably simply because you're out of that hype, that, “Now I'm legal to do it.” But yeah, so someone who's probably lived in Canada or California their whole life probably is more responsible.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Yeah. I think -- yeah, so, yeah, I guess we’ve just come to common ground that you can't have a yes or no answer to this.

Person A: Yeah. I know. I think -- yeah, I agree with that. Yes or no, I don't think you can support legalizing all drugs, but you can support legalizing maybe a few drugs. Or I believe in decriminalizing it, so then people in gangs can come forward, in that sense.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: So I mean it depends, because I don't know if we just all agree that marijuana is healthy now because there's been so much evidence brought up and maybe is there going to be another drug that we find out is good for us or maybe not, you know?

Person B: I think what's tough also is that it’s tough to test it out. So you can't just make heroin legal for a few days and see the effects.

Person A: Yeah. But there's also a lot of roots involved. So let's say alcohol, for example. If this was a completely different time and let's say you exchanged a different drug with alcohol, we would all be saying, “There's no way they're going to legalize alcohol,” because that -- literally alcohol has caused so many deaths in this country, in this nation, because of drunk driving, all this. But we all turn our heads because half of this nation is addicted to it and it makes a ton of money, you see? So it's kind of like, “Okay, why is alcohol better than maybe this other drug?” Alcohol has awful effects.

Person B: Yeah, completely agree.

Person A: But see, we legalized it and there's, I don't know, I think you're still going to lose some, but you're also going to win some. Because can you imagine people smuggling alcohol during the Prohibition Era? They decided to legalize it. So I think there are pros that come along to legalizing something that's bad because they track it.

Person B: Definitely. Yeah. I mean as you were saying that, if you had to buy marijuana from someone who's selling it legally, you can track -- I think you brought up a point of tracking who buys how much and all that.

Person A: Yeah. And also, the safety measures behind it. You know what's actually in the stuff you're purchasing and the chances of you getting stabbed or something like that are literally diminished.

Person B: Yeah. Yeah. And plus, there's a lot of data which you can analyze, whatnot.

Person A: Yeah. So you're a freshman?

Person B: Yeah, I'm a freshman. How about you?

Person A: That's cool. Senior.

Person B: Oh, that’s nice.

Person A: Going to -- about to graduate. Well, no. Next semester.

Person B: Bittersweet or looking forward to it?

Person A: I would say bittersweet. I've been waiting for this. I think junior year is when you're ready to leave. You're just like, “Oh my God, I want to work already.” And then senior year comes and you're thinking about all your college memories and how you kind of were in a utopia for a little bit with your friends here. Yeah. It's going to be nice though going -- starting to work again full-time, not having to study and I don't know, yeah.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Oh, okay. So I think we did reach some common ground, so that's good.

Person B: Yeah, that's really good. Yep.

Person A: Okay. I think we're ending this. It was a good talk.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Okay, let's see. Okay, bye.

Person B: Bye.

# Pair 243, Support P516, Oppose P509, Condition 4 (Long Audio), Agreement 0

Person A: So what are your thoughts on the issue?

Person B: I completely oppose having controversial speakers on campus. How about you?

Person A: I mean, I think free speech is important and even if it is controversial, I think it's important to allow speakers on campus if they do want to speak. And my thinking is, if you don't like what they're saying then just don't go. And if people do want to go then that's their thing, but if you don't want to hear it, then just don't go.

Person B: Okay. On that, why give someone a platform to continue to spread -- well, it tends to be hate speech rather than free speech -- why allow them to spread that to other people?

Person A: I think if it's hate speech and it is causing actual psychological harm to people who are listening, then yeah, that becomes an issue. But if it's just a controversial topic then that is a safe space to discuss things, like classrooms. And it's not like -- as long as things don't get violent, I don't see the problem in discourse on controversial issues because talking about and hearing different opinions is kind of what moves things forward. And so I think it's important to hear both sides to issues and it seems like people are so close-minded now that they don't even want the opposition to even be able to say anything. And so that just seems very problematic in and of itself that people don't even want -- if you don't have the same beliefs as someone, they don't even want them to be able to say anything. So that's my thinking. But I could see -- if it is actual hate speech and it's causing damage to people and major problems, then yeah, that shouldn't be allowed. But if it's just something controversial then I don't see the problem with it.

Person B: Well, I think what it was talking about is controversial speakers rather than topics. Which controversial speakers tend to talk about controversial issues, but most recently on campus, I think the reference that they give is talking about Milo [Yiannopoulos]. And I think having him on our campus was problematic -- it was really problematic. Especially with his values and what he stands for and what he has done. There's reason to believe that he was going to bring hate speech again because that's what his platform is based off of.

Person A: Mm-hmm.

Person B: So do you think it's okay for people like him who are just trying to rile people up and cause harm to people to be allowed on our campus?

Person A: No. If he's -- yeah, I think -- personally, I just think he's very immature and doesn't really have anything valid to say. And in that case, I feel like he shouldn't even want to come to Berkeley just for the sake that the majority of people don't even want to hear what he has to say. So that kind of shows that he does want to come just to rile people up. And that's definitely problematic. So yeah, if it is someone like him or, I don't know, if it's -- I think it really depends on the situation honestly because everyone's different. But I think it's unfair to not let someone speak just because it's a controversial person because I do think controversial people can bring discourse and discussion about issues that need to be discussed. And yeah, even if it's stuff you don't want to hear, I don't -- just don't go listen to them or just use that as a way to talk to other people about it and realize that what they're saying is wrong and that brings -- discussion could actually bring good out of it. So I don't know, I think it really depends. But yeah, if it's really just to rile people up and get people mad, then that's unfortunate and that should be discussed kind of on a different level.

Person B: Okay. Another thing is, so when we tend to have controversial people on our campus, police are brought to our campus in large amounts. What do you think about that?

Person A: To be honest, I don't see why police would even have to come. It's just because people are so angry that someone is coming to speak that that's what causes violence and I don't see the need to protest just because somebody is coming to speak. I guess if you're against what the person is saying, then yeah, but it doesn't seem -- it just seemed totally unnecessary. Last year especially, there was all this buildup for Milo to come speak and then he ended up coming and gave a five minute speech and so we wasted so much money on all that police presence. It was totally unnecessary because it was, yeah. I don't even -- yeah, that was really dumb in my opinion.

Person B: Same.

Person A: So yeah, I think it's the response of people to act violently or -- the fact that people are angry that these people are coming is the reason that there's the police presence. So if people just weren't so angry that controversial people are coming to speak, then we wouldn't need police presence and then we wouldn't have to waste money on so much security. It's just -- if we just let people say what they want, speakers come who want to come and then just don't go if you don't want to hear it, then I feel like that would just solve everything.

Person B: Mm-hmm. But my question -- another question -- sorry, I have a lot of questions, I’m just trying to understand.

Person A: Yeah, yeah, please.

Person B: So when it comes to -- okay, so what type of -- what do you mean by controversial issues? What do you think is appropriate to be on this campus?

Person A: I don't think anything isn't -- I don't know. If someone wants to come and speak their mind, I feel like there are always people out on Sproul [Plaza] and stuff just yelling whatever they want and no one really cares because you can say what you want in this country and that's okay. And so I don't see the problem with someone coming and if people want to go listen to them, then that's fine. So I don't see a problem with it unless it causes violence or -- whether that be psychological violence or just physical violence -- once things become violent, that's when action has to really be taken.

Person B: So I feel like with the recent people that are being brought to our campus, that are brought by the Republican Party of our school and stuff like that, have always been people who are really far right and tend to -- it's caused a lot of harm to folks on our campus. And people protesting against that and not wanting them on campus I think is fair because a lot of the topics that those speakers talk about are really traumatizing and target, in particular, people of color and other minority groups. So it's kind of hard to be okay with having those types of speakers on our campus as well as -- I think it also goes to dismiss a lot of people of color’s experiences, if that makes sense.

Person A: Yeah. Oh, that totally does make sense. And I think that's very valid. But what are your thoughts on how the Free Speech Movement started here? And so our campus should be committed to preserving that, I feel like. And so I still just don't see -- if you don't support the person, it's fine to protest and that's great to show what you believe in and stand up for that. And I think that's important and that shows who we are as a campus that we stand up for that. And then just -- I think the best thing in that situation -- okay, so Milo comes to speak and what if just no one showed up because we all hate him? The people on this campus who actually like him and respect what he says are so few. And so wouldn't it be great if he comes to speak, we let him speak because we support free speech and just no one shows up? That would be the biggest diss to him because it's like showing what we support and what we don't support just by our actions. And say we have a protest. That's awesome. And then just don’t show up to hear him speak because no one really wants to hear what he says except for the few people in the Republican Club who actually wanted him to come. I think that would be the best way to show like, “We don't want to hear you speak, but you're allowed to come because we do support free speech.”

Person B: But why do we have to cater to people who provide that, who provide hate speech, who could give two shits about minority groups? Who have outed people of their sexuality, who were about to out people who were undocumented? I don't see why we would have to even have that person on our campus because then it's like, “What about our other values?” Like free speech, okay, I get it. That's one of our values because it was founded on this campus. But then again, what about standing for people who are attacked every day on the basis of who they are? I just don't understand why it's necessary to have to even go through that. And when it comes to even having the speakers like that, police presence is another thing that's attached to that. And you know it's -- even if we don't show up, there’s still going to be police presence. And then when it comes to police presence, Brown and Black folks don't really connect with them. It's -- you don't feel safe. I personally -- I am a person of color -- I don't feel safe when I see police on campus, and that's a typical day. And then when it comes to having radical people talk on our campus just because we have to -- just because of free speech, it’s like, “Well, shit. What about me?” It doesn't make sense. I'm being dismissed for someone who wants to have 20 minutes of conversation about what their beliefs are and it's like, “What about my mental health? What about my security? What about my safety?” That's dismissed and it's just to have someone speak for that amount of time. I don't know.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Yeah, I see that for sure. All right. Well I guess we're done, but thank you.

Person B: Yeah, for sure. All right.

# Pair 105, Support P235, Oppose P233, Condition 4 (Long Audio), Agreement 0

Person B: Yeah, so I feel like I do not really have a lot of background information about the current situation on this topic. So how about you start so that I can understand what’s really going on?

Person A: Okay, so the topic is about reparations for slavery, and as I understand, reparations are monetary, so specifically money. And it's kind of like -- with the Holocaust when Germany paid in monetary reparations to the affected places that they had occupied and that they had killed people in. So, it's just kind of a, “Sorry for this, we apologize and we're going to give you money to make up for it.” Which, I mean, doesn’t exactly make up for it. But -- so should I just go down my list of arguments for it?

Person B: Yeah, sure.

Person A: Okay. So in the question it mentioned that one of the oppositions of it is that people who are currently living didn't own slaves, so why should it come out of our taxes to pay reparations for it? One of the arguments for that is that, “Well, yeah, you didn't own slaves, but you still benefit from the White privilege that slave owners benefited from.” And so for example, I'm a fourth generation American and my great grandparents came over after the Civil War, but we still benefited as White people. And we weren't -- after the Civil War was the Jim Crow era. And so that just kind of even -- it's like de facto slavery. Or like, segregation still happened. And that's within people's lifetimes now. People lived through segregation, and there’s still de facto segregation with housing and school zoning and everything. And so it's not like we're not benefiting from holdovers from the era of slavery. It's not like it was a clean slate that ended. Those things still happened, and people that are alive still lived through the aftermath of it. And so I think that it definitely does still affect people. And people still benefit from it, and so reparations should be paid.

Person B: Okay. I get it. So I think that probably -- so you mentioned segregation, and I do believe segregation is a problem even now. But why I'm against is the reason for segregation. Because I feel like -- for example, in the current generation, there is not really -- so segregation probably now rarely results from historical slavery or because of the aftermath of slavery. So sometimes I feel like segregation can be a racial stereotype or racial discrimination, but it's not because of slavery, but because of personal concepts against some specific racial group. Or because what they heard in media or what they – probably their influence from their families. So these cannot really be called a result from the slavery. So I think specific compensation or reparations for slavery is really not the reason.

Person A: Okay. So, my counter to that would be that, if there was no slavery, would people still have those kinds of attitudes? I think those attitudes have been learned through generations, through prejudices that came from the fact that people thought other people were less than human and could be possessions. And so I think that prejudices that caused slavery are the same prejudices that people inherit that they have against people that leads to de facto segregation today.

Person B: Well, but I think that today, racial discrimination or stereotypes do not only happen to African Americans.

Person A: Yes. So it's not just Black and White, it's White and then every -- the rest of the world. White is totally the minority, but this is specifically an American problem of slavery that the descendants of slaves never got the monetary start to live the American dream. So after slavery, they could still farm on land with crop sharing, and so they were being paid. But it's the American -- One of my arguments is that the American class system is more of a caste system in that there is almost no upward mobility. And that if you're born into poverty, you're not given the opportunities to escape. And people of color are more likely to be born into poverty than White people, and they aren't given the access or means of getting out of that. And that's because reparations were never paid. And in addition to that, one of the reasons for the class system having no upward mobility is because of the wage gap. So we always hear about how women are paid seventy-six cents on the dollar compared to White men. But that's just what White women are paid. And both Black men and women and every other person of every other ethnicity are paid even less than both of those. So in this situation specifically for Black people, they're paid -- I think it was in the fifties, fifty cents. So there are – We are already robbing them of this money that they're working for at the same effort as White men and women. And so, there's specifically a monetary reason. Not only did we not give them reparations immediately after slavery, but we're still keeping them from earning the same amount of money today.

Person B: So I have two questions. The first one is that you mentioned that all ethnicities are kind of getting hurt from this kind of discrimination. But not all ethnicities used to be slaves. So that’s the reason why I don't feel like slavery should be connected to racial discrimination, because racial discrimination is a whole lot more than just slavery. And because I come from an Asian background, and I do see reports that African Americans have a stronger voice -- have even more rights to speak up about their problems. Because Americans think there used to be a slave problem, so they're trying to pay more attention to African American voices rather than the voices of other ethnicities.

Person A: Yeah, it’s definitely -- like I said, it's not just a Black and White problem.

Person B: Yeah. So it's not just a Black and White problem, but if we just attribute the problem to slavery, it makes people think that's a Black and White problem. And they just ignore other ethnic groups. So that's the reason why I think just having reparations for slavery is just not enough. And instead, there comes my second argument, that reparations for slavery, that amount of money should be used to solve a lot of problems regarding racial discriminations. And not only monetary reparations, but also how to really break the barrier of education access or medical access. So these are -- I don't think these problems can be changed only through paying money.

Person A: Yeah, I agree with that. You can't just throw money at the problem and think that it will fix itself. So what I'm getting from your argument is that you still want some kind of repayment, but not specifically as if a court payment like, “Oh, we awarded them $50,000 each.” But you want that money -- you still want money set aside, but you want the money to be invested in enrichment programs for communities and education and that kind of thing.

Person B: Yes, and also these enrichment programs are set not for the reason of past slavery. You know what I mean? It should start for, perhaps, low-salary communities, even including all ethnicities even White people because there are also White families that cannot afford education.

Person A: Yes, yes.

Person B: Yeah. So I feel like we should not take out the African American group and say, “They're the only people that are harmed by our history.”

Person A: Yeah. So I took a sociology class and we would mostly focus on White versus Black. And my teacher said something like, “Asians have it easy.” And I’m like, “He didn't even mention the Gentlemen's Agreement,” which excluded Japanese people from coming into California. Or the Chinese Exclusion Act, which turned Chinese people away from the border, or Japanese internment camps. I totally understand that slavery isn't the only issue in American history.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: I think the time is up. Nice talking to you.

Person A: Yeah, you too.

# Pair 106, Support P225, Oppose P228, Condition 4 (Long Audio), Agreement 0

Person A: So I'm assuming that you're against legalizing drugs in the U.S. Okay. So I put down in the survey that I was for legalizing drugs, but not completely as is.

Person B: Yeah. I'm on the same as you in terms of opposing. I'm not completely opposing.

Person A: Okay. Do you want to go first?

Person B: So I was thinking that for me, I thought that opposing would be the better option because it would serve as -- even though if it wasn't legalized, there would still be a small barrier so people wouldn't necessarily have the ease of obtaining these illegal drugs, and eventually lead to abusing. Because just having a small barrier discourages people from going through deep efforts of just trying to obtain it. But, at the same time, I do realize that addiction would lead to the devoted need of getting these drugs. So that's why I wasn't completely opposed to the idea of it, of getting it legalized, because I know there's that alternate argument as well.

Person A: Right.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: I actually had the same opinion as you for a pretty long time before I came to Berkeley. But once I came here, I started working at a free clinic as a hepatitis counselor. So we do a lot of HIV testing, STI testing and we do work with a lot of needle exchange programs that give clean needles to injection drug users. And I feel when you make drugs illegal, you do -- there's a barrier put up, but there are more dangerous ways of obtaining drugs that are not necessarily clean. People who are injection drug users or who smoke different drugs put them at risk for different diseases. I feel like you're kind of putting other people's health at risk by forcing them to use these methods to obtain drugs. And at the same time, because drugs are illegal, there's a lot of knowledge not known by the general public about overdosing. A lot of people are afraid to call the authorities because of the fact that drugs are illegal, so they don't want to be associated with that.

Person B: Right.

Person A: Yeah, I understand why it seems kind of weird to legalize drugs to reduce the amount of people who die from drugs, or people who are affected by drugs, or people who go to jail for drugs. But it's my opinion that harm reduction is the way that we should use to encourage people to use drugs safely before you encourage people to not use drugs at all. Because I feel like it just doesn't work when you’re like, “Go to jail for 20 years” as much as someone who committed manslaughter or something. It's just -- it's, you know, I am -- I'm not condoning drugs, but I feel like it's not an effective way to just make drugs illegal because obviously it's not working right now.

Person B: What I was thinking was you could legalize drugs, but at least have restrictions in place so we can monitor -- or not monitor, but keep in check people who are abusers or, for example, diseases as you mentioned. I think that'd be a much more effective way than citing one -- completely being conservative about it and say no, opposing it. I feel like you could legalize, but at least have some rules behind obtaining and using these drugs.

Person A: And I feel that way the drugs are FDA monitored too, so they're not dirty or filled with something that you don't know what. But yeah, I don't know, it's really difficult.

Person B: It's just I felt a little more conservative because morally, I felt just drugs in general kind of oppose my perspective -- or just drugs in general, you know?

Person A: Yeah, culturally I wasn’t raised.

Person B: Culturally, morally. Yeah, so that's why I was more opposed to it. But in terms of other people using it, I have no issue with that. They could use it as they wish, but as long as it's done in moderation and monitored, in my opinion.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Yeah, go ahead.

Person A: I feel like eventually it would be great if addiction didn't exist, and hard drugs like cocaine and heroin weren’t used. But the next best step is just to legalize and just to take care of the damage that's been done so far. I think in the survey -- what country did they use? I forgot.

Person B: I think it was Peru, but I'm not sure.

Person A: Yeah, it was something like that. I know other northern European countries have used harm reduction techniques and it definitely decreased the rates of HIV. So I mean, it definitely seemed to work for them.

Person B: Yeah. I was also reading those facts and for me, when I was trying to decide, I was very convinced to both sides so I couldn't really see -- there wasn't a neither option. So I just went with my gut feeling.

Person A: I know, there wasn't a zero.

Person B: There was no zero.

Person A: That's how I felt about -- more about the other ones, like the racial reparations one. Yeah. I was like, “Damn it, there's no zero.”

Person B: Yeah. I wish there was a zero, because I feel like both sides do make valid arguments.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: But yeah, I think definitely legalized -- I would go towards legalizing. But morally not, but it's confusing. I don't know.

Person A: It's definitely not a personal -- it's not because of a personal choice that I would be making like, “Yay,” you know?

Person B: Yeah. Drugs for “legalize all drugs” sake.

Person A: It's just hard.

Person B: I feel like marijuana was something recent, and I definitely agree with what they did. I think it's very effective of how they legalized it. But there are still some restrictions to it. You need to obtain a card, right? So I think that is a very effective way of just distributing drugs without having people get it illegally.

Person A: So -- sorry keep going.

Person B: No, that's it.

Person A: You know, when it was time to vote for legalizing marijuana, my dad actually voted for it. And I was just really surprised because he's always been pretty against drug use. I think it was basically tax payer dollar incentive where they would finally tax marijuana that he was like, “Oh cool, it's physically advantageous to me so.”

Person B: I feel you. My parents are obviously -- they’re very conservative, they’re from a different country, so.

Person A: Asian country?

Person B: Asian country. So the way I’ve been brought up is kind of conservative, I would say.

Person A: Me too, actually.

Person B: But at the same time, as you interact with your peers and you learn more about the world, I just feel like my conservativeness is edging towards being more liberal. But at the same time, I still have these roots, so it’s hard for me to.

Person A: Actually, I feel like I’m in the exact same situation. Asian immigrant parents, conservative.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: But I grew up here, in the Bay Area.

Person B: Oh, yeah. Same here. It’s just hard not to look back on what your parents taught you, you know?

Person A: Yeah. Growing up, I was always very socially right with identity politics -- or not right, socially left. Identity politics, and then just fiscally right-leaning. Because of my parents, you know?

Person B: Yeah, and then coming to a school like Berkeley is extremely liberal. So it’s sometimes, for me, it rubs off a little strong.

Person A: Yeah, me too. It’s difficult to talk to – or difficult to openly express your opinions.

Person B: Yes. I feel like that’s the struggle of being a student at Berkeley. But I don’t mind. I usually try and see both sides of an argument.

Person A: Yeah. I feel like it’s because there’s a mix that I’m more moderate, I would say.

Person B: Same here.

Person A: But last year, when the whole Free Speech Week with Milo and everything, that was a little weird.

Person B: Yeah that was definitely -- made an impression on me. For me, at least when I was watching it, I didn’t really -- I was like, “Whatever”. But I guess it stuck with me, I don’t know why. When I first heard about it, I was very “whatever” about it.

Person A: Yeah, same.

Person B: But having friends that are extremely liberal sometimes discourages you to really voice your opinion, I feel.

Person A: Yeah. My roommate, who I’ve known since I was ten, so it was totally okay, but she is super left. And she like -- during that whole Milo Free Speech Week, she was really opposed to him speaking because she saw a difference between hate speech and free speech. For me, it was not so obvious.

Person B: To me, what I believe is let everyone have their own beliefs. I wouldn’t necessarily stop them from.

Person A: Same.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Why did they match us? I feel like we agree on a lot of stuff.

Person B: Probably, we just got matched because we disagreed slightly. All right, nice talking to you.

Person A: You too.

# Pair 204, Support P424, Oppose P427, Condition 4 (Long Audio), Agreement 0

Person A: Do you want to go on your view on the topic?

Person B: Yeah, sure. Okay, so the question was, “Do you oppose or support requiring government reparations for slavery,” and I oppose requiring government reparations for slavery. Because I feel like the racism that occurs today is largely institutional or systematic. And so although people are the ones who are running these systems, they don't literally constitute or make up the systems. And so, I feel that --in addition to that, using money or objects to fill in the gaps or whatever, like lack of resources that -- how are we naming this group? The ancestors of slaves -- whatever lack of resources they have, using money or objects to try to fill these things I don't think does anything to address the actual systemic issue. It's not really solving any problems. It's just saying like, “Oh you don't have this, here it is”. And so, I don't feel like that really does anything in terms of addressing the problem that did happen. And so the answer isn't -- or the answer wouldn't come from -- the issue at hand isn't that these people are lacking these resources as a result of slavery, but I think the issue instead is that -- is the way that they're being understood or the way that they were treated in a way that resulted in that lack instead. And so that's what we should be addressing if we were to try to combat whatever is going on over there. But I don't think reparations in the form of money or objects or structures -- I think is what they said -- I don't think that would be effective in addressing whatever.

Person A: Okay, yeah, I also agree with that. When I put it, I put kind of in the middle [on the scale], because I do believe that money may not -- it’s obviously not going to completely fix the problem because it's obviously systemic. But I also believe that they were -- their ancestors obviously were forced into slavery. I mean I just compared it to Native Americans, how they received reparations in the form of land ownership. So I kind of feel like that's -- it kind of sets a precedent. If these Native Americans were affected, obviously this colonialism -- and obviously so were African Americans, I feel like there should be some form of reparation. Like you said, I also believe it doesn't fix the problem, but it does help, because these people are -- they’re put into -- they’re obviously -- it is systemic. So they may be stuck in these neighborhoods that are bad, which would lead to them going towards crime, or obviously not going down the right path. And, maybe with a little bit of money, they'll be able to move somewhere else. It might lead to less violence or less -- they may be less prone to violence, I guess. And I also feel like slavery kind of set like this foundation for African Americans to fail, and for obviously White people to thrive. And so that's why I feel like, although it might not fix it, it could probably help a little bit. But I also don't believe that it's the solution to the problem.

Person B: Yeah, I think it could help. But I feel like -- I have no idea how, if we were to try to actually do this, what the proper or what appropriate or comparable reparation would be. Because you mentioned the Native Americans and how they gave them back some land. But I feel like that's -- they were there on the land, so they were just like, “Oh here, have it back”. But I feel like with this it’s super tough.

Person A: Yeah, this is a really touchy subject just for the simple fact that -- I mean, I myself haven't experienced this so I can't really speak on behalf of them. But at the same time, I know that this is really systemic and it’s -- money obviously isn’t going to fix it, but I feel like it might help. So I don’t know. I guess it's kind of a touchy subject.

Person B: Yeah, I feel like when it comes down to it, people should just -- I don’t know, we need to have a reshaping of how people see each other.

Person A: Exactly.

Person B: I don’t know how, but yeah. It has to do a lot with -- maybe just time. Because I feel like a lot of the more recent generations have a very different way of thinking about race and a different way of thinking about the way society should work.

Person A: Yeah. Well, I feel like it’s because -- well I don’t feel, I know -- racism, it’s taught. It’s not inherited, it’s -- you can learn it. So I feel like, in these newer generations, we’re being less prone to listening to colonialized thoughts that White is the only way to go. So I feel like now we're starting to see through that BS and think for ourselves. And try to be more accepting nowadays? I don't know.

Person B: Yeah. Do you have anything -- the only other thing I wrote in my notes was that people who -- if the government did require reparations or did institute them, people right now who are the ancestors of people who were slave owners and also other people who are totally irrelevant would have to pay for it, and so I feel that's also kind of not right.

Person A: Yeah, honestly, thinking about it, I feel like if there were reparations that other people would hate -- or not hate, but envy -- or yeah, I guess in a way hate them more because they're like, “Oh now we have to pay them,” you know? So if anything, it might cause the discrimination against them to increase, I could see -- I don’t know.

Person B: Imagine if we just started over completely, everyone. That'd be crazy. I don’t know why that’s what came to my mind.

Person A: I think that'd be too crazy to even think about.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: I don't know how. Because if you think about it, the way that the United States was structured, it was based off of colonialism. We built this nation off the backs of slaves and by genocide. So to completely change that -- turn that around, I don't know how America would be today.

Person B: That's true. Also, if we were to totally erase the system and try to come up with a new one, then people have to voluntarily participate in it and I feel like that would -- that would be a whole big thing.

Person A: Yeah, people are just not willing to change or to think differently.

Person B: Yeah, that's a good point. That's a good point that's relevant. Because people are already so set in the way that the system is. I think most people probably already think that this is just the way that it should be or this is just the way that the world is. And so I feel like that also complicates things.

Person A: Yeah. Especially, like they say, if you don't see racism is a problem, or if you don't think it's prevalent, then you're a part of it. I feel people just are so used to seeing it. It's an institution that's so normalized that we’ve -- it's become so intertwined with our lives that we don't even notice it, you know? But I don't know. Why can't we just spread peace and love?

Person B: I know, right?

Person A: Yeah. I don't have much else to say.

Person B: Yeah, neither do I.

Person A: I feel if anything I've argued more for against it.

Person B: Yeah. I think I only put also one away from being the middle [on the scale]. Because at first I wasn't really that sure about it. Now, I feel I'm more sure about it after talking about it.

Person A: Yeah me too -- because I mean it's kind of like a band-aid, it’s not helping. It’s a temporary kind of thing.

Person B: Yeah, but I would be interested to see if there are some people who are actually descendants of slaves and they really feel that the system is unchangeable, or maybe within their lifetime it won't be changeable enough. And so for that reason they would want money or something like that.

Person A: Uh-huh. I wonder if one day, it actually might change. That’ll be kind of cool. Or at least I would want to be a part of that.

Person B: I mean I hope we’re going in that direction, right? I would feel that we are.

Person A: I feel that we are, to be honest. There are a lot more people who are trying to -- are starting to see that it's wrong and I kind of like that.

Person B: Yeah. I wonder what will happen in fifty years. Because by the time fifty years passes, a lot of people will be dead, and a lot of people will be educated in new ways.

Person A: Exactly, yeah.

Person B: Yeah. That's half a century -- a lot can happen.

Person A: It really can, but I mean it's still crazy to think about.

Person B: Yeah, it’s far away.

Person A: But, yeah. I don’t really have much else to say.

Person B: What did you put for the other ones, like the drugs question?

Person A: For the drugs, I put no. I mean, I was completely against it because I feel like it's a big problem obviously now. But to legalize it, at least for me, I feel like it'll make it worse. Because they’re saying -- well the argument for them was that, if you legalize it, then instead of incarcerating them, you could treat them at hospitals. So instead of impacting jails like it is now, we're going to be impacting hospitals. We’re going to be having to deal with these people. It's so accessible and legal they're going to be more prone to using it. And so then hospitals are going to be overpacked. We're going to spend a lot of money just trying to treat these people, in my opinion. I don't know.

Person B: I only put slight yes. I feel like it's a good thing that we are trying to treat these people. But I also think that if we legalize them, we should probably set up the healthcare system in a way that it's ready to receive all these people.

Person A: Yeah. I feel like you can't just automatically change it, and then not have that set up because obviously it would just turn bad.

Person B: Yeah, I heard a lot of news stories where they talk about -- or just people who are very in support of legalization of all drugs speak about it, and I feel it was pretty convincing.

Person A: Yeah, I've heard of -- I also feel like it could work, but then I'm like, “What if it doesn’t?”

Person B: Yeah, it could work, but at the same time this is the U.S. and a lot of things are weird here.

Person A: Yeah, it really is. And then what was the other one? Oh, the campus speakers? What did you put for that?

Person B: I think I put the medium yes.

Person A: Oh, okay. Yeah, me too.

Person B: Yeah, the only thing that made me kind of against it was just the fact that even though free speech is a thing, the campus should have a priority of the safety of the students. And so that was the only thing.

Person A: Yeah, the whole inciting hate speech, that kind of made me iffy about it. But I also feel like everybody should be able to express their opinions because they’re opinions. But then, I don't know.

Person B: I feel it's hard to say, because if you reject a speaker from coming, it could be for any reason.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: Oh, and we’re done.

Person A: Okay. Alright.

Person B: Okay, well, that was fun. Thanks for talking.

Person A: It was nice meeting you, I guess.

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: Alright, bye.

Person B: Bye.

# Pair 235, Support P508, Oppose P507, Condition 4 (Long Audio), Agreement 0

Person B: Okay, cool, so I’m guessing that you support allowing extremely controversial speakers to speak on campus?

Person A: Yeah, I do for the most part, but I definitely have reservations about it.

Person B: Yeah, I agree. I have -- I can hear my own voice.

Person A: I know.

Person B: But yeah, I have some reasons against it. And I would want to do more research and have more information, but I can kind of just go over my points first if that works, and then you go over yours.

Person A: Yeah, sounds good.

Person B: Okay, cool. So I just think that, by far, the cons often outweigh the pros of an extremely controversial speaker coming to campus, especially from the examples that they noted during the survey and that came last year.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: First of all, in terms of safety, both mentally and physically, I know a lot of people feel uncomfortable. And I don't even think that that’s my main argument, because I do believe in free speech. But I think especially the physical safety of the volume of people that usually show up and how it becomes more of a riot than an event is something that's a little bit scary, and especially scary for a lot of students and as well as their families. I know my parents have been -- when they hear about these things they’re like, “Avoid campus,” which is kind of unfortunate since we have -- which kind of leads me to my next point. Our student lives are affected when these events are supposed to happen, because if there are meetings or classes on campus and there's violence occurring, a lot of that gets cancelled. And so things have to be rescheduled, people have to figure out a way to get home, and so that can be disruptive to your everyday schedule. And then I know a lot of times campus gets destroyed, also. I remember last year, I don't remember what event this was for, but the entire student union -- the glass was broken and that just is a lot of costs for the school. And that can come out of student tuition, stuff like that.

Person A: Right.

Person B: And then I think just my main point is that, when they have these really extremely controversial speakers coming to campus, a lot of times their message isn't even usually conveyed or heard. Just because of the fact that the riots and all the violence and the talk about the speaker overtakes the speaker’s actual message. So I just don't think it's an effective way of conveying your thoughts if you were to come onto campus, and I think there might be better platforms that there can be more of an open discussion. But yeah, usually these end in messy situations and the reason the speaker came and what they have to say is overlooked, which in terms of free speech doesn't really seem effective.

Person A: Yeah -- I can hear my own voice. You're right. I haven't done much research on this topic at all, and honestly, I didn't even think about the whole safety aspect, but you're totally right. Yeah, I agree that it totally gets overshadowed by the controversy versus the actual message. I guess my -- I'm just uncomfortable with the wording of not allowing people to come to campus. I know it's not a first amendment violation or anything, because that's the government.

Person B: Right.

Person A: So yeah, I've heard people calling it that, and it's definitely not. It's a university. It's ultimately their decision. What did I write down? Yeah, I mean I just feel Berkeley especially is a very -- we tend to hear the same things a lot. So I definitely -- I personally would appreciate getting different viewpoints some of the time. But yeah, I think you're right that it's definitely not the most effective means of communicating those and especially -- yeah, you're right, the examples are not -- I have no idea what they talked about, you know?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: I just know that they came, and that there, yeah -- and that there was a ton of drama over that.

Person B: Yeah, I don’t even know if either of them got to speak, just because of the capacity of people there. I think I'm not -- I don't know if either of them or both got shut down just because they couldn’t ensure student safety.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: So I feel if you're inviting speakers like that where you know that most of the students here are liberal and they're probably going to try to protest, it won't really work out. I think, in that case, I wouldn't recommend it. But I kind of -- I mean, I agree with you that hearing different points of views is important and having those types of speakers -- I just feel extremely controversial is not the best. But controversial speakers where it'll be contained in a healthy discussion or debate. I would appreciate that.

Person A: Yeah, definitely safety should always be the number one priority. And something I wrote down here, obviously I support free speech. I'm pretty sure everyone supports free speech.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: But also, I support the right to protest, you know? So I feel like where I lived when that happened, there was a lot of talk about shutting down people's free speech rights, but I feel like it's kind of exercising the right of students’ free speech to make their views known on the subject. So I don't know, I feel it's hard to balance those a lot of the time.

Person B: Yeah, I agree. Yeah, the only thing is if there was a venue, and obviously campus is the most convenient, but somewhere where students can go if they're interested in participating, but not when they're obligated to be in that area.

Person A: Right.

Person B: For example, I know a lot of the things happen near Barrows [hall] or Dwinelle [hall], and that -- in the Sproul [Plaza] area. And that if you have class or meeting you can hear the protests, or maybe you can’t even get to your -- like if there's a shutdown or whatever. Then students who weren’t interested in becoming involved are somehow dragged in.

Person A: Yeah, totally. I mean, I don't know -- I haven't researched it that much. I guess it's relevant, you know? But yeah, I don’t really have super fully formed opinions about it. It's a tough topic almost.

Person B: Yeah. I guess also probably we’re somewhere in between and more -- I don’t know, are you more on the liberal side or the conservative side, would you say?

Person A: I lean liberal for sure.

Person B: Okay, same. So I feel like we're not strongly -- I mean, extremely controversial typically are the conservative people, I mean for Berkeley at least. And so I guess I just don't have the correct information or maybe even the correct political viewpoint to fight for them to come.

Person A: Yeah, I definitely wouldn't go out of my way to make sure that Ben Shapiro got here. Yeah, it's just the wording of it stresses me out, you know?

Person B: Yeah. Not allowing.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Yeah, I get that too.

Person A: Yeah. And sometimes there's a lot of the same opinion here.

Person B: Yeah. That’s true.

Person A: But yeah, I'm not on either side of it really so much.

Person B: Yeah, I would -- that's how I felt about especially the other topics that they had. I was like, “I could take a stance if I had a lot more information.”

Person A: Yeah. The reparations one I was like, “Oh my God. Please, I don't know.”

Person B: Yeah, I was like, “Uh.” Even the drugs, because I've always been on the fence about legalization versus not because I don't think -- it's kind of people's choice, but also I get it's an addiction and that becomes a disease. But then you need treatment.

Person A: Right. Yeah. I said legalization on that one because I have heard about Portugal. They mentioned how they're doing way better in terms of --

Person B: Really?

Person A: Yeah, I think it really worked for them and it's probably a little more complicated here. I don't really know, but I feel what we're doing right now is not very effective for the most part.

Person B: Yeah. See I don't know too much about it so I was like, “Can't really say.”

Person A: Yeah, I know. I guess this was the best one -- this is the one I'm most knowledgeable about. So I guess that's good.

Person B: Definitely. Yeah. I had a drug debate with one of my roommates last year, and apparently in Europe they have these places where if you're like, “Oh, I want to take molly before a concert,” you can go there and show it to these drug vans. And they'll tell you if it's the right dose or how much you should take and making sure it's kind of regulated. Or they'll provide you with clean needles and that just -- I don't know how to feel about that. Because you're literally just allowing people to take drugs. But also, I get you shouldn't -- if you can’t help them avoid overdosing you should. But you really just shouldn't do it in the first place.

Person A: Yeah, I mean molly before a concert is a little bit, you know, but --

Person B: Yeah. That's a less extreme example.

Person A: Right.

Person B: I know they do have it for heroin. That’s when I'm just like, “Oo, should anyone be like, ‘This is the right amount of heroin for you.’”

Person A: I know. It's hard to support. I just feel it's the lesser of two evils there. Yes, people shouldn't do heroin, but if you're already addicted to heroin and committing crimes to get more of it, and you're using dirty needles, I don't know. I tend to support legalized drug use because I feel like it'll make it -- for one thing, it will decrease it and sort of de-stigmatize it. I don't know, because I know people -- it's a legit brain illness a lot of the time, you know?

Person B: Right.

Person A: And it's hard to get medical help for what is a medical problem that a lot of the time we don't think of as a medical problem. We think of it as a personality -- like you're not strong enough, you know?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: But yeah, it's an unfortunate situation.

Person B: Yeah. That's true. That's another one where I'd -- if people are investing taxpayer money into these types of programs, I would want to know for sure it works and reduces drug use, incidents of overdose and stuff like that. Just because it seems there could be other causes where that money -- but I don't even want to say other people are more deserving because you're right, that it is a mental illness. And I don’t want to offend anyone but it's just such a gray area.

Person A: Yeah, I know. It's hard to give money to people who are -- a lot of the time drug addicts do very, very bad things. And I get where you're coming from. Yeah. I don't have enough information to say that it works, but I feel like I've read somewhere that it's better than putting people in jail for it. But yeah, I definitely need to do more research on that.

Person B: Yeah. I did agree with the thing about how if your friend is overdosing and you're too scared to call because you might get arrested. That seems really unfair. Yeah.

Person A: Yeah, I bet that would –

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Oh, I think we're done.

Person B: Okay, well, good talk.

Person A: Yeah, it was nice talking to you.

Person B: Yeah, you too.

Person A: Bye.

Person B: Bye.

# Pair 151, Support P335, Oppose P334, Condition 4 (Long Audio) - T3 – both argue for support

Person B: Okay. So, what are we discussing? We are discussing drugs. Okay. Do you oppose or support legalizing drugs in the United States?

Person A: I support legalizing drugs in the States. And I'm assuming you are opposed?

Person B: No, I'm not. I'm definitely in support.

Person A: What?

Person B: Yeah. I'm supportive of it. I mean, I support it in the sense of anything that's considered non-damaging. For example, marijuana is a much safer alternative than alcohol or nicotine or any of the other drugs that are considered bad, the harder drugs.

Person A: Yeah, definitely. I'm just wondering that they said we're supposed to have opposing views. Oh well. I totally agree with you and I think that legalizing the entire industry will uncover a lot of transactions that people pay taxes on. This is my biggest argument. I think those taxes can actually be redirected to social causes, helping people overcome addictions and stuff like that. And this is way more efficient than stigmatizing it.

Person B: Uh-huh. That’s smart. I see what you’re saying. So as opposed to shutting the problem off, kind of making more sense out of it, bringing it into the public eye, so they can take reasonable action.

Person A: Right. Yeah. This was my biggest argument, because right now the black market -- I wish I had more facts on this, and numbers -- but I know that there is a huge black market in the United States. If some of it were to come out into the light and they started paying taxes on it and they are considered receiving income, I bet we can have even less tax on income gain that would promote even more growth of the economy.

Person B: Okay. I feel that. More growth in the economy. Legalizing everything in the sense where you’re hoping to get the money out of the black market, out of the hands of people that are not supposed to be held accountable for -- right? To a certain extent?

Person A: Yeah. Also, if you legalize any kind of -- I don't really know a lot about drugs -- but in my opinion any of them can be legalized provided there was enough regulation about it. It would remove the stigma from people. If, say, a person had a drug problem and they worked -- like a lot of people in finance, I know, have drug problems because of the nature of their work and just stress and stuff like that. And so they could actually just take a leave and go join a program to get rid of the drug addiction. But this would stigmatize them for life and they will never find a job again.

Person B: Uh-huh. I see. So it's the stigma.

Person A: Yeah. As opposed to when you just say, "Okay, I need to go to rehab, I'll be back in a month," and they don't fire you because it's not illegal.

Person B: Uh-huh. I see what you're saying.

Person A: I obviously don't know much about getting rid of an addiction.

Person B: A lot of your friends in business are -- you basically found that they do that stuff in order to help maintain stress or help ease stress to a certain extent?

Person A: Not any of my friends and not in business. I'm more basing my opinion on social media and on movies.

Person B: I see. I understand.

Person A: But I can see how it's plausible. I can see how it relieves a lot of stress and also creates a social image.

Person B: That's true. Yeah, that's a good perspective. The act of socially fitting in, seeing as you are somebody that does this or does that as kind of -- people might be doing or not doing it for the right or wrong reasons. Because they might be not even aware of the full ramifications. But if we removed those, basically, those barriers from it, it'll make the ramifications more known and less stigmatized to a certain extent.

Person A: Something else occurred to me just now. Since we are exploring the example of finance, if you already broke the law doing heroin or something like that, it creates a precedent. And you already have broken the law once. So it might make it easier for you and for your consciousness to break [the] law in other things, as in commit fraud and stuff like that.

Person B: That's true. Yeah, the accountability of the individual to a certain extent becomes tarnished or becomes -- the people that do it are more held to that scrutiny. Because, for example, let's say somebody you live with is a heroin addict. They're more likely than not going to interfere with your personal stuff in the sense of maybe trying to steal something or trying to obtain something. So they can get whatever it is that they are looking for.

Person A: That’s true. Yeah. I’m trying to see if I had any other thoughts. Oh, yeah. Having drugs illegal -- I’m just literally reading from the note sheet -- it leads to predatory behavior on behalf of the sellers. Because they go after the most vulnerable people who probably are not going to report them, who would be too pressured or afraid to report them. So that's why we have all the -- or I don't know if we do, but I didn't go to high school in the United States. I'm international from Russia, and we have a drug problem there. Because they mostly can go after school children because they have some amount of money and they can steal from their parents. And at the same time, they are probably too afraid to report the sellers.

Person B: And they’re also, like you were saying earlier, easily influenced in that aspect too. They might be wanting to seem like, “Oh, they’re talking to the older people,” or there’s social reasons as to doing it as well.

Person A: Yeah, definitely. While if we legalize it, we can create the legal age for it then just --

Person B: -- regulate it more smoothly, in a sense.

Person A: Mm-hmm. And then I don't know if it works with alcohol, I wonder, but when alcohol is legal and there is a legal age, many people would prefer to just wait or at least wait until you are really close to the legal age. And then you are not doing anything wrong, as opposed to when you were told to never have alcohol. Oh, that's a problem.

Person B: Yeah. Because then I feel like your kid is going to go and try to get it or try to talk to their brother, sister, whatever.

Person A: Yeah. There is no point in waiting because there is no threshold after which it's okay.

Person B: That's interesting. I totally get what you are saying. Was it a problem in Russia a lot? That you saw?

Person A: I don't know. Right about the time I was leaving, there was a drug called 'Croc', I think.

Person B: Oh, I've heard of that. Yeah. It's very gnarly, isn't it?

Person A: It's horrible.

Person B: It's poison, basically, right?

Person A: Yeah. We are mostly talking about the U.S., but, briefly, the situation there is that in Russia, nothing really grows, definitely not weed. So the best shot you have is to get something chemical.

Person B: Right, and that can be manufactured easily to a certain extent.

Person A: Right. So I don't know if in the United States, northern states have the same problem, like in Alaska.

Person B: Sorry, I was just going to say, I just looked it up. It's called desomorphine. So it's an alteration of morphine, essentially.

Person A: Oh, we can look stuff up here?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Cool. Wow, that’s -- yeah. But morphine is used for medical purposes, right?

Person B: Yeah. But desomorphine is a subclass or altered form of morphine that doesn't interact with the body in a way that's cohesive or suitable. It actually has a very high psychological dependence liability.

Person A: Shit. Here's the other thing though. If you legalize a bunch of different kinds of drugs, your friends will inevitably have tried some. And this doesn't sound fun, what you just read to me. I feel like you'd have some peer opinions about it and you would avoid trying something shitty. And you'll end up doing good stuff, hopefully.

Person B: Yeah. I don't see why anybody would want to do this stuff. It’s something that was invented in 1930, apparently. It's a mix of codeine, iodine, and red phosphorous. You're like, “Uh, it's Russian for crocodile.”

Person A: Yeah. Well, Russian for ‘crocodile’ is also ‘krokodil.’

Person B: Oh, okay. God, Jesus Christ. Sorry, I was just looking at it. It looks gnarly, like the images and stuff of what it does to you.

Person A: I'd like to look at it. What did you Google?

Person B: Literally ‘Krokodil’ with a K. K-R-O-K-O-D-I-L. I'm not sure if that's the right spelling, but ends up spell-checking it. And you can see desomprohine --

Person A: Oh shit.

Person B: You’re just like, “Oh shit.”

Person A: Yeah. But then -- oh. Oh, that's nasty. Oh my God.

Person B: I’m literally changing the tabs. I’m like, “Oh, okay.”

Person A: Okay, yeah, I'm done with this. Right. Okay. You shouldn't have told me to look at it.

Person B: You talked about it.

Person A: Right, oh my God.

Person B: Just turn it -- press the “x” button.

Person A: Yeah, I already did. I’m reliving the memories of it.

Person B: Let’s change the subject. What are you studying?

Person A: I’m studying economics and statistics. What about you?

Person B: Oh, statistics. That’s what’s up. I’m studying physics and math. Mathematical physics.

Person A: Wow, that’s incredibly hard. I can’t do that.

Person B: I was doing lots to do with probabilities and averages in quantum mechanics, where you’re basically finding sigma squared, which is the deviation --

Person A: The variance?

Person B: Oh, the variance. Yes, the variance of distribution.

Person A: Mm-hmm.

Person B: And then sigma itself is the deviation from the average.

Person A: Yep.

Person B: But did you know? Interesting fact, I was like -- hold on, I need to look at this equation for it. I guess sigma is the average of the square of the deviation from the average.

Person A: Yeah, that’s the formula for it.

Person B: Uh-huh. Very cool. You could use delta J, right?

Person A: J? I feel like -- oh, wait. Sorry.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Oh, I think we’re done.

Person B: I can’t tell if she’s talking to us or not.
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Person A: Hello.

Person B: Hello.

Person A: How was your day?

Person B: My day’s going pretty good. How about yours?

Person A: Pretty good.

Person B: You done with classes for today?

Person A: Yeah, I finish at 12:00.

Person B: Okay. What’s your general stance on having controversial speakers speak?

Person A: I said it should be allowed but I don’t strongly agree. I was the one right below that.

Person B: Got you.

Person A: How about you?

Person B: I said I don’t think so. You know how it was negative three to plus three? I was the negative two [choice]. I feel pretty strongly about it. My basis for my part is just I kind of agree with that main statement of it being hate speech by a lot of these -- the controversial speakers that they gave examples of were Ann Coulter and Milo Yiannopoulos. Those two, I feel like their kind of speech, especially Milo Yiannopoulos’, kind of falls under hate speech trying to incite violence. And that’s not covered under the First Amendment. So I feel like their right, especially on a school campus -- because I know he had that really controversial thing last year or two years ago, having the list of students here under DACA. And claiming that, and saying that you have a list and saying that you’re going to publish it. I feel like that’s trying to incite violence. That’s my general basis. What about yours?

Person A: That makes sense. I said -- so I wasn’t really aware of this whole hate speech thing. But my general opinion was that Berkeley preaches to be this liberal environment in which free speech is tolerated. But then it bars people like Milo from speaking on campus. So I think, “Practice what you preach.” If the campus preaches equality and free speech, then it has to follow through. And it can't take sides like it did a couple of years ago when he came. I think even if you don’t support Milo or whoever else’s views, you don’t have to go. For example, the guy on Lower Sproul [Plaza] who every day preaches his opinions, he’s always there, no one listens. But he’s still allowed. His opinions are absurd sometimes, but he’s still allowed. No one kicks him off or doesn’t allow him to speak on campus.

Person B: Mm-hmm. Yeah, I feel that I definitely think that there should be speakers with different opinions, all opinions, allowed. Especially during Free Speech Week. I totally get that. I just think that -- what I wrote basically was that different opinions are important especially because one, this is a public university, so you can’t be kind of partisan really. And then second, you're right, they do preach being a school that’s open and trying to hear new sides of things. But I think there are different people that the school could bring. And I know the club that does a lot of this stuff, like the Campus Republican club and the ones more on the conservative side that do this. They’ve had good speakers speak. Last year, there was – man, I’m blanking on his name -- but they had a speaker. I actually went to this. I think personally, I’m liberal but I went to one of their conservative speeches and he was very respectful. And his opinions were very different from I feel like most of campus’ but there’s a respectful way to go about that. And having those speakers come, I feel like one, it’s better to understand people, take difference of opinions from a person who is handling it respectably, way better than from someone who is kind of trying to be controversial. And two, one of my big things too is that this is a school and one of the important parts of being at school is that students should feel safe here. And I think there were a lot of people who didn’t feel safe when he was there. I had classes cancelled when he came. And Ann Coulter didn’t even come and she was just scheduled and I had classes cancelled. Because of the protests that were happening and because people just weren’t feeling safe to be on campus. And that’s the other thing. The point of school is to learn and have your classes and actually have them happen. So I think that was a big thing. And then finally, there was this whole thing where the estimated cost of the security detail for Milo Yiannopoulos was around one million dollars. And that came from students’ tuitions and school funds. And when that’s not what a majority of the people want, it is hard to justify the use of that much money. I’m out-of-state. I know how much more out-of-state and international kids pay. I know how important and how hard it is for people to provide tuition for their kids. And then to use that for something that a majority of students see more as a hindrance than anything else, because like you said I think the school identifies primarily as liberal. And that’s not to say that we shouldn’t have conservative speakers. But someone that’s costing the school a million dollars for one speech that may even be considered hate speech is to me sounds like, “I did not pay tuition for that to be spent on him.”

Person A: But how can you know ahead of time if it’s going to be hate speech or just another speech?

Person B: I feel like they could -- so two years ago, I believe, is the first time he was here. After that one -- and this is very specifically to him -- if they had been asking, “Oh, can he come? Should he come?” You’re right. They didn’t know at that point. But in last year’s speech, he had bragged a lot about what he was going to say on social media and stuff. He was saying, “I have a list, I have a list.” I think that in and of itself was inciting fear and violence among students. And then to know the consequences of what happened two years ago when he came, all the protests that turned into riots basically. It was dangerous for students to be on campus. After that, to go ahead and risk student safety again seems like a lot. And it just seems like it’s maybe not the best way. This is an academic institution. We are not just going for, “Oh, who can garner up the most views and get the most publicity for Berkeley.” I feel like we thrive in academia. So we should probably focus on people who just have a more academic stance. He is just wrong about a lot of things too, politically, in his facts and in his speeches. So there are way more respectable conservative speakers that they could have had that I feel like people would have responded better to. I just don’t know if -- in this case these cons to me seem like they outweigh the benefits.

Person A: So I wasn’t at Berkeley when he came to campus. So could you explain what he talked about a little bit?

Person B: Mm-hmm. So last year, he basically came. He didn’t even get to speak because they had to get him off. He got all of -- stood up there, got all of three words out, and they had to get him off. And I know --

Person A: Wait, why?

Person B: Just because of the protests and the things he was saying. At that point, I think they realized way too late that what he was saying was hate speech. He had bragged about it. But at that point the school administration couldn’t just stand there while he was saying, “I have a list of DACA students.” At that point, they got it together and were like, “Yeah, he can’t be on campus because this is actually a danger.” But the first year, he was just saying – it’s like he was purposefully trying to stir stuff up. He was saying things that were very relatable to a college student environment. So he’s attacking immigrants and Mexicans. Those are people that go here, those are actual people that are hearing these things said in a place where they’re supposed to feel safe. And there was a lot of animosity and I don’t think anyone handled it well either. The Berkeley Democrats’ club were trying to – I mean people starting fires, they were kicking trash cans over, people were tipping over tables. And I think a lot of that too, my issue is that kind of animosity follows long after this controversial speaker has left. To this day, when we do Calapalooza [Club Fair] or whatever, people trash the Berkeley Conservatives table, people tip over the signs for the Cal Democrats. People do that and that’s just a matter of how much they respect that organization. And there is an extent I feel like the most important thing that a school has to do is keep its students safe.

Person A: Mm-hmm.

Person B: And for that many people to -- for no reason at all. If you wanted a speaker here that has a problem with gay marriage or has a problem with pro-choice or wants us to be a fiscally conservative society and wants us to start wars with whatever country. You can get a lot of people that can say those things. You can get a lot of people that can say them in a much more respectable way, that have that exact opinion. You don’t need these people that come here to start stuff. And that’s not a good learning environment. I completely agree with your point about needing both sides of the spectrum.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: I don't think it's fair that nothing ever happens when we have super liberal speakers here. Most of our Commencement speakers, actually all of them, all of our Commencement speakers have been, if they’re politicians, they’re always Democrats. But I think that also is what the majority is comfortable with or what the majority wants. Which is why you don’t hear this backlash against controversial liberals. This stuff may be okay in certain colleges but here I feel like it just harms more people than it helps, if you get what I mean about that.

Person A: Yeah, that makes sense.

Person B: Yeah. I do think though that this is very limited to, I'm biased and I’m kind of just seeing if this is just Milo Yiannopoulos. This is my problem with him in particular. I don’t know if all controversial speakers are the worst. But it's just kind of, why would you get someone so extremely controversial when you can have someone that’s just more respectable about it?

Person A: Yeah, yeah.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: All right. I think we’re -- are we done or?

Person A: Nice talking to you.

Person B: Yes, nice talking to you too, thanks.
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Person B: Okay. Yeah, I thought it was interesting that I got put on this one in particular because I had kind of a middle-ground opinion on it. I thought I was going to get placed on the drug one because I definitely had a stronger opinion on that one.

Person A: I think I was pretty strong on this one more so than the other ones just because -- so my opinion on it is that we shouldn't ban controversial speakers. Does your opinion differ?

Person B: Yeah. Right.

Person A: I guess I was more strong than any of the others, but I really don't have a lot of experience with it. I know Berkeley is the place where it has happened a lot, but I think that in banning people completely from speaking, it kind of creates more divide. And to make an informed opinion, you kind of need to hear both sides. So I think banning people is a little extreme.

Person B: Yeah. Yeah, I think so too. I think my stance on it generally is that you have to hold space for people, even the people whose opinions you disagree with and even the people who disagree with you in hateful ways, you know?

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: But I kind of feel like it's a different thing altogether. Like, the Ann Coulter thing I don't really care about. Like, whatever. But I think the Milo [Yiannopoulos] one was just a little different because I heard that he was going to out an undocumented student. And I think when it gets to that degree, when it actually could create violence against someone, I think that's a bannable offense. He did a talk at another university where he outed a trans woman at the school. And she got so much hate mail that she had to drop out.

Person A: Yeah, I wasn't actually familiar with that. But that's definitely something to consider. I think what qualifies as hate mail -- or not hate mail, hate --

Person B: Speech?

Person A: Hate speech. That's the word I'm looking for. I think it's sometimes kind of a misconstrued line, but there are definitely things that are clearly one thing or another. And I think there is always speculation in issues like this, like, “What could he do? What is he going to say?”

Person B: Yeah, right, that's an issue. You don't know what he is going to say.

Person A: Yeah. And then having someone, like if they were to look at or scan what he was going to say then, well, is that still free speech? Because then you are allowing him to say or her to say certain things or not say certain things.

Person B: Yeah. Right. Do you have to submit a transcript of your speech before you are going to speak somewhere? What if, I don't know, the school or organizations are like, “Oh, you can't say that, blah, blah, blah.” Yeah, I'm in this DeCal [student-run course] this semester on deconstructing Whiteness. And it's just generally about how both White people and people of color can work toward dismantling White supremacy both in yourself and in your relations with other people. But we just read this really crazy talk where this guy was at an American university in Mexico City talking with all these students who had come to Mexico to do volunteer work. And this guy gets up on stage, and he was like, “I think what you guys are doing is disgusting. I think you are just importing American imperialism into another country. I think it's just disgraceful. You should all be ashamed of yourselves.” And we were talking about that in my DeCal cracking up. Because can you imagine just being so unaware of what your speakers are going to say? You invite this anti-imperialist guy to a college campus and then he just rips your entire organization apart?

Person A: Yeah, you don't hear about it a lot. But when you do, it definitely stands out on the news.

Person B: Yeah, it really does.

Person A: What DeCal did you say that was? Deconstructing Whiteness?

Person B: Yeah, it's really cool. It's in the Ethnic Studies department.

Person A: Yeah. So I totally agree that if you don't agree with someone, you should be allowed to protest. That's part of the free speech idea, whatever opinion that might be. But I don't think the university has the right to necessarily step in and dictate whether or not -- obviously if the speaker doesn't stand for their values, like you are not going to allow a KKK speaker. But then again, it’s all about where you draw the line. I don't think a school can dictate the beliefs of its students.

Person B: Well, yeah, and I think especially a public university, too. I think a lot can go down on private campuses because they just have different rules about how things work. I went to Catholic school growing up and --

Person A: Oh, I did too. Yeah.

Person B: Yeah. Oh you did?

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: So I grew up in the Bay Area. And when I was a junior or senior in high school, the Archbishop rewrote the teacher contract for all of the elementary, middle and the Catholic high schools in the Bay Area and made it so that teachers couldn't be openly gay.

Person A: Jeez.

Person B: Which I know, it's just so crazy to reflect that even could be legal, but it's a private institution. They are church-run schools, so they can do whatever they want. And the argument at the end of the day was, yeah, it's hateful and it's really terrible. But you don't have to send your kid to Catholic school if you don't want to.

Person A: Yeah. Exactly.

Person B: Yeah, which I thought was a really wild thing about free speech. But then also -- I don't know what the word I'm thinking of -- just like the separation of private institutions and how there are just different rules about what can go down.

Person A: Yeah. And I think that ties in well to this argument. Because if you don't agree with someone, you don't have to go see them. You can disagree and protest if you feel really adamantly against what they have to do. But I think shutting them down is then like -- you could then look at it like -- again, it keeps coming back to where is the line drawn? But what if there's something you are passionate about that someone else doesn't -- do they have the right to shut that down?

Person B: Yeah, totally. Yeah, the police even have to provide security at White nationalist events. You see photos from the Skokie march in Illinois I think. And it's all of these actual Nazis walking down the street. But there is a police presence because they have to protect these people.

Person A: Have you seen BlacKkKlansman?

Person B: Yeah, I saw with my parents a couple of weeks ago.

Person A: I just saw and it's top three of my favorite movies for right now.

Person B: Yeah. It's such a good movie.

Person A: I was thinking it was going to be a comedy and then at the end I was like, “Oh my God.”

Person B: Right, when they actually start showing the real clips of the Carolina March.

Person A: Yeah, seriously. I was touring Virginia actually at that time.

Person B: Oh wow. Holy shit.

Person A: I was there two days after. And all my friends saw me on the Snap Map and they're like, “Yo, what are you doing in Charlottesville?” I'm like, “No, it's not what you think, it's not what you think.”

Person B: Wow. What was the mood like when you were there?

Person A: It was eerie and I’m curious as to whether or not it threw off my experience of UVA [University of Virginia]. They addressed it right away. They were like, “We don't stand for this,” which I think is the right way to handle something you disagree with, even if -- as opposed to banning it. If Berkeley didn't want Milo, they could have sent out an email saying we don't necessarily agree with his views, but we want to express all the views of everyone who attend this university, you know?

Person B: Right.

Person A: But yeah, they addressed it. But even the campus was just eerie. I feel like it wasn't very busy. But I'll always be able to say that I was there. Not -- I wasn't actually there, but I was around there during that time.

Person B: Yeah, right. Yeah, I would imagine that people wouldn't be in a really celebratory mood because that woman died, right?

Person A: Yep. Yeah. Run over. Yeah.

Person B: Wow. That's horrible. Were you on campus for the Milo stuff or were you not here yet?

Person A: No, I wasn't here yet. Were you?

Person B: Yeah, I was. Yeah, I'm a senior now.

Person A: Okay.

Person B: But yeah, there was so much buzz about it in the days and hours leading up to it. And I was hanging out with my friends and I was like, “Do you want to go see the --,” because there was supposed to be a quote-unquote “dance protest” in Sproul [Plaza].

Person A: Of course. Because it's Berkeley. Yep.

Person B: Because it's Berkeley and it was supposed to be this kind of joyful rejection of what Milo stood for.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: But we were like, “Oh yeah, you want to go see what the dance protest is?” And then it just turned demonic really quick. Someone knocked over those really big police lamps that are like, tree height, those flood lights basically.

Person A: Yeah, yeah.

Person B: Someone knocked one of those over and it caught on fire. And it started burning down the trees by the MLK [building].

Person A: Oh, Jesus.

Person B: Yeah. And then all these people were dancing in front of the fire and there was this music playing and people chanting. It felt like I was at a cult thing, but it was the counter protests. It wasn't the people you would expect doing this. Yeah, it was really wild. I still have the videos on my phone. I'll be scrolling back, trying to find some things from a couple years ago and be like, “Oh holy shit, I witnessed this happen.” And then all of these people, like my family members, teachers from high school, and friends on the other side of the country texted me. They're like, “Are you on campus right now?” Yeah.

Person A: Yeah. I remember seeing that on the news and I didn't really understand. Again that time, I think I was a sophomore or junior in high school. And I kind of understood what was going on, but I was like, “Why is this a big deal?”

Person B: Yeah, right.

Person A: Again, I think I held the same views. He should be allowed to speak, and people should be allowed to protest. But again, with something so polarizing, it's events like that that create a lot of controversy in terms of just the protests themselves, what happened at them.

Person B: Yeah, totally. Yeah. A lot of my family lives on the East Coast, in New Jersey. And my uncle texted me being like, “How are things at ‘Berzerkeley?’”

Person A: Yeah. Oh, when I told people I was coming here, I got so much shit for just --

Person B: Yeah, I bet.

Person A: Like, “Oh, you are going to come back a crazy liberal?” And I was like, “Oh, I have the beliefs I have now.” And again, I talked about earlier, I don't think a university should dictate the beliefs of its students.

Person B: Yeah, yeah, I don’t either.

Person A: I feel like I'm adamant about that. I can kind of keep my views separate from what's here on campus, or what's kind of subliminally supported.

Person B: Yeah, right. I was joking with -- I can't remember, I don't know, one of my friends or something the other day that I came to Berkeley and I started working at an anarchist archive, and then I realized I was gay. And it just turned into a stereotype.

Person A: Yeah, yeah. I’m sure --

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Oh, I think our time is over. It was great talking to you. I think we had a good conversation.

Person B: Yeah. It was nice talking to you too.

Person A: Yeah, see you.

Person B: Yeah. All right. Okay, bye.

Person A: Bye.
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Person A: All right. Do you want to go first?

Person B: Sure. Okay, so my opinion on legalizing drugs is that I oppose it because I believe -- I had five main reasons why it wouldn't be a good idea. First of all, obviously, health effects, because taking all these different types of drugs, you are not fully conscious of what you are doing. Other health effects, like with cognition, especially if you are younger, that could affect you in the future. And obviously addiction, especially if mentally ill people had access to dangerous drugs. It wouldn't be good for them and their health. And it would be dangerous for the people around them and to themselves. The second reason was drugs are related to other crimes that are prevalent such as drug trafficking, sex trafficking, things like that, for those with evil intentions, because it is a big business. And also related to the health effects, it would lead to more accidents just like alcohol is one of the leading factors for car accidents. Now, if they had access to other drugs that lead to a lower --like your cognition is less so -- it would lead to accidents relating with machines and cars obviously. And then another reason was kids getting involved with drugs while they're young, which will affect their health, socially, their education, things like that. And then lastly, it would be really dramatic onto the market if this suddenly becomes legal. It would be a really big business. Those who are already in the business now, because it's illegal, would have an advantage over those not, too. And there would have to be new laws and new regulations to kind of regulate this new business. So those are all my things.

Person A: Yeah, I want to preface my position by saying that I kind of didn't feel super strongly on this topic to begin with. Mostly because I feel like I don't really have enough knowledge on this topic and all of its consequences and implications to sort of have a strong enough position to really debate it, you know?

Person B: Yeah, yeah.

Person A: But I do -- just in my sort of personal experiences, which is again, kind of few. So I went on a service trip in the Tenderloin district of San Francisco in high school. And we sort of had a chance to talk with some people who were the leaders of certain organizations that are trying to help out the very large homeless population in that area of San Francisco. And a lot of them are affected by drug addiction, the sort of drugs that we are talking about. And they felt very strongly that having certain places around the city, certain tents where people could legally and comfortably shoot up and use these drugs. They felt as though that has had a positive effect on people who were experiencing those addictions in the past when that sort of program has been implemented. I can't remember where they said that they had those kind of tents, but I -- yeah, I don't want to say because I'm not sure. But so I guess the sort of idea there is just that the nature of bodily addictions, when you kind of expect somebody just to go cold turkey or to sort of ban it completely, it can be less effective than expected because it kind of takes a little bit more of a weaning off, I think was the idea. I also just read an article last year. I think it was called, “How addiction is not to be categorized as a moral failure,” but I don't remember where it was published. But it was kind of just about how the way that our system is set up is kind of punishing people with addiction. Yeah. And it's like -- when a lot of the reason that they are kind of in that situation is circumstance. And some people are kind of brought up in homes that are more likely to lead to those kinds of addictions. And some people aren't. And it was also touching upon the neurological tendencies of individual people, and why they are more likely to become addicted and things like that. And I guess it was just implying that the current approach to dealing with these people who are dealing with these addictions is the punishment approach. Like just kind of throwing people into prison and hoping that the punishment is enough to send them back out and get them back on their feet. Whereas it's been proven because there is a sort of cyclical nature of a lot of people with these addictions, that they kind of just go to prison, and then they come out and nothing really changes. And I guess it was just saying that rehabilitation could be more of a productive means to, yeah, sort of saving their lives. But I definitely understand what you're saying about sort of, if we legalize it, then what does it mean for society as a whole, right? It's not just about these micro cases of people who are already addicted. It's like, how does the accessibility of illegal drugs affect children and people who aren't already caught in this cycle of addiction? And I'm not sure if I have the answers to that. But I guess it was just the reason why I said rehabilitation might be a better solution. It’s because that's just what I've experienced personally.

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: But yeah, I don't know.

Person B: Yeah. No, I agree completely. Rehab should be a bigger part of, I don't know -- they totally criminalized certain drugs and stuff. And I feel like rehab would be a better approach to these things and obviously it's racially profiled as well and things like that. But yeah, that's really cool how you got -- I've never -- places where they can -- yeah, because going cold turkey, not everybody has the resources to go to a good rehab center and stuff like that.

Person A: That's true, that's true, yeah. For sure, I think that it kind of feels like a blend of these two. That's why I also found answering this question difficult. I don't know. I don't necessarily think that legalizing these drugs is a good solution, but I do think that better rehabilitation programs would be a good solution. So it's like I'm just wondering if there's a way that those two positions could sort of meld.

Person B: Yeah, yeah, yeah. I don't know. Yeah, I feel like making it more of a public health thing and less so a criminal type of thing would be better. Obviously, that's just changing the public view of drugs and stuff like that.

Person A: Mm-hmm. Yeah, this is maybe rightfully so, but yeah, there's definitely a stigma surrounding -- like considering even marijuana, that kind of took a long time. And they are not terribly similar at all. So it's like, I don't know, I have a really hard time imagining a future where the mass society is okay with legalizing drugs like these.

Person B: Yeah, yeah. But I thought it was interesting in the survey when they were talking about Portugal did that. I don’t know, Portugal feels like it's really small and it's not as much of political clout and stuff like that. I don't know, it's a different situation over there, I feel like, than if it was America. America is huge, it has way more issues, different issues. Stuff like that.

Person A: Right. And different perspectives because it's just so big. Yeah. I feel like that applies to a lot of the sort of political opinion things we are discussing. I think that a lot of places get used as an example for America to follow, like universalized healthcare and things like that. And I respect those opinions but it also -- what you're saying is true. It's like, do we really feel that will translate and have the same results here given how fragmented everybody is here? Yeah, I don't know.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: It's tough.

Person B: Yeah, yeah. People are always talking about how, oh yeah, in the Netherlands, or Sweden or whatever, they have all these good things. But it just wouldn't work here. It's not homogenous. It's not -- I don't know. There are way more classes, it’s a melting pot, and all these things.

Person A: Right, yeah. It's something to be accounted for when you are trying to make -- and I think that’s maybe something that can be applied to this question too. A lot of things might be more effective if they are kind of implemented in increments. I think it’s something that could be considered. I think that a lot of the issues that we are talking about here are very revolutionary, very, “Let's just take it all down and start from scratch.” And I feel like, yeah, maybe something like what we're discussing right now, melding the ideas of rehabilitation but also keeping the drugs inaccessible to people. That's the kind of thing that would have to be broken down into smaller parts.

Person B: Mm-hmm. Yeah, definitely smaller. Because we would have to look at where it's most -- like the inner cities where it's most problematic and stuff like that. And then start from there, test it out, but also it really depends on where you are.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Okay, okay. Sorry, I have to hang up.

Person B: Okay, yeah.

# Pair 237, Support P505, Oppose P504, Condition 4 (Long Audio), Agreement 0

Person B: Okay, Hello.

Person A: Okay. Hi, I'm [name redacted]. Very nice talking to you.

Person B: Okay. So do you oppose or support requiring government reparations for slavery?

Person A: Yeah, I support it. How about you?

Person B: I oppose it.

Person A: Okay. So shall I give the reasons I support it, and then you can tell me the reason why you don't support it and we can go from there?

Person B: Should we just go one reason by one reason or just like --

Person A: Yeah, we can go one reason by one reason.

Person B: Just so we can have more of a conversation about it.

Person A: Yeah, sure. Okay.

Person B: All right, go for it.

Person A: Okay. So I think the government should make the society a more equal place. And to help all the different background of people live a happy life. And this is what government can easily help with these Black Americans to live a better life by giving them some financial support. Yeah.

Person B: Okay. So yeah, I agree with you like that. I think the government should help everybody live happy and should help try to abolish racism. I kind of just didn't think that money would be really the answer.

Person A: Why didn’t you?

Person B: Because people can take money and be like, “Ah thanks.” A lot of these Black Americans are living in communities that don't really support a lot of good habits. So I think a better way -- rather than just giving like, “Oh your ancestor was a slave, let me give you money.” I think a reason why I oppose these is because I think that there's a better way to do it. Like the social support for pretty much everyone living in poverty and uneducated and who are facing racism, because it's also not only something facing Black Americans, but also Latinx Americans and Asian Americans. Like there are lots of different ethnicities that I think --

Person A: Yeah. I completely see where you are coming from.

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: And there's a lot more that government can do apart from giving money to them. But from what I can see, money is one element that government can support these people, as well as other elements that we can bring into these communities. And as you talked about education, I was thinking that the level of education a child can receive is highly related to the wealth of a family. Like if you're from a more wealthy family, you can get better education from very early on. While compared to these Black Americans, they can't have the equal opportunities from very early on. And then if they don't have very good education, they can't earn as much money as these White Americans. So it's the kind of dilemma that money would be able to help if they receive these kinds of fund from very young, and they can get a better education, that kind of thing. But of course, the government can help them with a better education system.

Person B: Yeah. I definitely agree with that. I'm also thinking about not only as Black Americans, because there are other people who can benefit from better education systems. So rather than just giving the Black Americans who are descendants from slaves money, they could just go in into those low-income neighborhoods and help make a better school. Because more than just those Black Americans would benefit from that, and not necessarily all Black Americans are low-income [and] facing those difficulties. So I think just to make it easier and I'd say more fair to everyone's background, I definitely think that bringing up schools would be great. But that doesn't necessarily need to come -- the money doesn't need to go through the families of Black Americans. It could just go straight from the government to the schools.

Person A: Mm-hmm, yeah. I completely agree with your point of view. And I also think there could be some criteria for people. If they meet the criteria, they can receive some money and they would possibly have to report what they have been using with the money. And what's the outcome of the money the government gave them. I think that's the kind of way to healthily invest these money in these communities and help better social life for these people.

Person B: Yeah. That's something that I actually wrote down in my notes was also, how would we regulate what they spend this money on. Because if we are giving them money to help mend some of the negative feelings about slavery, it shouldn't just be like, “Oh here's money. Go ahead, buy whatever you want with it.” So yeah, I definitely agree with you on there should be some sort of regulation if that's a thing.

Person A: Yeah. So I think actually we agree on this point rather than disagree.

Person B: Uh-huh.

Person A: So there definitely should be something government need to do for these communities. And then money is one of the elements that needs to be regulated, while there are some elements that government can do to help.

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: Yeah?

Person B: Yeah. Yeah, I definitely think we agree. I just think that the part where -- I guess you kind of agree with me too there. Like the fact that -- the reason why I noted that I oppose this is because I don't think it's necessarily for slavery. I think it's just for racism in general and the inequalities that we see in this world. While definitely some of them are related to slavery, not all of them are. And some of like -- it's just more complicated than just slavery I’d say.

Person A: Definitely. Cool.

Person B: Cool.

Person A: I think that’s a very good conversation.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: We’ve helped with this research very well.

Person B: Yeah, cool, cool. Let me think, I’m looking at my notes. I think I hit on all of my things I was going to hit on.

Person A: Yeah, so here on my notes, I’ve got some stories of my background.

Person B: Yeah, go for it.

Person A: So I was born in China, and because China was founded very late compared to America. It was 1949. And we had our social evolution, like our economic evolution, in the 1980s.

Person B: Oh, wow.

Person A: Yeah, so my parents’ generation, their lives were very different to our generations’ lives.

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: So we can see the benefit of the social evolution. So I definitely wish these -- like slavery or other, Latin American or Mexican American -- these people’s lives can become better by different social evolutions.

Person B: Mm-hmm, yeah. So you have that hope, which is awesome.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Did you grow up in China?

Person A: Yeah, I grew up in China until I was 20.

Person B: Oh, okay. Wow, cool.

Person A: Then I went to the UK for ten years.

Person B: Okay.

Person A: And I moved to America recently.

Person B: Oh, awesome.

Person A: Oh yeah, how about you?

Person B: I grew up actually pretty close around here. I grew up in the East Bay, in Danville. It’s near Walnut Creek.

Person A: Okay.

Person B: Yeah, I don’t really know -- definitely don’t have that cool of a story. My mom has a kind of dope rag to riches success story. She grew up in Vallejo which is kind of a really ghetto town in the North Bay. And she moved out of her house when she was 18. She’s held her own jobs since she was 14, and so she’s just kind of worked her entire life to get what she wants. And so, yeah, like I said she worked and put her way through community college, and now is a dental hygienist in my town. And my town is a very -- like people say, “Danville, oh, it’s a bubble. It’s a very rich-kid town.” Like I have a famous rapper who lives in the neighborhood next to me. But like, so I come from a very well-off area, but I come from a different story than that. So I’ve always been taught to work for stuff, and if you are well-off, be generous enough to share it with those around you. Because we are close to Oakland and to other kind of lower-income areas, so yeah.

Person A: Yeah, that’s pretty good. I live in Emeryville, so it’s not too far from Oakland.

Person B: Uh-huh.

Person A: I have not been to -- you’re from Walnut Creek, isn’t it?

Person B: It’s right by Walnut Creek.

Person A: Yeah, so I haven’t been there. But I can tell the difference if I go to the border of Emeryville and Oakland. There’s definitely something the government can do.

Person B: Mm-hmm. My high school and even my middle school too, for Halloween we’d always go to an elementary school in Oakland and help them go through the Halloween parade and bring them gifts. And then we’d go back on Christmas and bring them Christmas gifts and stuff. And one of the coolest things that we did was with the fifth graders. One time we all -- this was in my senior year -- so we all brought in t-shirts from the colleges we were going to. We got to give it to a fifth grader and be like, “You have the opportunity. You can go to college.” Like just instilling that dream in them. And they were so excited to get a Cal Bears t-shirt or like -- there were a bunch of different schools that they got, and it was just super cool to see that hope because that’s not something that they’re used to being told. Like probably a lot of their parents have never gone to university. So.

Person A: Exactly, I completely agree with you because I did similar things before. When I was in the UK, we went to a very poor area in London, and we went to a few schools to read books with these students and show them what they can become in the future. I don’t know if that would make an impact in the future in their lives. But definitely if we continue doing what we are doing, it will make some change.

Person B: Uh-huh. Yeah, I definitely agree. It’s hard to figure out exactly what the best way is. Because everyone’s like, “Oh, education, education,” but it’s not necessarily like -- I’m in a fellowship right now, and one of the design challenges that we are doing is about creating a video game to help educate children ages 11 to 14 who are in low-income, single-parent households, to teach them about healthy relationships and topics such as domestic violence. So me and my group were talking about it, and education is such big part of it but there’s more than that. It’s a structural feeling, I feel, for a lot of the issues.

Person A: Yeah, I’m so happy that you are doing all sorts of things too.

Person B: Thank you.

Person A: That’s very good. So are you [an] undergraduate student here?

Person B: Mm-hmm, yeah I am. I’m studying cognitive science here.

Person A: That’s great.

Person B: What about you?

Person A: What year are you in?

Person B: I’m a junior.

Person A: Right.

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: I’m on my career break this year with Berkeley Extension.

Person B: Oh, okay.

Person A: Yeah, so I worked six years already in the UK.

Person B: Okay, yeah, yeah. So what did you do there?

Person A: I was an auditor with Deloitte for four years, and then I worked for Walgreens two years. Yeah.

Person B: Oh, okay. Cool. Awesome. And what are you doing here? You said you’re on your break?

Person A: Career break, yeah. I’m doing some studies with UC Berkeley Extension.

Person B: Mm-hmm. What are you studying here?

Person A: Business administration.

Person B: Okay.

Person A: Yeah, so there are some good lecturers.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Oh actually, that’s the end of it. Very nice speaking to you.

Person B: Oh, cool. Nice speaking to you too.

Person A: Nice chat. See you later.

Person B: See you.
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Person B: Okay, so this is a very weighted topic. So what do you think?

Person A: I definitely think this is a hard topic. I also don't know enough about the topic to have a really strong stance, but I thought that there was a way that there could be some type of government reparations for slavery. But it didn't necessarily need to be like a payment back to anyone whose family might have been involved.

Person B: Exactly. I feel the same way. So I mean the points that I wrote down -- let's consider slaves to mostly be African Americans, right?

Person A: Mm-hmm.

Person B: Current African Americans are a lot of generations down from the slaves, and basically they are not suffering from policies that were in place during their lifetime. And so because of that, I feel like it's going to be unfair to non-slaves that suffered from generational economic disadvantage. There are non-African Americans that are in a worse economic disadvantage because of generational issues, and so just paying those generations after the slaves would be unfair to them. So I think the best solution in this case would just be affirmative action. I am pro affirmative action. I think by -- there are studies that show that if you’re in the lower fifth of the economy, by going to college you will be placed in the top two-fifths of the economy. And if you're in the top two-fifth, then you would go down a tiny bit because of the cost of college. So I think affirmative action and college degrees in general, the combination of the two really rebalance these generational economic disadvantages that were caused by slavery.

Person A: Well I wrote affirmative action too. I think it's one of the best government initiatives that can be undertaken for repercussions of slavery. So my reasoning for why I would not completely support government reparations for slavery was that, also like you said, there are a lot of other minority groups or people that have been put at a disadvantage in more recent years for which we’re not accounting. So people that might have gone through genocides or have any other type of historical disadvantages are not being supported either. But like you said, I think there are programs that could be -- I think one of the main things is acknowledgement. I think that one of the things the government could do would be to make these initiatives or programs that would just acknowledge one of the main things that -- I wouldn't know as I'm not African American, but they -- it would be -- it's awful for a community that has gone through such hardships to not even be recognized. So programs that could acknowledge the mess and do something about it without it being just monetary. So again, initiatives such as affirmative action. Because I think the problem with slavery is that it created a deep-rooted vision of African Americans as inferior in the United States, which is a big problem that people talk about but is not really being tackled. So as we can see, a lot of the housing and education and jobs that are the most inferior are often held by minorities, including African Americans. And so through “government reparations,” and I say this in quotations because I wouldn't call what I'm about to say as a monetary reparation, but still, the initiatives and any type of -- I guess they do for various communities, some types of funds or scholarships that are in remembrance, I guess. Or in homage to --

Person B: In relation maybe?

Person A: Yeah. In relation or -- exactly, in relation to the past, and so that people can still be proud of the history of how far they've come, of how we've abolished slavery. And yeah, if that make sense.

Person B: Yeah, that makes sense.

Person A: To have a more lasting impact on the vision of different communities within the United States.

Person B: Yeah, exactly. And I feel like currently the government is in the right direction. I mean maybe not so much anymore with the new administration, because they're going against affirmative action and similar policies designated to help those underrepresented minorities or disadvantaged minorities. But I feel like the government, at this pace, is really helping rebalance those disadvantages.

Person A: Exactly.

Person B: And I feel like there should be even -- I mean, not more pressure on this issue. I feel like if we assert more pressure on the issue then there might be backlash and it might throw off the balance. I just feel like, give it a couple of generations and it'll do its job really well.

Person A: Exactly. And maybe not put too much pressure -- like you said, not more pressure. I was just reading an article in the Economist that was this huge debate about affirmative action. So I don't think there needs to be more push, but I think there should be more implementation of it. So it's great that people are looking into it and willing to do it, but I think there's not enough implementation. Again, I don't have exact numbers and don't know how well it's working, but I feel like it's something I hadn't heard of much before.

Person B: I feel like it's working in a lot of private schools. There is this -- have you heard of the new Supreme Court case against Harvard?

Person A: No, I have not.

Person B: So they're suing -- there was a class action lawsuit against Harvard by a lot of Asians saying that they are biased towards minorities. And so basically Harvard is fighting them back saying that they don't care what they think, that they're going to continue helping out the disadvantaged minorities in the college application process. And I feel like even if they lose the case, they're going to continue doing that because they're a private institution. Right? So a lot of the ideals are already firmly rooted into a lot of these private organizations. And so as long as those are firmly rooted in these organizations, other organizations are going to follow through. Especially with them being so important in the educational community.

Person A: Right.

Person B: The only universities that aren't implementing this are the UC’s, which are not implementing affirmative action.

Person A: Two percent of our student population is African American. Can you imagine?

Person B: Yeah, that's pretty bad. I mean I don't know if it's bad or not. The whole situation right now is bad. It's bad that we had to get to this point. It's bad that we had to put minorities in disadvantage, that we have to do this, because right now it is going to be unfair to a lot of Asian Americans, right?

Person A: Mm-hmm.

Person B: So it is a bad situation nonetheless, but at least we're going in the right direction and we hope someday the UC’s might follow through.

Person A: Right. But we are acknowledging it. I think you're right. So it's funny because this article I was reading about in the Economist just led to so much debate about affirmative action, because I think there's a lot of positive but there's also a lot of negatives to the process. So like you said, for Asian Americans who might've worked really hard and then just because they're not considered as much of a minority that needs affirmative action, they might be less likely to get into schools. So there are so much pros and cons, but then again, how do you come up with a perfect plan to prevent [these] minorities as being inferior and less represented and having less upper accessibility to universities as well?

Person B: Yeah. I guess as soon as representation in education gets close to the actual demographics of the United States where, like say there are X percentage of the United States [that are] Black and then X percent of university college students are Black or minorities. If the ratios are the same, if they're represented proportionally, at that point the government could look into reducing the effects of affirmative action. But even in that case, affirmative action is still a guideline. Private universities can continue to go and recruit more minorities, and that's because they have their own logic of the college admissions process. Some say that more diversity creates more community and that’s -- I don't know. They have their own logic, which I guess works given that their universities are doing so well.

Person A: But isn't there a problem? Then also wouldn't the problem be rooted back to education in general, like at the primary level or the high school level even? So that people would come into college with the same capabilities? Because often times when looking for diversity, you have people that might be more qualified but because they're overrepresented in the community, are not considered?

Person B: I think that works its way out well -- not “well,” but it's not too bad considering that, if they are good at what they do -- let's say the classic example of computer science, right? If they are really good at computer science and they don't get into a good school, and they end up at a school that has a less achieved pool of computer scientists, they are going to perform better in that pool compared to a better pool, say Berkeley or a better university. So they're going to have a higher GPA. They're going to have better job prospects from that university compared to the other people from that university.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: It was good meeting you.

Person A: Oh, are we done?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Oh, it was good meeting you too.
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Person A: Okay. So.

Person B: Do you want to go first?

Person A: Yeah, sure. I mean I can offer my own opinions. I think that it's kind of important to have controversial speakers on campus. I would try to think of it in a more generalized sense, not necessarily like that one guy Milo Yiannopoulos or whatever his name is or Ann Coulter. But it's important to represent the diversity and reflection of the political views of people in real life. So I'll just start with that. And then yeah. So can you explain -- I have a lot of number of reasons why, but do you want to explain why -- I don't know -- if you're in favor or against it?

Person B: Well I think my central point when I said I'd prefer not to have controversial speakers on campus is more of if the controversial opinion is centered on say, like hate speech or some extreme opinion that's really hurting people's feelings. Then definitely not. I actually do agree with you that it's good to have speakers of diverse opinions on campus to speak about them, but there is a decision to be made whether how controversial or how extreme this opinion definitely is.

Person A: Yeah. Well, okay. I will say that if we're going back to using Ann Coulter or whatever as an example -- the thing is, in the grand scheme of things, she's not actually that extreme. Okay, this is coming from me where I have my own personal experience growing up in relatively polarized environments.

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: But she's actually not -- honestly all things considered -- not as extreme, which sounds crazy, I know. But yeah, that's not the point. The thing is you mentioned not hurting people's feelings, but I sort of feel like -- I get it. I understand you don't want things to be too distressing for other students. But at the same time, I feel like there's a lot of facts about life, a lot of truths that we have to live with that aren't -- or a lot of other people's opinions that aren't pleasant, you know? And the thing is, this is a university. So my idea is that it's a home for ideas, and it's the idea to represent the population of the country and the student body that we have. So the good news about campus speakers is that, unlike a lot of other unfortunate events in life, is that if you don't like them or if it's hurting your feelings, you can avoid them. But I do understand your concerns about hate speech and things like that, because that's definitely a problem.

Person B: Right, for sure. I'm actually running out of things to say. I'm not actually so invested in political opinions and stuff. Well I'm an Asian American, so I did have experience with hate speech and stuff. And there were -- well this is not really regarding that, but like some -- I've had really bad words [stuck] on my dorm room and stuff. So I had like a personal experience with hate speech and all that, so that's probably why I took the stand of not allowing controversial speakers to speak on campus. But I do understand where you come from.

Person A: That's really horrible that happened to you. Geez. Was that in relationship with the speakers coming to campus or is that just like -- yeah.

Person B: It happened around that time, so I'm guessing that was one of the reasons.

Person A: No, that's really awful. Yeah. No, I'm an Asian American too, so I get that's nasty. That is awful. I hate it when that happens. And the worst part is that it's when it happens, not if it happens.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: The thing is living in the U.S., it's probably going to happen. But the thing is, I would say that racism is not automatically inclusive with certain political points of view. I know in the Bay a lot of people tend to have this opinion that like, “Oh, if you're not a liberal, or if you're not a Democrat,” then you automatically have a certain number of attributes just automatically attributed to you that could be positive or negative, you know?

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: Yeah, and it's not good. It’s not true.

Person B: Well I feel like that's a totally different topic sort of, because whichever party you support has nothing to do with say like whether you support some of the really extreme views that they take.

Person A: Yeah, absolutely. Yeah. Yeah, that's so true. Yeah, and do you have anything else to say?

Person B: I don't know, did we come to an agreement? I think we agree. Like we can understand and actually agree on some of our points of view.

Person A: Well I think our points of view had more in common than it had different. But I think we probably still have very fundamentally different views, but I think they overlap quite a bit.

Person B: Yeah, yeah.

Person A: Excellent.

Person B: Okay, so we have six more minutes to kill.

Person A: Yeah, well anyway, are you a student here? I’m just going to ask questions about you now.

Person B: Yeah. I’m a third year MCB [Molecular and Cell Biology] major here.

Person A: That’s so cool. Nice.

Person B: What about you?

Person A: I’m a second-year intended cognitive science student.

Person B: Oh wow, cool. I’ve been hearing about Cog Sci as like a meme thing associated with CS.

Person A: You’re not wrong, yeah. There’s a whole meme: it’s all “What are you?,” “CS,” “Oh which one?,” “It’s like Chicano studies.”

Person B: It’s so bad.

Person A: Yeah, but I really like it though.

Person B: What exactly is Cog Sci? Or like what type of courses or curriculum is it structured on?

Person A: Well good question. Well, so it’s like this interdisciplinary major, so it’s not like one concrete study. I mean I guess it is in a way, but it’s not like one study as in like, “Computer science you just focus on computers.” Or like MCB it’s like, “Oh Molecular and Cell Biology.” So it’s the study of human cognition, like how we understand the world around us and how we think. So it includes aspects of linguistics, computer science, neuroscience, philosophy -- I think there’s one more but I can’t remember. Yeah so it’s a lot of different things that all combine together to study how people think.

Person B: Oh wow, it sounds really cool.

Person A: Yeah, yeah. I really like it.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: What’s your concentration in -- or do you have one in MCB?

Person B: Yeah, my concentration is on immunology.

Person A: That’s so cool. So like diseases and vaccines and stuff?

Person B: Yeah, yeah, absolutely.

Person A: Wow.

Person B: I did a research using CRISPR. If you don’t know that, it’s like a --

Person A: Oh, I know what it is. Yeah.

Person B: Yeah, yeah. It’s really cool, and our concentration is actually targeting the antigens in the human bodies, and try and see if we can alter some of the genes, and see if the antibody and anti-gene will have some changes.

Person A: That’s so cool. Oh my God. Yeah, I remember when CRISPR first became a thing I was watching a video on it, and it was the coolest, coolest thing ever. It’s so awesome that you get to work with it.

Person B: Yeah, and it was so funny that -- my mom watched a movie during the summer, it’s called Rampage. And if you’ve ever heard of that, in the movie these scientists use CRISPR to genetically alter the genome of an ape, and somehow make the ape like a super-monster or something. Like my mom literally tagged me on Snapchat [and] was like, “You have to see this.”

Person A: That’s hilarious.

Person B: Yeah, yeah.

Person A: Wait, your mom has a Snapchat?

Person B: Yeah. We Snapchat each other a lot.

Person A: That’s so cute, oh my gosh. Yeah. My mom barely has social media at all. But yeah, that’s so cool that your mom knows what it is and it’s getting in the media now. That’s awesome.

Person B: Yeah, yeah. I’m really happy that this is -- MCB is a really concentrated topic, and it’s so specific on this part of science and I was afraid that my parents won’t really understand why I’m studying it and what exactly it is. And when she Snapchatted it, I was like, “Oh you actually know something.”

Person A: Like “Good job, mom.”

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: That is so cool, yeah. And it’s good that she does know about that because like, my parents still don’t even know what major I am. Well they know, but they forget it and they don’t know what it is like 90 percent of the time. So it’s so cool that she’s getting involved like that.

Person B: Yeah, yeah. How was your summer?

Person A: Oh, it was fun. I didn’t really do any -- I didn’t work or anything. I applied for four internships, which I realize now it’s not that many to apply for. But I applied for four, and I got zero which was great. So instead I worked at a day camp with some kids, and then I like -- yeah. I went to a camp just for teenagers and I learned how to wakeboard, so that was cool.

Person B: Oh wow, that sounds really cool.

Person A: Yeah, it was. It was a lot of fun. How was your summer?

Person B: It was good. I worked in the lab that I told you about, and when I’m not working in lab I just go on like road trip with friends.

Person A: That’s so cool, where’d you go?

Person B: So it was a lab back in China. So I lived near Shanghai, so we’d just go around little towns that’s not like, say Trip Advisor or a major visiting travelling site. We just go there and see it with our own eyes what’s in there, what’s fun over there. How the food’s like. That kind of stuff.

Person A: Wow, I bet that must have been so fun. Like I bet the food was super good. Or, yeah. So, you’re from China?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Oh, that’s awesome. That’s cool. Yeah, I’m from really close to here. I’m from like -- like my house is forty minutes from here. So.

Person B: Dang. Do you get to go home every weekend or something?

Person A: I mean I could if I wanted to, but I don’t always want to.

Person B: You want to be away from home?

Person A: Yeah. I mean, because it’s nice -- because I was like spent -- okay, when I was younger, I spent a lot of time at home. Like for the first two years of high school I was actually homeschooled by my -- I did a school program at my home instead of going to school. So I think I’ve spent enough time at home. All things considered.

Person B: Oh, wow. Yeah, yeah, sounds cool.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: I have roommates from like San Francisco area, and they always go home for the weekend so it’s just me and like, two other people. It gets lonely.

Person A: Oh, but isn’t it kind of nice that you have your place to yourself?

Person B: That’s also true. That’s a good point.

Person A: Yeah, because I have -- you said it’s you and two other people and then you have --how many people are in your house? I’m trying to figure it out. Like I can’t count.

Person B: Well, we have five people in a two-bedroom apartment, but the living room is separate to its own so we converted that into another bedroom.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: I think it’s done.

Person B: Ah, it was nice talking to you.

Person A: It’s nice talking to you too.
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Person A: Okay, so I don’t know -- did you want to go first and let me know what you think?

Person B: Okay, fine. I’ll go first then.

Person A: All right.

Person B: My stance on legalizing drugs is that I don’t want to legalize drugs. I feel like I oppose legalizing drugs in the U.S.

Person A: Mm-hmm.

Person B: And I have three major reasons for that. But before I begin to note my reasons, what is your stance on legalizing drugs? Are you against it or do you support it?

Person A: I feel like I take kind of a complex stance because I don’t -- I mean I generally support the decriminalization of drugs, but I worry that if -- we don't have a strong enough healthcare system in the U.S. to support the legalization of drugs completely. Although generally I do lean towards the side of legalizing drugs, I just -- that is my one qualm about it, is that because healthcare isn't accessible for everyone, it might be an issue here. Whereas it wouldn't be an issue in other countries like Holland for example or like in Amsterdam. Yeah.

Person B: Okay.

Person A: Yeah another -- if you want to go first and say your three reasons.

Person B: Okay so my first reason is that most drugs, they are harmful for people's health. And especially the overdose can be extremely fatal for most people, in fact for everyone. Thus, I feel that drugs in general would never actually be healthy for them. At least the ones that aren't legalized already. They won't be healthy for the people who consume them. And that’s why they shouldn’t be legalized. And my second reason is, for example, we could take the legalization of marijuana as a precedent, because I think the use of weed became widespread and rampant.

Person A: Sorry, could you repeat -- it became what?

Person B: The use of weed became widespread after its legalization.

Person A: I think it was widespread -- it was used -- it was already widespread before it was legalized.

Person B: Okay yeah, but its use increased after its legalization.

Person A: Mm-hmm.

Person B: And the impact of it being legalized is reflected everyday as you walk down the streets of Berkeley. We can see everyone smoking weed, and most of the homeless people, they behave in weird ways because they’re high all the time.

Person A: Hmm.

Person B: Which is another detrimental impact of using weed. And my last point is that, since the overuse of drugs can be fatal, legalizing drugs would increase the availability, and once their availability increases it might lead to the overuse of such drugs. And that can be fatal for people and that could be detrimental for the society.

Person A: Hmm.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Okay, I do agree with you in that obviously a lot of these drugs that -- like hard drugs are very harmful. But I think of it from a perspective of like, if they are legalized, can we control it, can we implement harm-reduction measures? Like needle exchanges to prevent the spread of AIDS. And then when people go to these needle exchanges, providing resources for people there so that they can get clean. I think the issue is like, people -- when it’s not legal, right --people kind of like are neglected by society. And they don't have -- it's much harder for them to get the help that they need. Whereas if we kind of support them as a society, then it can produce a much healthier society. And you can see how it's worked well in Portugal. And other countries like Holland, like I talked about, like Amsterdam. And I think another thing is that harsh drug laws disproportionately impact marginalized communities. So you'll see like with the discrepancy between laws against cocaine and laws against crack, and the different communities that they affect. And so I definitely support the decriminalization of drugs for sure. I'm a little iffy on legalizing all drugs, just in the United States in particular. But I definitely support decriminalization.

Person B: Okay. So I get your point about keeping a healthy society and healthy relation between the people in society through legalizing drugs. But I feel that instead of actually legalizing drugs in order to make this society healthy, we should be providing healthcare to those who want drugs and those who feel neglected from society because they're not getting the drugs that they want.

Person A: Right. I know, I agree with that. I would say that if we can decriminalize it in a way that people can feel comfortable going and getting the support that they need if they have a drug addiction, I think that's the best case scenario.

Person B: But what’s the point of decriminalizing it if we could just dissuade them from ever wanting drugs in the first place?

Person A: I think because -- sorry, could you repeat the question?

Person B: Yeah, so what's the point of decriminalizing drugs if we could dissuade people from wanting those drugs in the first place through medical care?

Person A: Well, I think the issue is people are scared to access that medical care when drugs are so criminalized, because they are afraid of the legal penalties of going and getting that help. But when you make that healthcare more accessible to people who have drug addictions, it's a win- win scenario. And then I think -- yeah.

Person B: Okay. I agree with what you're saying, but then it seems kind of insensible just for the fact -- just help those people who don’t have the courage to go up and get medical help because they feel that it's criminalized. We should be decriminalizing all drugs completely. Right? Because drugs have a really negative impact on the society as a whole when we look at it. The people who never wanted to do drugs, but are exposed to drugs because they're legal, right? And that's what we don't want to happen. That's what we don't want in this society. That's probably more harmful than the people who are already addicted to drugs, and they're not getting the drugs that they need.

Person A: Yeah. Well, I don't know. I think decriminalization is something different than legalization completely. That just means lessening the criminal penalties for people who are caught using drugs and -- I don't know.

Person B: Yeah, that makes sense. So what you’re saying is that yeah, the legal penalties for those who are caught using drugs, if they are reduced then people would probably be less ashamed or would be more courageous to be able to go up and receive help. And try to get healthcare for what they require. Yeah, that makes sense.

Person A: Yeah. And I think with things like needle exchanges, those are really good, but I think people are afraid to use them if they fear the cops are going to come and arrest them there. Or I think just allowing those is a really good thing for society. Yeah, I don't know.

Person B: Yeah, I mean -- like see, my stance -- based on what you've said-- my stance has changed. Because now I feel like, yeah, they don't necessarily have to be legalized, but they can be decriminalized as in the legal restraints or the penalties that they get when they’re found using drugs could be reduced.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: That makes sense. Yeah, that does make sense.

Person A: Okay. Yeah.

Person B: It’s just that if it's legalized and the [production] of such drugs is increased, then since availability of drugs is increased, it’s a tendency for the people to naturally be curious to use those drugs when they are available. And that could be really harmful for the society.

Person A: Yeah --

Person B: But if -- yeah, what were you saying?

Person A: Oh, I don’t know. I was just thinking, I don't necessarily know about how it works in terms of like the economic aspect, like supply and demand. But I know that like -- I don't know. I think just like legalization of weed in California in particular was a really good thing in that or like because --

Person B: In economic terms or in terms of health of society?

Person A: No, no. I know you were saying that making drugs legalized will make people use drugs more, and I feel like that's not necessarily true.

Person B: But yeah, the example that they gave us about Portugal, it said that the drug use had declined. So it is possible for drug use to decline too. I mean, you never know. Maybe this might just be the beginning, and soon it might decline.

Person A: Yeah. I think if you make it legal and -- as well as also campaign to dissuade people from using these drugs and provide resources to help them get clean if they have already started using these drugs -- if you use the taxes from them and kind of bring it back around or -- I don't know. I think like, for example, with the legalization of weed in California, the taxes from that go to education and good education.

Person B: From the economic aspect it makes sense too.

Person A: Yeah, I don't -- yeah.

Person B: Yeah but it's just that my only argument -- I agree with all of that, but my only argument is that, see we legalize weed because weed is actually beneficial for health.

Person A: Yeah, yeah.

Person B: It has therapeutical uses.

Person A: Oh yeah, yeah. Of course, yeah.

Person B: Whereas most other drugs don't have such uses.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: And honestly, they have no use in fact in society. They don't help your health. They don't help anything.

Person A: Right, yeah.

Person B: They just are detrimental to your health. They just give you pleasure that you don't really require from drugs.

Person A: No, I'm not arguing in support of drug -- like I'm not arguing in support of heroin or anything like that.

Person B: Yeah, yeah.

Person A: But I would definitely say the decriminalization of those drugs in particular would be a good thing, but I don't know. I think I'd have to look at the case of Portugal more to understand it better, because this isn't something that I'm very, very informed about.

Person B: Yeah, same.

Person A: But I think maybe looking to that as an example and seeing the parallels between there and the U.S. would be interesting. But also I don't know if I can take a firm stance on legalization without knowing more information about Portugal and how that worked as well. But yeah.

Person B: But giving a personal example, I'd say that the only reason I tried weed was -- the only time I tried weed was once I came here, and that was because it was available when I was over here.

Person A: Hmm.

Person B: I used to live in India, and in India it’s not legal. So although it was available, it was difficult for me to get it, right?

Person A: Right.

Person B: But because over here, since it was available so readily, it was easy for me to get a chance to try it. And once I tried it -- although I'm not addicted to it, but I've tried it, I have been exposed to it. And that in itself is something that you wouldn't want when you're looking at a country. You wouldn't want them to be exposed to these drugs in the first place.

Person A: Right. I think it’s interesting though, because I don't know if you can draw parallels between that and harder drugs especially on the survey we did, it was saying how drug use declined.

Person B: Okay yeah, that's true. That's true.

Person A: So I think I'd have to look at the statistics to know more about it, but I don't know.

Person B: Yeah, yeah. What you are saying makes sense. Yeah it does make sense. Because it’s really different. Yeah, hard drugs are really different from drugs such as marijuana or hash or something like that.

Person A: Yeah, yeah.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: Oh, okay.

Person A: It was nice talking to you.

Person B: Yeah nice talking to you too, yeah.

Person A: Okay, yeah, thanks. Bye.

Person B: Bye.