# *Pair 57 P121 & P130 – Long Text – T1*

Person A: Hi  
  
Person B: Hey!  
What's your view on this?  
  
Person A: I'm for controversial speakers to come to campus I'm guessing you're not?  
  
Person B: I oppose allowing extremely controversial speakers to speak... Although I'm still a little iffy about his  
\*this  
  
Person A: haha same.  
  
Person B: Primarily because of hate speech, there's a difference to free speech and hate speech  
  
Person A: Yes, but when it's gotten to a point that violence actually occurs I think it's wrong  
  
Person B: Because while free speech is important and people should be able to express their beliefs, some of these beliefs invalidate the experiences of others and cross the line of where they aren't just simple opinions anymore... They actually start to threaten people... Yeah, I agree  
  
Person A: I know that the ones who committed violence during the Milo Yiannopoulos protests probably aren't Berkeley students and they don't stand for the extreme views of Berkeley students. I think the best way to protest is honesty to just let him come and then boycott it  
  
Person B: Also, usually evidenced "facts" and exaggerated claims are used to instigate parties against one another, causing for one party to believe in fake news and project anger onto the other party, wrongfully so…  
And you're right! But do you feel that since  
some parties will still come to those speeches, it'll just boost them to continue?  
  
Person A: But Berkeley has such a reputation for being liberal and mega-protestors that a lot of people who are more conservative might feel unsafe expressing their views  
  
Person B: Like for example, some Cal Republicans might still come to Milo's speech so it wouldn't be completely empty... Just a bunch of people feeling like they can hate together?  
  
Person A: then we can have a proper debate  
  
Person B: But then again, aren't some opinions and views not just opinions anymore when they invalidate someone's existence or experience. And yeah, I'm all for calm, controlled debate  
  
Person A: i think to a certain point hate speech shouldn't be allowed on campus but it's a hard line to draw.  
  
Person B: For sure... And also, especially when a lot of hate speech invalidates someone's life or existence... It's hard to want to debate with them but it needs to be done  
  
Person A: True and the thing is even if they don't come to campus it's not going to change their mind anyways. The fact is if we hadn't make such a big deal about Milo Yiannopolos he wouldn't have become that famous at all  
  
Person B: My parents are from India but I was born here... Growing up in the South as a woman of color gives you a lot to see. Like I've talked to so many Republicans who invalidate my parents' or my experience to the point where it's just disrespectful and rude rather than just an opinion?  
Wait, you're right?  
Do you think they're doing it for the popularity and attention?  
  
Person A: I agree and that's a sad thing to see. We are in real trouble if we are swayed by the opinions of close minded people who invalidate your experiences  
  
Person B: The question might even boil down to is everyone actually entitled to their own opinion  
Esp when it's just hateful and disrespectful... Really hard question to answer  
  
Person A: for sure. I just prefer to keep an open mind, and a space for everyone to share their opinions. Frankly Berkeley is very liberal, so much that it's a bubble and I think it's good for the students to see that other opinions exist even if we know they are wrong  
  
Person B: I agree, also seeing that a lot of people who go to Berkeley are from California itself  
They haven't really talked to people from other sides of the political spectrum  
As much  
  
Person A: yeah I'm from SF myself and I know tons of my friends who support liberal politicians just because they are liberal. I think it's a huge problem this partisan divide  
we should be judging the matter for itself, not which party it belongs to  
  
Person B: Do they ever research the politicians though?  
  
Person A: i have no idea  
  
Person B: Just because someone is liberal doesn't mean their means to get into politics is "correct" or less "corrupt"  
Bc it's politics after all  
  
Person A: exactly and it doesn't mean the things they support are right either  
  
Person B: Right so essentially we need to look past parties  
  
Person A: Yep  
  
Person B: I mean the Democratic party is pretty fragile right now  
  
Person A: yeah basic line is as berkeley students I think we need to realize that not everybody thinks the same way we do and that stupid opinions exist in the rest of the country.  
  
Person B: But then again, our entire political system is based on parties despite no intention of it happening when our political system was created  
  
Person A: yeah sadly  
  
Person B: how do you change an entire system  
  
Person A: you can't

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: nice talk  
  
Person B: change it from the roots in university classes?  
Right! Nice speaking with you!

# *Pair 58 P127 & P119 – Long Text – T2*

Person B: Hello! It's nice to meet you  
  
Person A: Hello! nice to meet you as well  
how are you doing today?  
  
Person B: It's been a good day so far! Hope you've had a good one as well. Seems we'll be debating government reparations for slavery.  
  
Person A: thank you likewise! And yes this is an interesting topic  
  
Person B: I'd like to first say that my stance on this isn't very extremist. I DO think the government should be helping communities impacted by slavery, but not necessarily on a individualized level (ie stipends, etc), but at a more community level.  
  
Person A: Something that I've thought about and also discussed in class  
  
Person B: Like providing communities in Oakland with afterschool centers that can help at risk youth.  
  
Person A: So you do support reparations?  
What makes you stray away from providing people with stipends?  
  
Person B: I feel as though it isn't fair to ask people, many of whom are recent immigrants or come from economically disadvantaged homes, to provide money for individualized stipends.  
  
Person A: Like taxing people for this reason?  
  
Person B: I think something broader scoped, like learning centers or health clinics that can positively impact larger communities and areas, could be taxed for.  
  
Person A: That's true, I also believe that there should be more support services out there on a community level  
however this also makes me think about how hesitant people are to give people "handouts" or direct money/cash  
Like many of our social services are very policed/rigid in order to ensure poor people use money in a way that is restrictive  
  
Person B: Do you believe that direct individualized reparations should exist? and Why?  
  
Person A: such as food stamps, they don't get cash but a debit card  
and the government chooses what they can and can'y buy  
can't\*  
I think it should be a mixture of everything  
Direct money, community programs, affirmative action  
  
Person B: So all families who had a family history impacted by slavery should receive reparations?  
  
Person A: Or just starting off with an apology/acknowledgement by our government  
  
Person B: Or would it depend on current socioeconomic status?  
  
Person A: Since I don't think they have ever issued a formal apology for the violence they caused  
I think it should be all families  
  
Person B: I don't think they have either. An apology would most certainly be warranted.  
  
Person A: Even if they are well off  
Because I'm sure they've had to work for it and their position probably didn't come easy if they have a history of slavery  
  
Person B: For me, my hesitation stems from being a first generation immigrant. There are so many people I know who have risked it all to be here, who have very little to their name. Do they deserve being taxed more because of reparations for something they played no part in?  
  
Person A: I don't think this money should come directly from individuals though, I'm sure our government can cough up some money that they're allocating elsewhere  
  
Person B: If that could be a guarantee, I see no reason to not allow reparations  
The problem is, our government hoards money in specific places and doesn't like allocating to social causes  
Which means, likely, more taxes  
  
Person A: I also don't wanna put people impacted by slavery versus African Americans here  
Because there is definite overlap  
and I'm sure many immigrants have also been impacted by slavery  
  
Person B: Wait, I'm sorry. I don't understand.  
Are you saying we should only discuss African Americans, or a greater number of people impacted by slavery?

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: It was nice talking to you!! Sorry we couldn't finish up!  
  
Person A: it was nice to meet you!

# *Pair 59 P122 & P120 – Long Text – T1*

Person B: Hello  
  
Person A: Hello  
You can explain your thoughts first  
  
Person B: yea thats fine. i generally oppose having controversial speakers mostly for the effect it has on the students  
  
Person A: and what is that effect?  
  
Person B: i think generally different viewpoints should be allowed to be voiced but that sometimes especially in the past the speakers that have been on campus have spread hate speech  
stuff that they say that could endanger students  
and i dont believe that theres space for that on campus  
as it hurts the learning environment  
what do you think?  
  
Person A: But you can't disregard the fact that the 1st amendment is in place. I don't think that anyone should be allowed to determine who gets to speak their opinions or where they get to speak them  
  
Person B: i understand your point but i believe that the time and place of reasoning behind the first amendment is very drastically different to the point where your trying to make  
before it was to allow free speech in order to create change nowadays people will invoke it to say any thing they want in order to be controversial versus creating change  
  
Person A: free speech means that everyone has the right to speak their mind  
  
Person B: ok and if they want to speak their mind elsewhere thats not my problem go ahead  
but if your doing it on a college campus with intent to create problems you need to reevaluate your views  
  
Person A: Controversial speakers don't have the intent of making probelms]  
they are just speaking their views as anyone else would  
  
Person B: you know i do understand and think that you should be able to speak your mind but i think sometimes you should look at the way that your presenting your information and many controversial speakers don't do that  
take for example milo , there were rumors that he was going to target specific students on campus and make knowable information about them that they might not want to the publici think anyone that is trying target people is not someone who wants to speak their mind  
  
Person A: but you are not 100% sure that is true  
  
Person B: that is true but the possibility should not be allowed at all  
i remember at the time one of my professors was doxxed or hacked i dont remember the term just because he tweeted something to miloi think at that point you're not sharing ideas, you're just creating trouble  
  
Person A: But we can't use one person to represent a group as a whole  
  
Person B: otherwise i say go ahead and discuss whatever you want, but you need to understand that one person can affect a lot of other people

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: im glad we had this talk  
  
Person A: Yupp  
  
Person B: i will take some of ur ideas and reflect on them more

# *Pair 61 P131 & P132 – Long Text – T3*

Person B: hi, I'm [name redacted].  
  
Person A: Hi, I'm [name redacted].  
  
Person B: I don't think legalizing drug is a good idea in the U.S.  
  
Person A: Why do you think drugs should be illegal?  
Why do you think that?

Where I am coming from, it seems like the positives would outweigh the negatives with legalization  
  
Person B: We believe that legalizing drugs may decrease the crime rates. But it won't. People will have more opportunity to get drugs  
  
Person A: But isn't it the black market for drugs that creates such high crime rates?  
With legalization, incarceration rates for those with minor possession charges would go way down  
  
Person B: Yeah, bad people may utilizing this chance to create more crimes  
  
Person A: What do you mean by that?  
Right now there are so many people in the American prison system for minor drug charges  
It is very expensive and the criminal record is ruining their lives  
We could divert the money we save from incarceration to programs that would help people with addiction  
and into the regulation of the substances  
  
Person B: Secondly, what if a person who has not done drugs before, now there is a chance he can try it  
and he got addicted, then he spent a lot of money, and his family is destroyed.  
If drugs are not legal, he wouldn't have that chance to try  
  
Person A: I understand where you are coming from, and that would be one of the risks for legalizing drugs but with legalization, the government could also publicly research and produce information for the public on side effects  
  
Person B: Government will waste a lot of money on controlling drugs than just make it illegal  
  
Person A: So that people are able to make informed decisions about what they take  
I don't think that's true  
The prison system is extremely expensive  
  
Person B: I understand that  
  
Person A: It costs at least a million dollars a year to keep a single person in jail  
That money could be better used elsewhere  
Furthermore, just putting someone in jail for using an illegal drug is not actually solving the issue  
  
Person B: Yes, legalizing drugs will put on risks on people. Government shouldn't be easily trusting people's self-control ability  
  
Person A: That person may have gotten into selling drugs because a lack of economic opportunity  
or they tried a certain drug at one point and are now addicted and the issue has gone well beyond them being a criminal, they now have a mental health issue that needs to be addressed in a facility  
and will not improve in jail  
Legalization will allow the government to establish better options for people with addiction  
so that society can improve as a whole  
right now we have such a stigma against addiction that people who are addicted are not receiving any help  
and THAT'S when they ruin their families  
and their own lives  
  
Person B: The question is, would legalizing drugs really stop people consume drugs. We know that only those who really want drugs would buy drugs in black market. Now it's legalized, those addicted people could use drugs easily, and will cause higher chance for people to get addicted.  
  
Person A: I see what you are saying, but I don't think that legalization would suddenly create a population of addicts  
There are examples of other countries in the world that have legalized drugs, such as Portugal, and their country is great  
Very low crime and HIV rates  
  
Person B: Ideally, government could help those who got addicted. But in the reality, it wouldn't be so easy..

**[Experimenter says time is up]**  
  
Person A: Thank you for talking with me it's a difficult issue  
There is a lot of grey area  
  
Person B: Yeah. I kind of agree with your point.  
but different area has different situation

# *Pair 62 P126 & P125 – Long Text – T3*

Person B: Hello :)  
  
Person A: Hi  
Should I start?  
  
Person B: Sure!  
  
Person A: Okay! I think my main argument in supporting in supporting the legalization of drugs is that drug addiction/abuse needs to stop being criminalized and it needs to be recognized for what it is truly, a disease  
sorry totally repeated myself  
  
Person B: Oh no problem  
My main argument for opposing the legalization of drug is that people could be easily exposed to drugs, and do not think about the consequences that follows for taking drugs.  
I agree that there should be more ways to help people who are addicted, but I don't think legalizing illegal drugs will prevent addiction and abuse  
  
Person A: I agree, that often times drug use is done irresponsibly and legalizing it could lead to an earlier exposure than expected but at the same time legalizing it means that the distribution of it for the most part can be done in a more monitored setting through the governmental/medical lens such as with marijuana. It won't prevent addiction and abuse but the money that right now goes to keeping people in jail for it can be used to open medical centers and make these centers available to those that cannot afford it.  
  
Person B: One of my concern would be that what if people are exposed to legal drugs that are monitored by the governmental lens, and they want more drugs and end up going through an illegal means to obtain more drugs.  
  
Person A: But then can't that be said for just about every other single drug, such as alcohol. Then should every person that comes home and has a glass of wine be seen as a criminal? That is always the risk the idea that a persons' tolerance can increase and their need for the drug become greater. I think legalizing drugs could also welcome a society that de-stigmatizes them. Removing that stigma open up conversations where people can begin to feel comfortable talking about them and eventually become more open with talking about their problems with them

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: Thank you for your opinion   
  
Person A: it was a nice convo!  
Thank you for yours

# *Pair 63 P123 & P128 – Long Text – T3*

Person B: Hi  
  
Person A: hellooo  
alright so i am for legalization of drug use lol  
  
Person B: okokk  
so  
you could talk about your viewpoint first  
and then I can takl about mine  
  
Person A: these are weak arguments lmao but here we go  
  
Person B: and then we could do some back and forth aftert?  
  
Person A: Yeah  
  
Person B: yeah go ahead, lmk when you're done and I'll just keep quite until you're done with your train of argument  
  
Person A: 1) okay so i guess i can use prohibiton as an example. when alc was banned and legalized. people still had some sort of access to it. eventually it was repealed. 2) people who are naturally inclined to do drugs will do it regardless is legalized or not. ( i myslef have never done drugs).  
3) visa versa.. those who dont do drugs.. just dont  
4) survival of the fittest. those who overdoes... well too bad? :/ LOL not to be mean... and those who are injured by a high person.. sorry too  
5) also according to our intro survey, puerto rico (i think?) had pretty good outcomes after legalization of drugs  
6) gov spends alot of effort fighting against drug cartels ...it can be used for rehabilitation centers  
The end :)  
oooo illegalized\*\*\* for 1)  
  
Person B: Ok! those are some good points and I definitely agree with some of them. I'll talk about my viewpoint and we cna debate from there. Sorry about the typos btw  
  
Person A: dw! i have alot of typose  
  
Person B: So my argument depends hugely on the two assumptions provided. 1) we are talking about legalization of all drugs (I think "all" was the wording from the survey) and 2) we are talking about the situation in the US  
When you look at the US, it gives a very unique case where a lot of social behavior and expectations are determined with individual freedom in mine  
\*mind  
I think that's ggreat, but in order for that kind of society to be functional there needs to be a minimum agreement, which is why we have law that applies equally to everyone  
When something like hard drug does not get banned explicitly, in the context of US and the mindset of "aye it's not illegal, let the man do what he wants" that non-ban is like an implicit acceptance  
while some drugs don't have huge and obvious harms, in terms of health, others definitely do  
And for the government, banning those drugs are like 1) symbolic gesture of not supporting those bodily harmful substances and 2) being responsible with the safety and health of its citizen  
So I think the answer is not legalization, but somewhat of a compromised decriminalization of drugs that are proven scientifically to be not very harmful  
That's about it from me. Any comments  
  
Person A: ohhh i also forgot to add. lots of people are incarcerated for drug possesion, even before some drugs were legalized. since legalization, people criminalized before havent been released and i think it kinda sucks and there should be reparations. incaration for drug vs incarceration for murder. i vote drug to be the least threatening...  
hey those were great arguments!:D

yeah, the arguement about the non-ban implicit acceptance is pretty good  
  
Person B: eah! the criminalization and "war on drugs" are defnitely huge and I think they should be worked upon  
  
Person A: i was actually afraid you were gonna bring that up

**[Experimenter says time is up]**  
  
Person B: Lol i guess gg  
  
Person A: and i can understand the consequences of the non-ban

# *Pair 66 P141 & P139 – Long Text – T2*

Person B: Hello, what position did you take on the question?  
  
Person A: Hi, so I slightly supported the topic, but was only neutrally supportive of the opinion. What about you?  
  
Person B: I was opposed to it.  
Do you want to give your list of reasons first?  
  
Person A: Yep  
so, first off, my stance lay on the idea that their are many minorities and groups of people who have experienced, subjugation, discrimination, etc. I think that in a way, we are all parts of people who have had such an experience  
therefore, I think that my arguement, lies more in that if we are to give reparations for slavery, we should give it to others as well  
  
Person B: Let me know when you finished your reasons and I will reply  
  
Person A: ok, will do  
An example of other places of reparation are many people of Jewish descent that had suffered as a result of World War II discrimination. While the topic we are debating about is whether the US government should offer reparations, I still think it is a good example of why we should adopt some form of reparations.  
However, I would not argue to simply give reparations to those who suffered the results of slavery. Instead, i would argue other groups that were hurt by US decisions in the past should also receive reparations. An example group would be the Japanese citizens during WWII that lost businesses, homes, and forced to live in camps.  
Lastly, the major issue would be of how much do we spend in reparations and from where this money would come. I suggest additional taxes, and while I'm aware that's probably the last thing anyone wants, I think that it is the most logical solution. We already pay taxes on many services that we do not use, and if that is the case, then an additional time-limited tax could be installed. Who would be responsible for paying this additional tax however I am unsure.  
Ok, I think that's about it  
Done with my arguements  
  
Person B: My general question is: Do you think that it is appropriate/right/ethical to correct for history? I do agree with your statement, given the logical conclusion and implications of slavery reparations, that if we were to endow slavery reparations, we would have to give it to others as well. I am generally opposed to the idea of slavery reparations for a few reasons. One, it wrecks the freedom of a free society. Those not complicit in the practice of slavery have no moral duty to repay back. Two, I do not see the merit of slavery reparations. Is the assumption that African-Americans today are worse off because of the history of slavery? There are numerous examples of successful African-Americans today, so the pathology of slavery and its concrete effects have much more to do with culture than it does with the color of your skin. I think we, as in us Americans, have done a significant amount to "repay" back our heinous deeds; we have given equal rights to everyone regardless of race, religion, etc. History is sad, but I do not think we are in any position to correct it.  
I want to provide one example of how hard it is to actually institute slavery reparations.  
  
Person A: I am not sure I see it that way. For example, with the case of reparations being paid for Jewish families in Germany, would you be against that as well?  
  
Person B: Consider the case of India. India was colonized by the British. But before the British, it was colonized by the Afghans, then the Mongols, then the Persians.  
Who owns India?  
  
Person A: I see good good point.  
  
Person B: How far back do we say it okay now?

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 67 P143 & P140 – Long Text – T2*

Person B: Hey  
  
Person A: Hi! how are you?  
  
Person B: I'm doing well  
  
Person A: so what are your thoughts on the topic?  
  
Person B: I think it is most definitely an interesting topic  
  
Person A: yeah for sure, it's definitely relevant in politics rn  
  
Person B: I'm on the opposing of it for multiple reasons  
in terms of logistics, ethics, and other factors  
  
Person A: ok, can you go into more detail?  
  
Person B: While the proposal seems to be a morally correct play, I do not see the operation to play out smoothly  
As in how do we track who is a "descendant of a slave", how do we fund it/how much do we give to each person for example  
As well as how does the reparations adjust per the average rent of a city  
In addition, does this affect the tax returns of low-income folks who may need welfare  
  
Person A: well the way I took it wasn't that there would be straight financial distribution among people affected by the legacy of slavery  
I took it as affirmative action policies  
among other programs  
I don't agree with just giving money out either  
  
Person B: I do agree that affirmative action policies and programs to assist these folks are a step in the right direction  
  
Person A: yeah because I think it can help give people with disadvantaged backgrounds better opportunities  
  
Person B: I would like to note that affirmative action has some special power dynamics that make it not the best policy - I'll use college for example  
  
Person A: right, I agree with you on that as well, I only put a 1 on the agreement scale haha  
  
Person B: I feel that affirmative action helps people of color get to a position such as college/a job, but it doesn't support them afterward in terms of getting resources, not experiencing racism/discrimination, and etc  
The one thing that I was unsure of for this topic was how mixed folk would be helped  
As in half black half white for example  
  
Person A: yeah I get what you're saying. I think I would support a certain amount of affirmative action but there have to be other programs to help as well because in the end it doesn't really solve the problem beyond college  
  
Person B: I resonate with that too  
I think there has to be more institutionalized changes that can help communities of color  
especially with the issues of police brutality  
  
Person A: yeah it needs to be something that will have a long-term plan too because I don't view affirmative action policies being really effective in the long run

**[Experimenter says time is up]**  
  
Person B: Well it was nice talking with you  
  
Person A: you too!

# *Pair 68 P142 & P138 – Long Text – T1*

Person B: Hello  
  
Person A: Hello! What is your stance on allowing controversial speakers?  
  
Person B: So our topic is whether we affirm or negate allowing extremely controversial speakers to speak on campus. What are your thoughts? I oppose this because of the following reasons:   
1. It can stir violence and and cause polarization and riots like it did in the past. This does not mean that disagreements with the government (or whatever issue) are necessarily bad, but I believe that there is a large chance for injuries and unnecessary chaos  
2. Although you may say it refers to a freedom of speech and that people have the right to express themselves, the fact that it says "EXTREMELY" controversial defeats this purpose. Like how you are not allowed to yell "FIRE" in a movie theater. Or how the Nazi Party used speech in hateful, violent ways. The freedom of speech is definitely a right, but only to a certain extent.  
  
Person A: I see where you are coming from. I agree that it can cause a lot of chaos, which is why I do not support it completely, but I do think it is important to allow controversial speakers because it is important to hear other perspectives to respond accordingly and have a back and forth discussion on the varying ideals to avoid being in a bubble. That being said, I do not think it is a good idea to invite controversial speakers because of incidents in the past, but I do think they should be allowed.  
  
Person B: I understand where you are coming from as well. I don't think it is necessary to allow EXTREMELY controversial speakers on campus at all, though. There is a fine line between speakers talking about current issues and giving their opinions on it and speakers who are very radical and stir chaos and riots that only cause harm.  
  
Person A: I think that is where it becomes important to define controversy. I also am not okay with very radical speakers, but oftentimes people that speak are considered controversial for simply disagreeing with the majority opinion.  
  
Person B: I do agree that some controversial speakers should be allowed, just not EXTREMELY controversial speakers. This is why our country is so polarized, and people with extreme ideas will cause very distinct groups who do not understand each others' sides and can not find compromise. Yes, controversy definitely needs to be defined.  
  
Person A: The current political environment is very charged and very polarized, making a lot of claim considered controversial. \*claims  
  
Person B: I also believe that bringing extremely controversial speakers on campus inhibits students from original ideas and thoughts. We tend to agree/disagree with major topics because of speakers and their contentions. But this limits us from creating our own arguments and organizing our own logic.I do agree that polarization is why a lot of issues are considered controversial, because people often fail to reach a common ground. However, if the question said allowing controversial speakers allowed, I would agree. I just disagree with the wording where it says "extremely"  
  
Person A: I think they can also allow original thought. Oftentimes, Berkeley students are stuck in a bubble as a result of hearing similar ideals on a daily basis. New, potentially controversial, ideals can challenge students to better understand their ideals and discuss them with others.  
  
Person B: Some controversy is necessary to play devil's advocate in some people's minds and try to open people up to new perspectives. But not extreme and radical speakers. Ahhh, yes. I definitely agree with that. I just disagree with the idea of "extremely" controversial speakers.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: NICE TALKING TO YOU!!  
  
Person A: Controversial speakers are constitutionally allowed to speak on campus if they do not threaten anybody, so I think they should be allowed. nice talking to you too

# *Pair 85 P183 & P182 – Long Text – T1*

Person A: So  
  
Person B: Hi  
  
Person A: Where do you stand on this?  
  
Person B: I feel that These events usually cause a lot of chaos and thus I oppose it  
  
Person A: Go on  
  
Person B: what about you  
Okay  
  
Person A: I'm the complete opposite, by the way  
but I'd like to hear your side first  
I'm open to new ideas  
  
Person B: while i understand that Berkeley is the home of the free speech movement and I totally believe in free speech for everyone there are a lot of problems with the way these events are organized.  
  
Person A: so it's not an issue with the controversy itself, bu the way in which it's organised?  
how would you go about organising it then?  
  
Person B: again, it is important to realize that we need to have open and honest conversations about all topics  
yes okay.  
  
Person A: Agreed  
  
Person B: to start with  
i would make sure that the events are actually going to happen  
with binding contracts  
  
Person A: why make it binding?  
for the speakers, I'm assuming  
  
Person B: and not just work on anticipation  
Yes  
  
Person A: Sure  
  
Person B: because we see what happened with Milo last year.  
  
Person A: I'm not familiar with what actually happened, I'm a visiting student  
  
Person B: he was scheduled for a talk and he just showed up for 10 mins  
  
Person A: so my perspective on these issues isn't from that of someone who's aware of what happens in Berkeley generally  
oh, okay  
  
Person B: the talk was supposed to be for 2 hrs and was supposed to create a lot of chaos  
  
Person A: I think we're censoring thoughts and perspectives if we don't allow for these sorts of speakers to open themselves up for criticism on their viewpoint  
  
Person B: for with the university hired hundreds of police officers  
  
Person A: hence my position in this  
oh wow  
  
Person B: yes, of course  
and I am totally for free speech as i said earlier  
let me tell you more about it  
  
Person A: Sure  
  
Person B: The University ended up spending over $2 million on security  
  
Person A: ah, I see where the poor organisation becomes relevant  
I take it you're a student here, then  
  
Person B: and it's is not an unknown that UC Berkeley being a state university is very underfunded  
yes  
i am a sophomore  
as a result the tuition for students was raised by 2.75% which is a big deal for everyone  
especially for out of state students like me  
there were a number of salary cuts for employees which is not at all justified  
students were forced to miss classes because of safety issues  
  
Person A: I see  
  
Person B: with all this in mind  
i feel that it should have been organizeed beeter

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 90 P195 & P193 – Long Text – T2*

Person A: Hello  
  
Person B: Hi! I'm [name redacted]  
  
Person A: Hi, I'm [name redacted]  
What are your views on reparations  
  
Person B: I'm guessing that we disagree on the question at hand for us to be paired together haha  
Can you describe your view for me?  
  
Person A: I think it depends what you call reparations. I don't necessarily think the right answer is give cash to black families, but I am in favor of gov investing a lot more money into specifically black communities/programs for black people to hopefully heal some of the damage done by slavery's legacy  
  
Person B: Okay give me a minute to write my stance then I'll respond  
So I'm pretty liberal but I don't think reparations are the way to go to address the legacy of slavery. I take a few issues with the reparations approach. First is a legal issue -- by international law, reparations can only be paid to victims of the crime (not descendants). And there seem to be a lot of issues with paying only descendants of slaves -- for example, there are a lot of African Americans and other minorities that are economically disadvantaged in the US that did not explicitly experience slavery because they moved here after 1865 but have experienced racist government policies since  
To respond to your statement - yeah, I take reparations to mean specifically money payments  
I agree about investing more in African American communities and more seriously addressing issues that affect them. There's such obvious disparities reinforced by government policies (prison policy being the most publicized of them)  
  
Person A: I understand that. That's why I think that reparations would be best formatted as x amount of dollars allocated toward funding new gov programs, etc that would help black communities. I think in particular that could mean investing in poor black areas where housing discrimination has meant generations of black families don't get to accumulate the wealth that white families have by owning houses  
It might be too difficult and complicated to try to calculate out and quantify the damage done by slavery, plus hard to determine which families have actually been affected by it and which, as you pointed out, may have moved to America after and thus not experienced its direct effects  
So I think the better option is to retool the idea of reparations to mean use taxpayer money (even if that means raising taxes) to fund new infrastructure, housing, healthcare, education reform targeted at black students, etc. But the important thing is that it's not just a "oh we are going to make everything better for everyone" because it really is black people who need those resources most as a result of slavery:  
  
Person B: Totally agree. I'm pretty sure that wouldn't be legally considered reparations but it gets at the same idea. I definitely wouldn't call it reparations when trying to pass something through Congress though because Reps aren't going to like that  
  
Person A: That makes sense. I think I just wasn't sure if reparations meant specifically money to black individuals, or if it meant money and resources being allocated to black communities as a general concept  
  
Person B: First thing I would personally change is property taxes for education... that system is so messed up  
It guarantees that kids who grow up in wealthy areas get a better education

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: Looks like we're out of time it was nice chatting!  
  
Person A: Thanks for the insight!

# *Pair 91 P196 & P194 – Long Text – T2*

Person A: Hello

Person B: Hi! I'm [name redacted] nice to meet you

Person A: Hi I am [name redacted], nice to meet you too

Person B: So I think we should just establish what our initial stances are

Person A: That's a good idea

I support reparations, what about you

Person B: i support reparations but not in a financial way if that makes sense

I'm not exactly sure how the entire process would work, how much more we have to pay, who we have to pay

Person A: Okay, but I think the the financial way is important to reduce economic and educational inequality in the society

The specifics can be worked out by the government, but one has to agree in principle that something like this should be done

Person B: i can see the educational way being important but i feel like the discord between races is more social rather than financial

Person A: It may be more social, but it is also clearly economic

Person B: It should be economic, I'm just not exactly sure how

and i feel like the mentioning of reparations from slavery would make people confused and maybe upset?

Person A: The disparity is clearly evident.. proportion of people from racial minorities who have gone to college or hold good white collar jobs is definitely lower

Person B: I think that the reparations should go to education personally

mostly because I think just giving people money doesn't make sense

I'm not sure if that was what you were saying but

Person A: I agree, but education would not be enough

Person B: what else do you suggest then

Person A: This can only help students and youngsters in doing better than their parents

Person B: If anything, I feel like they shouldn't call it "Reparations for Slavery" haha

How do you plan on helping the parents?

Person A: But older people would continue to suffer... say for instance people from their 40s or 50s

of course it can be called anything -- social justice grants or whatever

Person B: I was thinking students who succeed can perhaps help the parents?

Person A: The state should introduce special employment training and employment generation programmes

Well the state can force any child to help a parent and that's too difficult to monitor and oversee.The state needs to directly do something for adults from these groups

Person B: The thing is, if you don't relate it to slavery, but also don't say what it's for, I don't know how many people would be okay with paying taxes for it

Person A: Well you can just say it is for reducing inequality between racial groups

And you can introduce similar support for all poor and give sligtly more to those from racial minorities as they suffer additional burden of prejudice

Person B: So not just African Americans

Person A: Well give it all those who face similar problems perhaps and give more to african americans

Person B: I think we both agree that there needs to be a way to help minorities

Person A: it may be extremely costly but the state can definitely transfer burden from other expenditure

Person B: but I'm just saying it shouldn't be because of slavery

Person A: yes I think we both agree on the need

Person B: I just think the reasoning in this case isn't the correct one

Person A: Well even if it isnt mentioned explicitly, slavery would always be implicit as that's the reason for minorities being prejudiced against

Thats when it all started

Person B: True, but don't you always think African-American whenever someone says slavery in the U.S.

Person A: Yes

Person B: this shouldn't be reparations for slavery, it should just be reparations for centuries of prejudice

Person A: I agree

And it should be funded by the statre

Person B: And we have come a long way from slavery, but it is still quiet obvious we treat people differently because of their race

Person A: Yes

The prejudice, for a variety of reasons, continues

Person B: What about all those people who aren't in favor of racial equality

Because they believe that it is a capitalist country

and they refuse to pay the taxes for it

For example, the Republican Congress we have right now

Person A: Well if someone doesnt pay taxes, there are enough enforcement mechanism to catch them and get them to pay

Person B: I'm just wondering if there would even be enough support in Congress to pass something like it

Person A: Yes, we just need to hope it can be passed

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 95 P206 & P204 – Long Text – T1*

Person A: Hiya  
  
Person B: Hello!  
I would oppose allowing extremely controversial speakers to speak on campus because it is incredibly harmful and dangerous, mentally and potentially physically.  
  
Person A: while i definitely would say there's a risk to their appearance on campus, i would also argue that disallowing them is a violation of their freedom of speech. this is not to say that i agree with the speakers in question  
  
Person B: I totally agree that it is important to have a widespread venue for all forms of belief, but I believe that there must be some form of limit, especially to thought that can invoke danger and violence. Judging by what happened at UC Berkeley with those riots, everyone understood that those speakers were bound to cause trouble and violence in their audiences. Universities have a responsibility to counter that violence, and if it means limiting extremely controversial speakers to come, for the safety of students, I would say go ahead.  
  
Person A: quick clarification question, because i genuinely don't remember, but did the university cancel the first milo y. speech? or was it his own people?  
  
Person B: I do not remember, I just know that UC Berkeley student opponents of Milo were the ones who were involved in the violence also  
  
Person A: but putting that part aside, the response to the cancellation of the first event garnered so much backlash that the school hosted another "free speech week" for the alt-right, the preparations for which cost the university over half a million dollars. i do believe that if they still allowed the first talk to occur, there would be a higher likelihood that fewer people would have demanded a type of "redemption"-style event with free speech week.  
ahhh okay, got it!

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 128 P280 & P279 – Long Text – T3*

Person B: Hi  
  
Person A: Hello  
  
Person B: do you support it?  
  
Person A: Yes, I support the legalization of drugs, with regulations, of course.  
  
Person B: what regulations do you think are necessary?  
because i oppose the legalization just because it might cause too much damage overall  
  
Person A: I would say that we would need to ensure that drugs remain contamination-free, as many drugs today such as meth and cocaine have undergone dangerous combinations without regulatory control.  
Amidst other regulations.  
  
Person B: Maybe I'm not very knowledgeable about drugs, but won't those still be dangerous? Even if they don't have any other contaminations  
I'm not against drugs or anything, but I don't think that making it more accessable to people is for the best  
  
Person A:Yes, substances could be dangerous but the way I see it is that drugs are not themselves a moral problem nor could be handled in a punitive manner but a health problem, at times. What studies have identified is that there's a rather remarkable difference in people who takes substances and become addicted; the markers tend to be trauma and other mental afflictions which may present a problem since we are essentially criminalizing a medical disorder rather than rehabilitating it.  
  
Person B: I feel like that is too broad of a statement to apply to everyone. I know people who are constantly doing drugs (not necessarily addicted though) and idk but it just feels like it makes them a danger to themselves or others  
  
Person A: But simply offering services is not enough. Because it's criminal behaviors, substance addicts - versus users - are not likely to commit themselves to these rehabilitation programs.  
  
Person B: I agree that people with addictions should get help  
But on the other hand, I still don't think that they should be given such access to drugs  
I support people being able to do whatever they want with their bodies  
As long as it won't bring harm to themselves or others. I think that's when it is the government's job to step in and regulate drugs: when it would cause an actual problem  
Like I said, maybe I don't have enough info on this topic, but I feel like no one is gonna see super amazing, positive effects from meth or heroin lol  
  
Person A: But I cannot help but see you identify these substance users as "dangerous." What exactly is dangerous about substances, when substances such as alcohol and tobacco remain legalized, regulated, and even taxed for government revenue for matters such as public health? Tobacco, for example, has not grown dangerous but has become negatively perceived due to health initiatives and public health programs but would tobacco had been tackled well if the government decided to ban it rather than deal with the addiction itself and factors that may lead to addiction such as poverty, trauma, and access to rehabilitation? And furthermore, drugs such as heroin are so remarkably similar to everyday used drugs such as opiods that market and regulatory problems excerbates substance abuse and without a regulatory framework for similar drugs, people are left to become criminals or face dangerous lifestyles.  
  
Person B: However I do think that people who need medical help if they're overdosing or something shouldnt be punished for taking drugs. Kind of like doctor-patient confidentiality. I think there should be systems in place to make sure that if people do need medical attention, they should be able to get it without worrying about being put in prison  
I also don't think alcohol and tobacco should necessarily be legal though. Or rather, that is why there are laws about how much you're allowed to drink before driving. Because at a point, you become a danger to society  
  
Person A: And then there's the research problems when marijuana or even ectasy cannot be used to explore alternative medical purposes such as the use of ectsasy in treating PTSD for veterans.  
But how could these people have access to rehabilitation if they are effectively criminals?  
  
Person B: For example, my ex's best friend is a huge fan of meth  
and she gets violent  
  
Person A: But would she benefit from being branded as a criminal?  
  
Person B: I'm not sure why, I don't know enough  
I'm not saying she should be branded as a criminal necessarily. But i don't think it shold be made readily available to her  
i just don't think the government should endorse it

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: nice talking to ya  
  
Person A: Likewise

# *Pair 129 P292 & P282 – Long Text – T3*

Person B: Hi!  
  
Person A: Hey  
  
Person B: So I'm opposed to legalizing drugs and i  
i'm guessing you support it?  
  
Person A: yep  
and we both put 1 [on the scale]  
like mildly agree  
whatre ur thoughts  
  
Person B: i think i put 2 [on the scale], but yeah  
my thoughts are that kids will grow up thinking that doing drugs is okay because many people will be doing drugs legally, and I don't think that creates a good image for the government to make it okay to use drugs  
also drugs can lead to a lot of health problems down the line so i don't think it's very safe for the user and those around them who might inhale those fumes  
  
Person A: yeah for sure, I totally agree  
like drugs aren't something to be encouraged  
my point is that we ought to teach and spread the message to not do drugs  
HOWEVER  
if someone is going to do drugs, they're going to do drugs. And making it illegal only encourages ppl to use black markets  
  
Person B: that's also a really good point, because if people are bad they're just going to keep doing bad things no matter what  
so it's kinda like how do you regulate people?  
i personally just think that since people can be in such dangerous state of minds when on drugs, they might be more inclined to commit crimes, so it looks better if the government isn't condoning that  
it's kinda like that whole prohibition thing though where alcohol was banned but people found the means to drink anyway  
so it's a pretty difficult situation i think  
  
Person A: ya that's a good thought too, like you said we don't want the gov to spread the message that it's ok to do drugs/encourage ppl to keep on going at it  
  
Person B: yeah i guess i'd like to know specifically what drugs are going to be legalized and where, because just "legalizing drugs in the US" is very vague  
  
Person A: oh and another thing is that making it illegal will discourage people from getting help. like if someone is addicted or is on the brink of overdose and needs serious medical attention, many times their friends won't alert the ambulence bc they fear that their friend will get in even more trouble  
hmmm I think any type of drug, like medical, or recreational  
  
Person B: that's very true, because they might get in trouble with the cops for possession  
there's like that whole gray area  
  
Person A: ya for sure  
like def not black white  
  
Person B: yeah i dont think there's a clear side of like which is morally right or wrong because i could honestly understand arguments for either  
  
Person A: yep haha  
I think we have four more minutes  
do you have any other thougts  
  
Person B: do you consider yourself more liberal or conservative or something else?  
  
Person A: I'm in between  
like no particular side  
  
Person B: same lol  
  
Person A: you?  
Cool  
  
Person B: like my parents are religious so we're kinda conservative but they also have a lot of liberal ideas so i feel like caught in the middle sometimes  
i think its a good quality though not to be too stuck on one end  
  
Person A: ya for sure. i've actually done this experiment three times. Same idea but the first time it's face to face, the second time was a skype call and now it's typing  
  
Person B: oh okay wow lol  
what year are you?  
  
Person A: interesting to think what differences it makes  
sophomore  
You?  
  
Person B: oh okay, junior  
yeah well i bet it's more stressful face to face to disagree?  
because i feel like online takes the pressure off a bit  
  
Person A: yep  
cool it was nice talking to you  
  
Person B: you too!

# *Pair 130 P290 & P293 – Long Text – T3*

Person B: Hello

Person A: Hello, what's your position on the topic?

Person B: I feel like class A drugs shouldn't be legalized

heroine cocaine etc

Person A: Does class A still include marijuana?

I think it does if I'm not mistaken

Person B: oh yea

i think thats the exception tho

i think marijuana is fine to be legalized

Person A: Okay. Personally, I feel like the government should not have a say in terms of what you can do with your body unless it affects another person. Even if said thing you do to your body is harmful to yourself. I understand that under the influence of those drugs one may do things that are harmful to others, but I don't think they should be punished for those acts until they are committed, otherwise it goes against the whole "innocent until proven guilty" maxim. Also, I don't think that the frequency of those acts which could harm others while under the influence of Class A drugs would increase if they were legalized because people generally find ways to get around the law and get the drugs anyways.

It may increase slightly because of perceived social normality, but I think the overall rate of crime would decrease because cartel crime, black market crime, etc. would decrease because drug markets could now be regulated.

Person B: I agree with what you're saying about how the you're entitled to your own actions, but I feel like there are a large amount of externalities created by these drugs. I mean, just walking around Berkeley you see the effect that drugs has on a lot of the homeless people. And the fact that these drugs are highly addictive means that people will have less time for socially beneficial activities (going to work etc.) There's also the entire case of these drugs being glorified by popculture, xans and molly, and I think thats extremely detrimental to the youth. If these drugs are made available to everyone, then young adolecents would take them heedless of the consequences.

Person A: I agree with most of what you

Oops

Person B: Of course, some people would still get around the law, but laws still act as a barrier of protection. It would be kind of crazy to see people taking cocaine like the amount they drink alcohol

Hahaha

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: good talk!

Person A: I agree with most of what you're saying, but I don't think that the amount of drug use would increase for the aforementioned reasons

good talk!

Person B: yes thats fair!

thank you!

# *Pair 131 P283 & P278 – Long Text – T1*

Person A: Hello fellow debator  
  
Person B: Hello, I am arguing for banning controversial speakers  
  
Person A: Awesome, glad to have this discussion with you.I am arguing to allow controversial speakers on campus. What is your beginning statement on this topic?  
  
Person B: I believe that controversial speakers should not be allowed on campus because it interferes with the higher goals of education  
  
Person A: That is a valid reason. I do not believe that speakers should interfere with education, but it is also our job to educate ourselves on pertinent topics that these controversial speakers bring up. If we never hear any opinions that can be considered controversial (ie far right and left viewpoints).We would never give other students the chance to explore their morals and develop themselves intellectually.  
  
Person B: I do like the point that you bring up. However, I believe that there are other ways for students to explore their morals that could be considered safer than allowing people who can inflame their opinions. Personally, I think it would be unhealthy for them, as there is an inherent risk for allowing controversial speakers to come and talk about those topics.  
  
Person A: That is true, and I see your reasoning behind this. However, students never have time to do things outside of academic work, and to bring these speakers to campus allows students convenience to experience a different viewpoint. The Free Speech Movement that originated at Berkeley was also considered a controversial event, since MLK was considered to be a radical in politics. I am not saying that these speakers would have the same effect as MLK, but the people come to Berkeley because it is an epicenter for change. If we do believe that the speaker can cause harm then there needs to be better policies and centers to keep students safe (ie have these speaker come on a Sunday when campus is not as busy).

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Ah darn, you made some good points. I wish we had more time to talk.  
  
Person B: I respect and admire your opinions. Nice talking with you.  
  
Person A: You too, I appreciate the respectful debate we had

# *Pair 132 P286 & P281 – Long Text – T1*

Person B: Hi  
  
Person A: Hello  
Would you like to start?  
  
Person B: Yeah  
  
Person A: My name is [name redacted] bvtw  
  
Person B: I'm [name redacted]

[emoji]  
  
Person A: damn that smiley face is creepy  
go ahead  
  
Person B: so to be clear on the positions, you support allowing controversial speakers onto campus?  
  
Person A: Yes  
  
Person B: ok  
My main problem with this is basically that I don't think all opinions have value  
and there's no need to allow speakers who say nothing of value to have an audience on campus  
  
Person A: ok, fair enough.  
What is your criteria for establishing what opinions have value?  
\*which  
  
Person B: I admit there isn't really an objective way of determining this  
but I don't think there needs to be  
  
Person A: how so>  
\*?  
  
Person B: in general I think people at reputable institutions can do a decent job of not being overzealous about it  
  
Person A: hmm, I feel that that in it of itself is already a fairly subjective point, but I can see why you would have faith in the institution. However, I don't believe that institutions would necessarily be able to determine which opinions are valid. Especially because every opinion is subjective. Because our evaluations of opinions are also subjective, I don't believe that it would be wise to allow any restriction on speech.  
who would you have determining which speakers are allowed?  
  
Person B: I'm not sure, I hadn't thought of that detail  
I was thinking more in terms of the principle of the matter, instead of the practicality  
though it is true that practical concerns are important  
  
Person A: Honestly, I don't agree with I think any of the speakers that were coming to campus, but I believe that if we make it possible to restrict speech for minority groups we don't agree with, we cannot guarantee that that same framework we establish will not be used to silence our oppinions once they become held by a minority aswell.  
  
Person B: I understand that concern, but I think in the context of the general values of institutions like this, it's not a huge risk  
barring some major overhaul in societal values or something  
I guess I think of this from the perspective of someone in academia  
People can argue that peer review and consensus can shut down minority opinions, but usually when we shut down an opinion we have a really good reason for it  
  
Person A: Humans are unpredictable. Years ago, many of the perpectives that are held today were once deemed to be controversial. Also, academia is not entirely in agreeance with many topics. In fact, the whole idea of academia is using debate and argumentation to find truths.  
Many opinions have been silenced before, even good and wholehearted ones.  
  
Person B: Yeah, but we've made it to where we are now

**[Experimenter says time is up]**  
  
Person A: Sorry if I cut you off or stopped you at any point. Just ant to say it was a good conversation and I hope that we can both think about our views. This was fun. Thank-you!  
  
Person B: Thanks!

# *Pair 133 P285 & P276 – Long Text – T3*

Person A: Hello1  
  
Person B: Hello  
  
Person A: So what do you think about our topic? where do you stand  
  
Person B: My position is to oppose the legalization of drugs in the US.  
  
Person A: And I support the legalization of most drugs, such as marijuana, lsd, cocaine. I'm not sure where I stand on "harder" drugs like meth and heroine  
Why do you oppose  
  
Person B: I see. One of the reasons I thought of to support this side of the argument was that legalizing drugs would make easier the access of children to such substances, which can subsequently harm them both physically and socially in the sense that they will not be able to reach the highest potential of success possible with the side effects of drugs.  
I know that the term "drugs" has a negative connotation. It implies a sense of addiction that users eventually acquire.  
  
Person A: I support legalizing because I believe drug use/overuse is more of a public health issue than a criminal one.  
  
Person B: And this addiction can stop people of all ages from being engaged in other worthwhile things.  
Also legalizing drugs may lead to more decisions of the like to be made, such as the legalization of harder drugs.  
There have been many articles regarding cases in which there is a murder or other occurrence of violence that was primarily traced back to the consumption of drugs. So I am led to believe that restricting the use of drugs in the first place can reduce the human tendency to conduct such harm in our society.  
  
Person A: I agree that drug use can be bad and ruin lives. But I just cannot ignore the disproportional rate of POC being imprisoned for drug use/dealing.  
It is both an educational and public health issue. Children/teens should get a more comprehensive education about drugs and their effects.  
As stated in the survey, rates of drug use and addiction actually go down when drugs are legalized and decriminalized.  
People who have been arrested for drug use should get medical help, such as rehab. Putting drug addicts in prison does not help them at all, and they often return to their drug use once they get out.  
I understand your concerns about legalized drugs being more accessible to children, but think of legalized drugs becoming like alcohol. There would be a strict age limit for buying these substances.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 134 P284 & P277 – Long Text – T3*

Person B: Hello!  
So what're your thoughts on drugs  
...?  
  
Person A: my main reason for believing drugs should be decriminalized is that countries with 'drug problems' have employed the strategy of decriminalization and it proved helpful for countries' 'drug problems' (though I dont believe in drug problems)'  
what do you think?  
  
Person B: I saw that it did well in Portugal (I think it was), but I've never been so I can't really argue too much to that point. Living in the US my whole life though, it seems to me that legalizing drugs would have more negative consequences than good  
I think it starts with the reason that people use drugs in the first place  
to alter brain chemistry to change perception of reality right?  
Isn't the result really then just that drugs distract us from the bad parts of life that we don't want to think about when we could be working to improve things  
  
Person B: i too think the root of 'drug problems' is largely social  
would you agree that people with drug problems might get off of drugs if they had a strong group of close relatives or friends?  
  
Person A: Not necessarily, in my experience, people don't always want to get off of drugs  
going to public school, a significant portion of the school smoked or did harder drugs  
It's not always seen as problem as much as a way of having some fun  
  
Person A: how do you feel about alcohol, being that it is a drug  
  
Person B: although I do think that in many cases, a strong group of close relatives or friends could help someone get off of drugs if they want to  
Alcohol is interesting for sure  
I was talking to my mom about that a couple weeks ago  
when I was heading off to college she said not to smoke or do drugs  
and I shot back at her that alcohol is a drug and I thought it strange that she disagreed with me  
I think a lot of the reason why alcohol is so pervasive in society is how ingrained in our culture it is  
Americans have been drinking since the very beginning- Fourth of July is basically just an excuse to get smashed for America  
  
Person A: yes, it is far more socially acceptable to escape reality with alcohol than it is meth or opiates  
  
Person B: Hahah, definitely true  
I met someone the other day who did meth and I was shocked but I walk but frat row everyday on my way to campus without batting an eye  
walk by frat row\*\*  
  
Person A: i think many institutions would have you believe that the 'loss of reality' with alcohol is to a far lower degree than these 'harder' drugs but i dont agree with this either  
what are you studying  
  
Person B: I'm MechE [mechanical engineering]  
  
Person A: Cool!  
  
Person B: Yea I'm not sure as I dont have a lot of experience with harder drugs  
what's your major?  
  
Person A: philosophy! Lol  
  
Person B: Hahah that's awesome, I really wanna take a philosophy class while I'm here  
  
Person A: and to be fair i dont have much experiecnce either, its just a number thing. not enough tiome to explain'  
you should!  
  
Person B: which one do you suggest?  
and what year are you?

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 135 P291 & P288 – Long Text – T3*

Person B: Hi, how are you?

Person A: Hey!

Person B: All right, let’s talk about drugs! Personally I would stand against legalizing all drugs in the blanket statement described in the prompt.

Person A:  
ok, why do you feel that way?  
also just to be clear: that would include currently legalized weed or are you just referring to drugs that at the moment are illegal?  
  
Person B:  
For the discussion, let's just assume currently illegal drugs.  
I believe that many such drugs, narcotics for example, possess negative impact on the immediate user and their communities... making them illegal is a way of keeping them out of the hands of an even larger portion of the population.  
I understand that making these items illegal encourages black market activity and its whole extra set of ramifications, but my opinion is just based on keeping certain drugs to as small a share of the population as possible. Interested to hear what you have to say!  
  
Person A:  
I definitely get your point! That said, a large part of the population still does get their hands on illegal drugs, often quite easily, and often from unreliable and unregulated sources. My argument for legalization would be that regulated drugs are far safer than unregulated ones. Many overdoses and deaths occur because a user was unaware of other unknown components being laced into the drug they knew they were taking. Legalization allows for regulation and certain standards to be set, which could allow for much safer drug use (because legal or not, people will continue to use drugs).  
  
Person B:  
Sure thing, makes sense! My question with that situation would be, even if all drugs were more effectively regulated, what would prevent people from still lacing these with other substances? If someone could lace an illegal drug, they could still lace a legal drug after its processing.  
  
Person A:  
My 2nd argument would be the external cost. The drug trade carries with it a whole host of other issues, including violence and crime that affects not only the people using or selling the drugs being sold. In addition, there is a direct external cost to society from people being incarcerated for drug use.  
  
Person B:  
Regardless, interesting points- I definitely see both sides to this problem. Shame not everything can be cut and dry, right and wrong in the world.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: Have a nice day!  
  
Person A:  
That's a fair point, that's a danger no matter what, but I think when it becomes easier to buy from a reliable source, it will become harder for people to tamper with any legal drugs.  
you too!

# *Pair 137 P294 & P289 – Long Text – T1*

Person A: Hello!  
  
Person B: Hey, how's it going?  
  
Person A: It's going good, yourself?  
  
Person B: It's been productive so far haha  
  
Person A: I use he/him/his pronouns by the way. Just for future reference  
  
Person B: Good to know, and same here  
  
Person A: I'd like to understand your viewpoint on this topic of controversial speakers. Would you like to go first?  
  
Person B: Will do, and for some context regarding my opinions: I am a fourth year and I've been here for Milo and other protests  
  
Person A: Okay! Thank you for the context, I'll provide some as well. I am a first year that has not been present for the protests on campus, but have participated and led numerous peaceful protests against controversial speakers in my area  
  
Person B: My opposing argument against having controversial speakers is strongly based on the fact that it creates an unsafe environment for students and campus community  
  
Person A: I see. That is a very valid point  
  
Person B: Have you read/are you aware of the protests that took place?  
  
Person A: Absolutely, in fact they were a deciding factor in my attendance here haha  
  
Person B: Ah I see haha, well yes I believe the cons heavily outweighed the pros in having them with the sole pro I can find being that free speech and thought is valued but outside of that violence, vandalism, and negative press is greatly disrupting our campus environment  
  
Person A: I see what you are saying. You have a completely valid opinion in that.  
  
Person B: The Milo protest I remember vividly had a lot of unaffiliated persons destroying both the campus and local businesses and streets with some students even being injured  
  
Person A: Not to say your opinion is invalid, in fact I agree with the horrendous nature of the vandalism, violence, and negative press. It doesn't help anyone. But I feel that ideas are ideas and to ignore knowledge by shutting our doors is to lose it immediately.  
And this is a research institution, Cal exists for the pursuit of knowledge  
  
Person B: A lot of outside see these events as opportunities to cause mayhem.  
  
Person A: But I completely agree with an objection the negative aspects. Which is why I like what Chancellor Christ had to say at convocation this year. "Hate speech is like mold. The only way to get rid of it with with fresh air and bright light."  
  
Person B: True but shutting our doors doesn't completely lose ideas, I believe other domains or venues can also share whatever message but until a safe, viable, and efficient solution is found for hosting speakers like Milo, then I believe community safety should be prioritized  
  
Person A: The protests were handled improperly. That is something we both agree on. But if handled correctly in the future with the aid of UCPD or other resources, we can allow these people to share differing ideas  
  
Person B: That's honestly as far my opinion goes. I am open to having controversial speakers on campus as well actually, but the consequences must be considered and there is no just compromise yet  
  
Person A: Also, going back to what you said about the outside seeing this as a chance to cause mayhem. I personally feel that this is not as significant an issue. No matter what happens, media outlets will twist it however they like. Insightful people will care to understand enough

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: It was a pleasure talking with you about this! I hope you have a wonderful day.  
I will definitely keep your perspective in mind for future discussions!  
  
Person B: Thank you and likewise! Not so much media outlets but groups like Antifa and such

# *Pair 146 P315 & P313 – Long Text – T1*

Person B: Hello  
  
Person A: HIi!  
  
Person B: What do you think about the question?  
  
Person A: I am for allowing speakers on campus, no what side of the spectrum they are on  
matter\*  
right or left  
What about you?  
  
Person B: I think the question of allowing or not should not be seen as between speakers of "right or left," which seems like a false dichotomy to me. Rather, if enough students, faculty and staff protest or pressure the administration to cancel a speaker's event because they feel it puts them at physical or emotional risk, then the administration should listen to that  
  
Person A: Wouldn't that be sensoring? I think by only allowing certain speakers to come because it may upset other people is unfair, and only allows certain students to engage in things/topics that are given to them. None of these speaker's events were forcing anyone to attend. If you disagree with what a speaker is saying/stands for, why not just not attend?  
  
Person B: I understand that selectively allowing speakers may seem like it goes against the Free Speech Movement, but in certain cases I don't think it does. The FSM was a community effort to increase openness, support diversity, and be able to question the dominant political narrative (in that case topics like the Vietnam war). In these cases, if speakers are coming with arguments against openness, diversity, and exacerbating the dominant political narrative of today, which includes a lot of rhetoric similar to historically catastrophic rhetoric, such as speakers in fascist times or civil wars all over the world, in these cases they are not adhering to the idea of the Free Speech Movement.  
  
Person A: I agree that if the speaker specifically is threatening to physically harm someone, they should not be allowed to come. But, from my knowledge, that was not the case in either cancellation. If anything, it was outside forces, and or protesters that created the violence/physical harm  
  
Person B: That's a good point, but oftentimes these events are not only events in a small room on campus that no one notices, rather the University has to spend money, from everyone's tuition as well, to provide space for these big-name speakers  
I know that hate-speech is a buzzword these days, but if we look at history, the effects of even a small gathering can snowball into much greater catastrophes if the ideas said aloud and shared and built on are full of hate  
That's why I think that if there is public outcry, which you're right, should definitely be peaceful, then the University should reconsider  
  
Person A: The events are only made into bigger events because of the resistance. Ben Shapiro came and spoke at Berkeley a year or so before the recent events and there wasn't a problem, why, all of a sudden does it become a problem?  
  
Person B: Is that a rhetorical question, or are you curious about the answer?  
If you are curious, I definitely don't have a solid answer, but I can imagine a few things:  
  
Person A: I understand that a lot has to do with the current administration, but I dont think its's fair for the students to be punished  
  
Person B: Sometimes scale matters, so depending on how well-known the person is, more people feel at risk  
Which students?  
Those who can't hear the speaker?  
  
Person A: Yes

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 147 P323 & P312 – Long Text – T2*

Person A: Hi!  
  
Person B: Hello there!  
Would you like to go first?  
  
Person A: Are you in support or oposition?  
I stated I wasn't strong on that topic   
  
Person B: I wasn't very strong either. I am in opposition, though I'd say it's more conditional opposition.  
  
Person A: Got it  
  
Person B: I think that the harmful vestiges of slavery are still very much prevalent, but I worry that simple monetary payouts would not be enough/effective in combating the system that is currently in place to support institutionalized racism.  
  
Person A: I agree, however, my initial thought that government reparations can possibly take different forms and do not necessarily cause a significant increase in taxes, etc. Some programs can possibly be developed for African Americans especially of the lower socioeconomic status, such as healthcare subsidies, more educational grants, possibly housing vouchers. Etc  
  
Person B: Besides the fact that this type of legislation would be very hard to pass through an already difficult congress, I think it would face so much opposition as to come out as largely inaffective (while only furthering the idea that America could declare racism "over" a la "we have had an African American President now the issue is well and truly behind us).  
  
Person A: I believe many of what I listed does exist already but I'm thinking it can be further developed for the target communities.  
If some of the programs adopted on the state and local level, I believe it's possible to pass such a law. I meanwhile think that monetary compensation is not going to bring a sufficient change. More resources needs to be allocated to fight the existing bias in such areas as racial profiling or workforce hiring bias.  
  
Person B: It seems like there are so many things that are directly affecting the African American community (specifically police violence and the utter imbalance of the legal system when it comes to prosecution and sentencing of African Americans as referred to as the new Jim Crow). Only giving money seems to ignore these realities. I agree that there needs to be a focus on a holistic approach to aid.  
Exactly. I think my worry is that the idea of monetary reparations themselves would trigger such an outraged response by many in this country that it would overshadow all the other work being done.  
  
Person A: Agree. A simple monetary payout seems to be just a way to hide the problem while additional funds to well-targeted programs might possibly do good.  
  
Person B: I know it might sound a bit callous to anyone in a disenfranchised financial position, but I think there is a fair point to be raised around what the monetary value of simple reparations could be and what it would really do. In the long run, even thousands of dollars doesn't cover the amount of "free" labor that was provided by Antebellum slaves, nor does it account for the pittance wages paid to sharecroppers and others in the wake of the war.  
When many African Americans are barred from housing and loan access, what can this money do tochange the system?  
  
Person A: I was just thinking about how the amount would be determined. It seems impossible to put into a dollar value.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 148 P322 & P316 – Long Text – T2*

Person B: Hi!  
  
Person A: Hi!  
  
Person B: I guess we can start by saying our stances?  
  
Person A: sure   
what do you think about government reparations for slavery??  
  
  
Person B: I would say that I'm opposed to offering reparations for slavery  
What do you think?  
  
  
Person A: for the most part, i would say that i'm for offering reparations but i'm not super strong on my stance  
i don't feel like i know enough about it to feel very strongly about it  
why are you opposed?  
  
Person B: That's a really good point, I don't think I'm well-educated enough on this topic to be super firm about it  
I think offering reparations opens up a lot of economic, logistical, and maybe even ethical issues  
  
Person A: yeah, for sure  
i'm with you on the economic and logistical issues  
can you elaborate on the ethical issues part?  
i didn't really think about that  
  
Person B: Yeah it's kind of counter-intuitive considering that slavery is very clearly unethical  
I mean to say that I'm not sure how offering reparations to one group will work when other groups have also been discriminated against, though in different ways  
Japanese internment camps for example  
How is it okay to offer reparations to some and not to others? That's more what I meant  
what's your opinion?  
  
Person A: ah, okay  
that makes a lot of sense  
it's interesting that you mention that because i think reparations can be/should be extended to other groups that have been discriminated against as well  
if reparations were done, of course  
specifically for african americans, though, i feel as though we are still reeling from the aftermath of slavery even today  
with the whole black lives matter movement and whatnot  
  
Person B: ah gotcha. it would be really interesting to look at the data on all this-- education effects, etc.  
I don't know a lot as I said haha but there is definitely a lot of info out there  
  
Person A: yup, that's true  
  
Person B: I think I  
oops haha  
  
Person A: haha all good!  
  
Person B: I think I'm pretty much in agreement with you over this last point then so I guess for me it's more the economic aspect  
  
Person A: is it just the fact that it seems economically unsound?  
  
Person B: Essentially. America has a large debt and I'm not sure where in the budget this type of funding would come from  
Would we cut other spending? Would we increase taxes? Etc  
And also is it fair to make people pay for what wasn't necessarily their fault (new immigrants, for example)?  
What do you think?  
  
Person A: hm that's a good point  
i don't really have an answer for the economic problem oops  
but for the immigrant thing, i see your point, but at the same time i kind of think that you inherit the history of another country once you move ??

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: well, it was nice talking to you!!  
  
Person B: Ah that's okay! good point and nice talking to you too!!

# *Pair 149 P320 & P317 – Long Text – T2*

Person B: Hello  
  
Person A: Hello  
  
Person B: What is your opinion on the topic  
  
Person A: I think that the government should provide reparations for slavery  
  
Person B: I chose to mildly disagree with the subject, but only because I was unsure of how the government would plan to do this  
  
Person A: I think that they should have a long time ago, but even though slavery ended over a century ago I think they are still responsible for reparations  
Yes, the logistics are hard. I don't want the government to be bankrupt  
But, there's no effort so that's frustrating in itself  
  
Person B: I agree with that  
One question I have is how the government would determine whether or not people are eligible  
What do you think?  
  
Person A: I can't say that I know in what form / to what extent reparations should come.  
  
Person B: I do heavily agree that many of those whose families were forced into slavery deal with the effects today  
  
Person A: I think that there is no perfect way to determine eligibility. Structural changes in government, education and laws I think would be best  
structural changes don't require a "list" of who is eligble/ineligible  
  
Person B: They've been placed at a disadvantage that results from slavery, and when at such a disadvantage, it becomes hard to overcome, even after over a century  
  
Person A: You and I are definitely in agreement there  
  
Person B: So do you believe that a system that could possibly end up giving reparations to more people than are deserving or not giving reparations to everyone who deserves it could still work because it is capable of providing reparations to many who do deserve it?  
  
Person A: I am definitely in agreement with you that reparations would be a very, very difficult thing to implement. For practical reasons and also because I don't think the majority of Americans would support it  
I think so because hopefully, whether the people "deserve" it or not, the programs help people in need  
  
Person B: That is true.  
  
Person A: I think if people are in need and need help, if they get help it is generally a good thing.  
  
Person B: I guess that if a large amount of people who are held down by society as a result of slavery's aftereffects can be helped than it is a good thing to do so.  
So I guess than that we can agree that it is a morally correct thing for the government to do, but that it is incredibly difficult to do so.  
  
Person A: Yes, but I think where is disagree is that you don't think it can be done, and I think something can be done  
What that something is could be small, it would take effort and be hard to figure out. But I am sure something can be figured out  
  
Person B: Alright  
Maybe I consider things in terms of absolutes too much, as if there needs to be a concrete solution that provides help to everyone who deserves it  
  
Person A: I think in terms of just morale, any type of effort on the government's part would help the black community  
emotionally if nothing else.  
  
Person B: I guess you have changed my mind somewhat. If the government is capable of doing something about it, even something small or not fully concrete, it is preferable to doing nothing at all  
And it means that the government recognizes the struggles black people face today over a century after the end of slavery  
  
Person A: Yes. I am hesitant to say that there's a perfect solution that would help everyone (I certainly don't know what that would look like).  
Yes. Recognition of wrongs goes a long way.  
  
Person B: I believe that what makes it difficult for a perfect solution is the large gap in time as well as lack of records  
  
Person A: Because not only does it acknowledge and help the black community, it helps to mold public thought on the issue which is equally if not more important  
  
Person B: But that is something that can't be changed  
Agreed  
If the government is taking a concrete stance on something, then that helps formulate a citizen's mind  
  
Person A: Yes, the time that has passed and the loss/destruction of records is hard  
We agree

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: nice talking to you  
  
Person B: Yup

# *Pair 150 P319 & P314 – Long Text – T3*

Person A: hello!  
  
Person B: Hi  
My name is [name redacted], nice to meet you  
  
Person A: I'm [name redacted], nice to meet you too, I was in support for the legalization of drugs in the US  
what are your thoughts?  
  
Person B: Well, I'm totally disagree with that  
I don't think we should legalize drugs in the US  
  
Person A: I see, do you think that because of the dangers of a lot of people misusing drugs?  
  
Person B: that's one of the reason I think of  
I think one reason why some many people are homeless in the US is because of drug  
one of the \*  
they use all their money on drugs instead of paying rent, paying bill or even feed themselves  
  
Person A: I see, and do you think that if hard drugs are legalized, there'll be even more of a problem with homelessness?  
  
Person B: yup  
  
Person A: Because right now hard drugs aren't legal but people still get a hold of them somehow and it can lead to those problems  
What I was thinking is that since many people already know about the dangers of drugs, as we can see in problems like homelessness, even if legal, I don't think that there would be widespread misuse of these drugs.  
Like looking at alcohol, excessive amounts of alcohol can have adverse effects and lead to death but pretty much all types of alcohol are legal in the US  
and people do suffer from alcohol misuse but it's still legal  
  
Person B: and yet that lead to DUI in the US  
  
Person A: yes  
  
Person B: that what I'm trying to say  
  
Person A: oh okay, do you think that alcohol should also be illegal?  
  
Person B: Well, I don't think that alcohol should be illegal. I think most of the people who take drugs are teens and they didn't know that their behavior after taking drugs can dangerous others live

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 172 P372 & P366 – Long Text – T1*

Person B: Hi  
  
Person A: Hey  
Do you want to share your stance on speakers?  
  
Person B: Yes. In my opinion, any speaker who falls into the category of "extremely controversial" should not be allowed to speak on campus. The campus is an actively growing community of learners and influencing extreme thinking can have negative repercussions .  
What do you think?  
  
Person A: But wouldn't you agree that "extremely controversial" is subjective? I'm sure that a far right winged individual would consider a leftist speech to be controversial in their opinion  
I do definitely agree that speakers have a strong influence on our community  
My stance is more so focused on the free speech  
And the environment that UCB students worked so hard to cultivate in the past  
Yes, inviting controversial speakers gives them a platform to spread hateful messages which isn't something that should be honored  
But students also have the freedom to protest, oppose, and not listen  
I think it gives an opportunity for both sides to present themselves and respond  
Were you here during the Milos riot 2 years ago by any chance?  
  
Person B: I agree that people have their right to free speech and opinion. But as a society we depend on each other for the whole well being of the society and no matter which spectrum we belong to, we have to reach a peaceful median. Most the "extremist" speeches have been used to incite violence (example the leader of KKK) or force extreme religious beliefs of people's personal life (ex. preventing abortions) or generate hate and alienate people who belong to the LGBTQ community  
on people's personal life\*  
  
Person A: That  
That's true.  
  
Person B: For example: ISIS is often reported to be using online streaming to radicalize people into islamic extremists, influencing them to conduct acts of terror. Can we allow ISIS to come to campus and speak in the name of free speech?  
  
Person A: Would you say the same about those hippies that stand in the middle of Sproul preaching about Jesus?  
Religion is also a "controversial" topic  
Not violent, but controversial  
  
Person B: Yes I would discourage the hippies!  
  
Person A: I'm most focused less on content and more of exercising the right  
Even though they aren't inciting violence?  
Even though "spreading the word of god" is encouraging people to be kind or go to church?  
  
Person B: But the pen is mightier than the sword and the content of the speech, for that matter, the content of any speech is what would influence people  
So in this case the boundaries of the "extreme" needs to be defined better

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 173 P371 & P368 – Long Text – T3*

Person A: Hello

Person B: - Drugs (cocaine, heroin, meth) are toxic chemical substances that should not be legalized. They should not be considered recreational due to the harm they cause physically, emotionally, economically, and socially.

oh hey

Person A: I agree that drugs such as cocaine, heroin, and meth are harmful towards people.

Person B: I don’t necessarily believe in intense prison time for users of substances. however distribution is a major problem and should be criminalized

we are talking about hardcore drugs right

Person A: Yeah

Person B: okay cool

Person A: like schedule 2 and 1

not marijuana

Person B: good

Person A: I personally believe that almost all drugs should be legalized because I personally people should be allowed to do.

Person B: schedule 2 drugs facilitate and lead to various other crimes. They create people who cannot contribute to society because of their addictive and harmful nature, increase homeless population, poverty, etc.

Person A: As long as they don’t harm others.

The thing is that I believe that legalization and decriminalization will reduce many problems caused by drugs

Person B: Hardcore drug use also facilitates a lot of other crime: assault, child endangerment, robbery. Also a lot of distribution of schedule 2 drugs stem from gangs.

it's a no go for me.

Person A: Legalizing drugs will stop the distribution of drugs from gangs.

For example, in the 1920s alcohol was illegal.

And most of the alcohol was bootlegged and lacked regulation.

Leading to a lot of alcohol poisoning.

And gang violence.

And a myriad of other social issues.

Person B: I disagree, i think legalization of hardcore substances normalizes toxic, problematic, and addictive drugs

Legalizing, i believe, will make them more accessible

Person A: That is tru.

I agree that it makes it more accessible.

Person B: I think alcohol and cocaine are different though

Person A: But it makes it safer as well.

Person B: I don’t know if I agree with that

Person A: You know what you are getting.

Instead of buying from gangs

Person B: I think legalizing pot and alcohol makes the use of those two substances safer

But why would we want to allow people to start buying cocaine legally

Gangs will still exist

Person A: By legalizing cocaine, the cocaine supply would be much safer.

Currently, most cocaine is cut.

Person B: Cocaine supply will never be safe

Person A: And because of that people do not know what they r getting.

Person B: if more people have access, more people will get involved in a very harmful lifestyle

A lifestyle that leads into various behaviors that are problematic

Person A: But if cocaine is legalized, treatment options would be much easier as well.  
  
Person B: I would imagine child endangerment/abuse would rise, stealing, assault  
Why would we want to legalize something that is harmful and in turn create a wider need for treatment  
schedule 2 drugs are in no way needed in society, legalizing them makes them seem recreational

Person A: People already use drugs though.

Person B: I understand where you are coming from.  
that argument could be said with anything though  
murder happens, might as well legalize murder  
  
Person A:  
Thats different though  
Murder directly harms other people  
  
Person B:  
I just fundamentally do not believe hardcore drugs should be legalized  
  
Person A:  
Drugs inherently harm the person doing drugs.  
  
Person B:  
and those around them  
  
Person A:  
I understand what your coming from as well.  
  
Person B:  
Cool  
  
Person A:  
Drugs can be bad.  
  
Person B:  
Agreed  
  
Person A:  
But I personally believe that the government should allow people to do what they want.  
And that people should have the choice to make choices themselves.  
  
Person B:  
I think the government should allow people to do what they want if it does not harm others, and i believe use of hardcore drugs does harm others  
I think harm is unavoidable

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 174 P374 & P369 – Long Text – T3*

Person A: Hello!  
  
Person B: Hi!  
Would you like to start the debate or would you rather I start?  
  
Person A: You can start!  
  
Person B: Ok, so first off I assume that you are for the legalization of drugs since we matched as opposites?  
  
Person A: Yes!  
  
Person B: ok. So to start I acknowledge that there has been evidence from other countries that decriminalizing drugs has helped addiction rates and such but I believe that the solution to a lot of people engaging in dangerous and criminal behavior is not to remove the punishment for said behavior. I think a better solution would be a more comprehensive drug education program in schools and community that better outlines the effects drugs can have on you mentally and physically and how these effects can be permanent and irreperable.  
  
Person A: I do think more drug education programs in schools and community is a more long-term solution that creates healthy habits for people to stay sober. But I believe that by legalizing drugs, the officials could obtain the ability to be in control of drug's users  
sorry I hit send by accident. Still need to finish that  
usages and maintain proof of documentation. People who would like to have access to drugs now have to be in the system where everything is recorded.  
  
Person B: I see your point. But just in my personal experience, since the legalization of marijuana in California dispencaries? (sorry about the spelling) have popped up like weeds (pun not intended). There are 2 on telegraph alone. And when I walk to and from the dorms most days I smell weed at least once a day but the police don't do anything because so many people consider it to be a non issue. So people like me who don't want to do drugs and don't want to be around that behavior or exposed to it are forced to be

**[Experimenter says time is up]**  
  
Person A: Good talk! Happy Friday

# *Pair 175 P370 & P367 – Long Text – T2*

Person A: Hello!  
  
Person B: Hi  
  
Person A: I'll just write out the question here for the sake of it: Do you oppose or support government reparations for slavery?  
  
Person B: I oppose reparations for slavery, but my stance isn't strong at all.  
  
Person A: I support reparations for slavery, and my stance is strongly felt, but not TOO strongly felt  
  
Person B: Ok that  
\*thats fair  
  
Person A: I don't really know how to articulate how strongly I feel about it honestly  
what are your thoughts on it?  
  
Person B: I'm not too familiar with the opposing sides of the argument nor with the general points. However, some thoughts are that I don't think there are former slaves that are still alive today. Also, many of the people in the US today are descendants from immigrants who immigrated post abolition. Another thing is that reparations will be extremely costly and I feel like there are other pressing matters that could use those types of funding.  
I understand that the US as a whole holds responsibility for having the institution of slavery in the past, but there were many who were opposed to it and fought for abolition  
  
Person A: I see your point -- logistically, the idea of tracking down the distant descendants of slaves when during those times record keeping was certainly less than efficient just sounds like a nightmare. I suppose that when I think about the situation itself, African Americans with deep familial roots in this country are, in lower-income communities, disproportionately present in many places. Although slavery officially ended a few hundred years ago, the socioeconomic ramifications of the practice itself still run deep (African Americans being unable to easily trace back their ethnic heritage, implicit biases, the need for the Civil Rights Movement to occur just for African Americans to be seen as citizens equal to their white counterparts, etc)  
I think that the U.S. government, at the very least, must place a large portion of their focus into improving communities that are lower-income and do not have as many educational or work opportunities as others may have already.  
  
Person B: I agree with the idea that if there should be reparations, it should be in the form of funding more training programs for lower income communties as well as more funding/educational opportuntiies for them

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 187 P408 & P401 – Long Text – T2*

Person B: Hi  
  
Person A: Hello  
  
Person B: I am currently opposing the stance for government reparations for slavery  
You?  
  
Person A: i am in favor of reparations, although my stance is not particularly strong  
  
Person B: I see  
I do not support reparations because the fight for slavery ended more than a century ago  
  
Person A: i am indifferent because the argument doesn't really pertain to me, so i feel like i don't have a right to push forth an opinion  
i support the idea of reparations because income inequality is a huge issue as is racism  
  
Person B: well i oppose because anyone who was a slave or any immediate/secondary family memebers has since passed away  
  
Person A: and i feel like reparations are just giving payment where it is due  
i see your argument  
  
Person B: in addition due to the generation gaps there are prpobably a lot of descendents  
here today  
and there porbably isnt enough money to go to all of them  
  
Person A: don't you feel like there should be some sort of reparation towards african americans in general?  
  
Person B: income inequality cannot be undone just because of reparations  
not really  
i mean there are immigrants from africa who came after slavery  
how are we gonna tell the difference  
  
Person A: i do agree that reparations will not resolve every issue in this case  
but i feel like there should be some effort or movement towards lessening the mistreatment towards the race as a whole  
and reparations is an idea that has good intentions  
  
Person B: i also think that if there are reparations, they should have been done in the respective time period  
  
Person A: i agree with that 100% it would have been much more effective and ideal  
  
Person B: like american japanese people were given reparations like twenty years later  
after ww2  
  
Person A: yes true  
  
Person B: maybe mistreatment of african americans for your point of view needs to be solved another way  
  
Person A: Yeah  
  
Person B: jsut not reparations for slavery  
  
Person A: i see your points, wish i had thought of them earlier  
my bad  
  
Person B: lol it aint your bad we had like 10 min to thk this through  
  
Person A: well  
that was a sad debate  
where are you from?  
  
Person B: i just already made my mind up so yeah. you were like in the middle  
im from socal  
chino hills to be exact  
You?  
  
Person A: nice !  
sacramento  
was born in cupertino though  
  
Person B: r u a kings fan cuz im a lakers fan  
lmao do u even like basketball in general tho  
  
Person A: i do like basketball  
im not a huge kings fan but gotta represent the city  
but i am not a fan at all of the lakers  
So  
  
Person B: lol may i ask what gender r you.  
  
Person A: female  
what year are you  
  
Person B: oh maybe basketball aint a thing to talk about  
im a soph  
  
Person A: lol also what  
does that mean  
  
Person B: idk  
what major r u  
  
Person A: mcb/nutritional sciences  
pre-med in general  
Hbu  
  
Person B: aw cs/data sci intended  
typical guy here at berkeley i gues  
  
Person A: wowza  
legit everyone i meet is cs/data science  
i dont even know what data science is but i guess it's really popular  
  
Person B: anyone not in my classes are mcb so...  
are you also a soph  
  
Person A: nope lol i'm a freshman  
  
Person B: Ayyyy  
  
Person A: yeah kms  
another reason to hate me lol  
  
Person B: im technically a spring admit so its my second sem. does that make me a freshman too  
Nah  
  
Person A: oh woah what  
i didn't know that was a thing

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 188 P410 & P400 – Long Text – T2*

Person A: hey! what is your opinion?  
  
Person B: Hello  
I had a pretty weak opinion so im def just gonna listen to what u had to say  
  
Person A: i honestly do not know enough about this topic…  
  
Person B: I think i was slightly opposed  
whats ur name?  
I'm [name redacted]  
  
Person A: to even have an opinion  
[name redacted]!  
  
Person B: haha hey [name redacted]  
  
Person A: umm i think i was slightly supportive but i don't really understand what "reparations" means  
  
Person B: Yeah idk i pretty much just said kinda disagree because I don't really think that the reparations are necessary bc I think the system willl fix itself if we work on fixing it  
I think reparations just means money  
  
Person A: ohh ok. yeah i can see that  
are you libertarian?  
  
Person B: so like if my ancestors were slaves we would recieve compensation  
  
Person A: oh ok that makes more sense  
  
Person B: nah i dnt rlly hav an affiliation  
  
Person A: ok bc what you said sounds exactly like what my boyfriend would say hahaha  
he's libertarian  
i am like a moderate liberal  
  
Person B: ahh i see haha  
  
Person A: but i've started to ween away from wanting a lot of government intervention on things  
  
Person B: this is kinda like a really direct form of affirmative action  
  
Person A: i don't think the government needs to be involved in everything  
  
Person B: LOL its kinda funny tht u said tht bc my gf and i kinda debate abt affirmative action too and im kinda anti  
  
Person A: i feel like if you asked most people here with the berkeley mindset they would automatically say yes  
so i really appreciate that you didn't say that haha  
omg that is funny  
does your gf consider herself liberal or nah?  
  
Person B: yeah i just dont think its really practical to think that the govt could adequately compensate for slavery so they should just try to make it better in the future

and yeah she is haha pretty moderate tho

Person A: yeah and i think that if like say a business was discriminating against black people now then they wouldn’t get much business honestly in the 21st century

Person B: also im japanese american so this kinda reminds me of when the govt tried to compensate JA citizens for putting them in camps

and tht didnt go well

Person A: oh rly? wow that is interesting

Yeah so i guess like being aware of the affects of slavery is important but it’s not super necessary to take taxpayer dollars to put towards it because it has been mostly fixed? (i know ppl are still discriminated against but i think overall)

Person B: Yea

Person A: i don’t even think it’s something the government can do

they can’t even pull off good healthcare

Person B: i also thought the point that the people paying for the reparations wouldn’t necessarily even be the people whos ancestors were responsible was kinda valid

hah tru

Person A: there is this freeway in Seattle (where i live) and the state has been constructing on it for the past 10 years and still have not finished and it’s literally just like half a mile of road they’re working on

Person B: loll

Person A: it’s awful and knowing that my taxpayer dollars go to that gives me no faith in the government sometimes

Person B: thts government for u

Person A: and yeah true i don’t think we should be forced to pay for that

Person B: yeah no i just don’t even think the govt could pull it off and if they did itd b like here’s a 30 dollar check

Person A: yeah honestly i think it would be offensive to ppl if they just got like $30

Person B: bc they def wouldn’t like hand out any reasonable amnt of money

Person A: no amount of money would make up for the awfulness of slavery

i honestly think that more than money, people would just like to be respected and acknowledged for having that past

Person B: and also other minorities have also faced a lot of discrimination as well so i dnt think itd be fair to just compensate african americans

Person A: that’s true

i've felt that myself

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: hah had fun talking to ya

Person A: ok bye!! :)

You too!!

# *Pair 190 P412 & P399 – Long Text – T3*

Person B: Hello!

Person A: Hello!

so why do you think drugs should not be legalized?

Person B: I believe the most apparent reason why they shouldn't be legalized is because of their detrimental effects they will have on the public.

especially with younger generations

for example- if kids grow up learning that drugs are okay to be used and bought and sold regularly what is going to stop them from using them?

Person A: really? i think that legalizing drugs actually decreases their usage. for example, marijuana has been decriminalized and yet marijuana usage rates are significantly decreasing in our generation

i thinkit would be a lot easier for someone struggling with addiction to step forward and get help if they wouldn't be criminalized for doing so

Person B: I have nothing against the small recreational use of marijuana and its legalization

but the legalization of all drugs in the U.S. is something that shouldn't be allowed

marijuana doesn't have serious side effects or health issues related to it whereas other drugs such as cocaine and heroine are extremely dangerous to use

there are many places where struggling addicts can turn to for help where they wouldn't be criminalized

Person A: but the same thing goes for opiates like oxycontin and percocet, yet they are legal. prescription drug abuse has increased significantly

Person B: we have no control over the overdosing of prescription drugs

Person A: the problem is, a lot of those places (private rehab etc.) are restricted to those who have financial access making this a socioeconomic issue

Person B: that is true in that some rehab places are unavailable for those who can't afford it

however what's to come when we legalize the drugs

and then people become addicts

making more addicts and more people wanting rehab

who are unable to afford it

Have you watched the show Dr. Phil?

Person A: lol yes

Person B: Hahaha

I think that if people seriously wanted help or wanted to turn away from their addictions they will choose to do so

Going back to my point on how it will affect younger generations, how do you think schools will be affected by the legalization of drugs?

Coming from my school and the greater Los Angeles County I've seen drugs being used on a widespread basis

Person A: I really don't think that legalizing drugs encourages kids to use it, its glorified enough as it is in the media etc

Person B: I think it does encourage kids to use it though

Most teens are thinking "I wanna do it just to try it"

so what is going to stop them when drugs are prevalent and easily accessible

Person A: The main reason why I want drugs to be legalized is because the enforcement and incarceration of individuals who use/traffick drugs is highly racialized

And statistically from othercountries who have legalized drugs,the rates of addiction and drug use actually go down

Person B: what do you mean?

highly racialized as in targeting certain races?

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: Byeee

Person A: poor black and latino communities are highly targeted

hah bye

Person B: ahh yes

they are

# *Pair 191 P409 & P407 – Long Text – T3*

Person A: Hi there!

Person B: Hi! I do not think that drugs should be legalized in the United States.

Person A: Well I support the legalization of drugs

Person B: I think this because the drugs that are currently illegal in the United States are Class 1 drugs that have been deemed dangerous for some reason of another.

Person A: But we saw in the example case that legalization actually reduces deaths due to drug overdose

Please complete your point

Person B: I think that that example might be true for a smaller country with a society and government who can offer help and care to the individuals, but the United States is very culturally different, and is more focused on ideas of individualism.

Person A: Difference in size of country is a good aspect to consider, I agree

Person B: I think in Portugal it works because the society and families feel the need to care for those in their societies because of their culture and history, but here, if someone became addicted to drugs, they'd be looked at really negatively.

Person A: But if drugs aren't legal, the illegal activities (trafficking etc) around drugs increase

Person B: I don't think that means that we can't take care of ourselves, but that we don't care for each other enough to the point where this wouldn't be an issue.

I think you're right about that, and I'm not really sure how it could be lessened without the legalization.

Person A: A lot of resources go into regularizing the issues around drugs when it is illegal

Person B: I haven't seen the numbers on legal vs. illegal marijuana in California, but it would be interesting to look at it after the legalization.

Person A: So US Govt. ends up spending a good amount in this anyway

Person B: What do you mean about regularizing?

Person A: Also if drugs are legal, there would be tax collection from this place

Person B: Do you mean regulating?

Person A: By regularizing I mean catching peddlers

I mean regulating yes

Person B: That's true, but I know of a great number of people in Berkeley who will still get it the "illegal" way in order to avoid the taxes that have been put on it when its sold in a legal way.

Person A: Good point. Most people will try to avoid taxes

Person B: And I completely agree that the government spends a great amount trying to catch the people who are selling it illegal.

But when you think about it, marijuana is already legal. It would be concerning to me if drugs like heroin became legal, and everyone would have access to them. Marijuana has been shown to have health benefits, but drugs such as heroin have none, and aren't even used by college students. If it became legal and started to be prevalent, I think our society would face a lot of issues.

Person A: Do you want to talk more about the individualistic point you were making

Person B: I don't know if you have any strong views on this point, but it would be interesting to hear!

Person A: I think there should be more awareness about the ill effects of drugs instead of criminalizing it

I feel there are always a few people who will nudge you - friends, partner, family- if you are getting addicted to something

however different the cultures might be

Social stigma might be a very non-US thing though

Person B: I think both of your statements are true. I agree that a lot of people are in jail for drug crimes relating to heroin, marijuana, etc. that only were users, and that isn't right.

And hopefully there would be people that would nudge and try to stop you, but if not it would be nice to have a government to step in and try to help if not.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: It was nice speaking with you :)

Person A: Same here!

# *Pair 192 P411 & P404 – Long Text – T3*

Person A: Hello

Person B: Hi

Person A: how do you feel about legalizing drug use?

Person B: While I can see benefits and cons to both sides, I went towards more of an opposing side.

Person A: I veered in the direction of pro

Person B: Why do you believe we should

legalize them

Person A: I would say the term legalize is a little too extreme, but I believe there are a number of drugs that should be regulated due primarily to that the designation of certain drugs as illicit has not prevented illicit drug abuse.

It is more important to solve the problems such as the detriments the drug abuse puts onto the user than it is to punish use and distribution

health detriments\*

Person B: So basically, one of the reasons why I think that legalizing drugs is not a good idea, is this... while I am sure there would be an age requirement for who can hold the drugs legally, in general, there will be great increase in access to drugs. Thus, younger generations will be able to access drugs earlier. This can impede education, mental health, and beneficial citizens.

Person A: I see your point, but I don't think access that younger generations have to drugs will necessarily increase

I do not believe there will be more drug users in total due to its illegalization

I believe most people will maintain their current position to personal drug use....

... I think people who are against drug use will not be more likely to fall into that crutch

And I think more effort (including financial efforts) could be put into drug information/education, to discourage kids from using drugs beginning in junior high

Person B: Well, with a child that is in a household where parents might already do drugs, this will worsen the problem as they will have more access. Having it easily accessible with no consequences for distributing and using them, will make people use them more frequently. And, drugs can increase rates of like abuse in the house.

Person A: I'm sure the figure is in the billions for how many dollars the US spends on prison terms annually for people imprisoned for drug related offense

Person B: I don't think that putting more financial means into drug education will help. Just look at all the people who still drink and smoke weed under the age.

Person A: That is a good point, as I know this sort of abuse will occur at times with high schoolers stealing their parents opioid pain medication

But I also believe that redirecting funds toward preventative measures would drastically decrease drug use among all age demographics

As abuse is currently happening regardless of legalization

Person B: Also, drugs are linked to crime. With more drug users, there can be a big increase in crime. Drugs can lead to eradicated, unpredictable behavior. In prison documentaries I have watched before, many of the men who committed crimes don't always remember what crime they committed because they were under the influence of drugs. One guy didn't even remember stabbing someone to death.

What can of preventative messages do you think could help?

Person A: My belief is that legalizing drugs would not increase the number of drug users, but rather decrease them

The prison system in the US is among the worst of developed countries, and I think rehabilitation centers should be implemented rather than punishment for drug use

I believe that drug abuse that results in criminal behavior should not be legalized

Person B: But the drugs that they want to legalize like acid, shrooms, etc, are different than weed. They have much greater effects on a person, and I think that more people will get into harder drugs if they have more access.

Person A: those punishments should still follow

The original survey mentioned drugs from all classes

I think opioidss are the biggestconcern for our nation

in terms of deaths and health

Person B: I understand that our system does not deal well with drug issues

Person A: and that legalization for this class would have far different implications than for shrooms and acid, which are already being used by youngins

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 193 P403 & P398 – Long Text – T3*

Person A: Hi, I'm [name redacted]!

Person B: Hi, I'm [name redacted]

I'm guessing you think drugs should be legalized

since we were paired up

Person A: Yeah

And you think opposite?

Person B: Yup

Person A: Lol okay cool

So why do you think so?

Person B: Classic Berkeley Lmao

Person A: ^^

Person B: I think that since drugs are bad, making them illegal gives people the incentive to not do them, for fear of being arrested

Person A: I can see what you mean but there is already so many illegal activity that goes on already (like the black market and domestic abuse). Weed was just legalized in CA but everyone was still doing it before.

Person B: That's true, but the number of weed users in California, Colorado, and Washington increased after it was legalized

Person A: Okay but I think you also have to consider reverse psychology. Like if drugs are out in society openly, there wouldn't be anything taboo about them and people would not be as curious. Also, we would be able to save the money from enforcement and put it towards creating rehabilitation centers that are a better alternative to prisons. The American prison system in general is really messed up.

Person B: That's true, prisons are not great

But I don't think people have to be arrested for doing drugs. I think if they were fined instead, the cost of enforcement would pay for itself and possibly could raise money for rehab facilities.

Person A: That would work but only for people who could afford to pay the fines. If drugs were legalized, there would be no incentive to illegally trade goods at all which would decrease the potential of complementary crime (such as a shoot out if agreements don't go as planned, or the presence of gang violence).

Person B: That's true, but I think even with legal drugs, you wouldn't see Heroin sold at your local pharmacy, it would be the same people selling the hard drugs but with no punishment

Person A: I guess. There would be specialized stores and companies set up I imagine though.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Ahh okay it was nice talking to you!

Person B: You too

Person A: go bears

Person B: Go bears lol

I bought a 40 dollar sweater I finally feel like a real student

Person A: yay!

ouch that price though. was it from the student store?

Person B: Yup

Person A: noooo

theyre ripping students off

Person B: oh well rip too late

# *Pair 244 P522 & P521 – Long Text – T1*

Person A: Hi

Person B: Hi

Person A: So, I support extremely controversial speakers on campus

Precisely on CAMPUS

the audience of critically thinking students that can overcome their own personal feelings about what is spoken about and treat it as thinking material is a good fit. It benefits student's career. Only, of course, if a student chose to be in the audience

The bottom line, when I imagine topics that might be too sensitive for me and might hurt mu feelings have a choice to hear the speaker out and "know my enemy" or ignore the participation at all.

Person B: I don't for the reason that many of the extremely controversial speakers tend to hold alt-right and, at times, white nationalistic views. My main issue is that these ideas can be actively harmful to minority students in particular, even if they aren't in attendance because these ideas become implanted in those who do attend and eventually will resurface in one way or another.

Person A: If an extremely controversial topic is disturbing for many, it still may be a good platform to raise awareness and unite as campus community upon/against the cause

I disagree about the idea of "resurfacing in others". I think, the community of critical thinkers is very strong on campus and will fight the negative idea of a presenter (which is not only presenter's point of view in the world/country/state) more effectively

Person B: Even if students aren't attending, followers of these people do tend to come in support and create problems in the forms of issues between protesters and counter-protesters. Plus, if many students don't agree with/don't want the speaker to be present, wouldn't it just be better to refrain from having the speaker in the first place?

Person A: I do agree that the extremely controversial speaking is not a good feed for general public, but can be turned out to be a positive challenge for the community of outstanding students on campus. (i consider UC Berkeley as a specific campus we are talking about)

I believe that some ingenious ideas and most effective innovations came through a challenge to conformation

Person B: Also the idea of the speaker's ideas resurfacing in others doesn't have to be outright prejudice, it can be latent. By these speakers reaffirming stereotypes and prejudices against minorities (I'm using the basis from the speakers given in the example as they tend to be outspoken towards minorities in their online presence) they create a more difficult environment through the attitudes of others

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 245 P524 & P518 – Long Text – T1*

Person A: Hello!

Person B: Hey!

So what is your opinion vis a vis inviting controversial speakers to campus

Person A: Well, in all honesty I think they should be allowed to express their opinions, let me tell you why

Regardless of what their views are and what ours are, we shouldn't restrict someone's ability to free speech. And if their views don't agree with ours we should take the opportunity to listen and take what they say to further strengthen our view. What do you think?

Person B: I think that's a good reason in general to protect free speech, but I think it's a little different when it comes to universities and highly controversial people like Coulter and Milo

Person A: Why do you think so?

Person B: I think a university definitely has an obligation to be a forum for debate and curious thinking and open-mindedness, and these are exactly Not what Milo and Coulter, etc. were offering. They are less interested in fostering debate or interrogating ideas than in building up their own fan bases through targeted self-promotional misogyny and racism

Are there any speakers so controversial that you wouldn't want Berkeley to invite them?

Person A: I see what you mean

I guess I would agree that having them speak at universities is not the best platform or space to speak about such issues if they have no interest in debating them

Would you say that you might consider some speakers if they were interested in debate even if their ideas didn't match yours?

Person B: Absolutely. It's just the particular speakers I object to in this case

Person A: But wouldn't the question then be "what is too controversial?"

Person B: On the other hand, some thinking is so deranged or counterfactual that it doesn't make sense to have a debate on it, especially at a university

Person A: Because everyone has an idea of it, but who decides the line?

Yes of course, I agree we shouldnt have crazy people talking about unicorns lol

Person B: In the Coulter/Milo case only the very small Republican club got to decide, leaving to one side the overwhelming majority of students and faculty who find zero merit in these speakers' ideas

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: It was nice to see your side!

Person B: Yours too!

# *Pair 247 P527 & P525 – Long Text – T2*

Person B: Hello

Person A: hi! you wanna go first?

Person B: Which side are you arguing on?

Person A: i support reparations

Person B: I believe that our government should not be required to pay back for slavery, an institution that happened in the past.

Person A: you cant deny that there still remains slavery remnants

and with it racist sentiments

Person B: Not only will it be a huge source of spending for the government, a reparation program is hard to implement.

Person A: considering that larga levels of inequality

and todays black movements

Person B: We need to acknowledge the harms of slavery on our society, but it is impossible to pay back.

How would you be able to track slavery decedents?

Person A: and the rise of extremism on both ends, there needs to be some addressing of this matter

there are historic documents with the names of many former

slaves

Person B: Slavery in America lacked historical records.

Person A: and many slaveowners kept documentation, since they were considered property

depending where you look, but there was also much written by resistant forces

Person B: How about immigrants who came and worked for little to no pay?

Once you start paying reparation to a group, more groups will be asking for it

Person A: thats a sepparate issue? volunteer work vs being enslaved, not that they should receive poor pay but the matter is completely different

Person B: Our government has more issues to focus on now.

Person A: Like?

Person B: I don't think it was volunteer. Many immigrants are FORCED to accept the job in order to make a living.

Person A: that is true but under different livin conditions than being enslaved

Person B: Why don't we focus on racism today? The government can spend efforts fixing the issue NOW, instead of the past.

Person A: reparations would ease tensions

Person B: Will it really?

Person A: trangenerational trauma is a thing that deeply affects future generations

Person B: How does the government find funds to pay back slave descendants?

Person A: considering theyve had the short end of the stick yes

think about red linin

Person B: Does all descendants get money?

Person A: for decades their progress has been limited

because fo racist policies that the government attmepts to mask under false

Person B: If so, then the expense will be huge considering that many generations have been produced after the end of slavery

I suggest other programs to help these people. There are also a lot of successful people today who had an unfortunate past.

Programs such as better schooling will best help them.

Giving them money can only assist so much.

Person A: there is already a considerate amount of welfare being provided to these communities mainly because of their historical disadvantages and their slow progress....... giving them the resources that they have been barred away from would help them get a good start.

Person B: I am wondering how much do you think the government should pay?

Person A: its not just about the money its about the immoral injustice about their current living conditions

Person B: Also, is that the responsibility of our current government?

Person A: its like you working your entire life and then not receiving a paycheck at the end of it, except that tyou are free

if the government then allowed it and was part of it

Person B: Injustice can't be solved by money.

Person A: how is it not

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: Thanks for debating

Person A: thanks !(

lol i didnt know what to argue

# *Pair 248 P526 & P523 – Long Text – T1*

Person B: Good afternoon!

Person A: Hi!

Person B: How did you feel about controversial speakers on campus?

Person A: Well, I wanted to start by saying that I feel mostly neutral or unsure about the subject. I think it's kind of tricky. On the survey, I listed myself as somewhat agreeing that they should be allowed, but if there were a neutral option, I would've selected it. I don't agree with the rhetoric of the speakers that sparked the controversy last year, but I fear that by not allowing them to speak, we make our university look bad and it strengthens their arguments.

What do you think?

Person B: That's actually really align in my opinion too. I feel like overall the university could have handled it better by not allowing ANTIFA to come and incite violence. On the other hand, I feel like Milo in particular, was looking forward to the violence and press that came with it, so it did honestly -- like you said -- strengthen his argument and gave him press

Person A: Yes, that's a very good point. I think that ultimately, what hurt us last year were the violent protests that took place. That could have been handled much better, I think.

Person B: Do you think "fighting words" and free speech are something that the university should look into? since it is a public space.

I know right. There was a video about a man being beaten on the streets during it

It was honestly really disturbing

Were you there during it?

Person A: I agree. I really do believe that it makes our campus look bad. Nowadays when I tell people from my hometown that I go to Berkeley, they make jokes about how I must be into protesting and ANTIFA and things like that.

No, I actually did not attend Berkeley when it was happening; that was just before I started. But I do remember "free speech week" last year and the controversy that surrounded that.

But in regard to "fighting words" and hate speech, I think it's a hard line to draw. There are definitely some things that should not be said on campus, especially things that may promote violence. But in some cases it's hard to determine what can promote violence, I suppose.

But on the other hand, I do believe in free speech in general--just when it does not aim to promote hate or violence.

Person B: I agree. It's a hard line to draw, especially because they probably had no way of knowing ahead of time that it would result in violence. I feel like protests should be encouraged in support of against controversial speakers in the future. Students have a right to air any grievances or discomforts they have.

I don't want to point any particular fingers, but do you think the university should encourage events like these to be held off campus in a private space?

since most of the controversy was over it being a universtiy-sponsored event or any last closing thoughts?

Lol

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 249 P528 & P520 – Long Text – T1*

Person A: Hello there

Person B: Hello

Person A: So I think I put that I do not oppose controversial speakers

Person B: yeah i think so because i put the opposite

Person A: My argument for this is that I think under certain circumstances it should be allowed because university campuses can soemtimes be a bubble of ideas

Person B: i agree it is good to have a difference of opinions my problem comes in when their is hate speech involved

Person A: and if we invite other people that have these views then we can potentially better understand them. And like at Berkeley they're probably not gnna convince people to turn into convervatives

yeah no i get that because then it can cause dangerous situations

Person B: exactly! i agree its more than likely not going to chane anyones mind but it can fuel someone who already thinks in a violent or dangerous way

Person A: like if a controversial speaker is saying that they hate a certain ethnicity for example (even tho I'm POC) i fear that by not letting them talk then that gives them more power to be like "see they dont' even wanna let me talk because they're afraid about me being right"

Person B: yeah i see your point it is important to hear them out

just in a respectful way

either way they lean

Person A: yeah true... I think a lot of online platforms can be like that. Just before coming into this study I was talking to someone about this page on Reddit that fostered a lot of sexist crimes and people who had shot women were also members of this extremist reddit page

which sucks but yeah... if ppl feel a community of people who feel like them that could be dangerous

Person B: thats crazy! stuff like that should not be allowed but at the same time i feel like it could be helpful to track people with that kind of belief

Person A: lol trump is all hate speech and somehow we let him talk

yeah so true at least you can track things that are online

Person B: honestly! the only time he opens his mouth is to talk bad about someone lol

Person A: yeah

Person B: its still crazy to me that people voted him in to office!

Person A: Yeah…

but also I've lived in CA all my life and don't understand very well the type of american that voted for him(i.e. white, bible belt, conservative, being affected by dying industries like coal etc)

Person B: yeah ive grown up in cali my whole life too but most of my family members who voted for him are all rooted in misunderstanding

Person A: i think this same question would have been interesting to someone from anotehr university. But berkeley specifically had several in the last year or two that were controversial

oh interesting, I didn't know a single person that voted for him

until after a friend from berekely told me like a year later that she'd voted for him

but mostly it was like "my dentist's niece's neighbor voted for trump"

all very distant relations

do u think ur family members still agree with their vote

?

Person B: i have one cousin who admitted it and like he honestly just doesnt understand and doesnt want to understand other cultures and in the end he just wants eveyone to conform or leave

my cousin who admits it seems like he will vote for him again because he overlooks the racist and sexist things that he does

i tried to hear him out but it didnt last long because he was pretty stuck in his mindset

Person A: it's very hard for me to understand or sympathize with overlooking something that sounds so serious to me. A leader who can be that sexist and racist is just inherently unfit (IMO)

that's sad

Person B: Honestly

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Bye

Person B: bye

# *Pair 250 P536 & P533 – Long Text – T1*

Person B: Hi!

Person A: Hi!

you want to go first?

Person B: yeah for sure

So like I feel that while discussion with people whose opinions differ can be productive, there comes a point where inviting someone known for harsh rhetoric can cause more damage to the community, the students, the faculty, and the school than simply not inviting them in the first place

Person A: I definitely see your point about how it can be bad for the people but for me I really stand by the first amendment and letting people speak. I'm one of the believers in this concept that I like to make up called the "market place of ideas" where people are free to choose what they say to the public. They will obviously have to deal with the consequences of their words especially if they are trying to stir up violence and such but I feel like if we restrict opposing opinions then it looks bad on the people who have the differing opinion. Also I truly believe that the best ideas and words will prevail and good will always beat bad ideas.

I also think that not letting controversial people speak just adds to the narrative of "us vs. them" and that it why politics and people are becoming to polarized

Person B: I definitely agree with your sentiment about how restricting opinions can have a bad appearance but I also feel that, especially as a University, we must work hard to ensure that the speakers we are inviting are using fact-based information and using sound logical arguments so that, even if we differ in opinions, we can still have a true discussion about whatever topic we choose

Person A: yes that is true which is why it is up to the people to hold the speaker accountable for their words. If they start to state lies and harsh rhetoric the people need to stand up and keep them honest. People are entitled to their own opinions but not their own facts

Person B: Yeah I agree. If the prospective speaker must resort to using attacks or falsehoods to make their case then I do not feel that they should have the ability to speak. On the other hand, if they are able to hold a calm, collected debate whilst adhering to facts then I am open to differing opinions

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 251 P532 & P530 – Long Text – T3*

Person A: Hey!

Person B: Hello!

Person A: How you feeling today?

Person B: I'm fine. How about you?

So our topic is on drug legalization

Person A: I'm good, ready to debate this

You wanna start?

Person B: I suppose you said that it should be legalized?

Sure!

Person A: Yes

Well, not really

decriminalized

not legalized

big difference

Person B: Oh not legalized

Person A: not necessarily

How about you tell me why you think certain drugs shouldn't be legal?

Person B: I think the hard drugs that were listed (LSD, heroin) shouldn't be legal because it makes accessibility much easier; legalization doesn't mean that the drugs are harmless.

Person A: Except LSD is actually not a hard drug.

Person B: I saw how the rates in the use of those drugs went down in Portugal, but it could be different other countries. Ok not counting LSD

What's your stance?

Person A: Good point about the countries. Luckily a bunch of other European countries have went ahead and legalized certain drugs while decriminalizing the use of others. For example, magic mushrooms are legal in the Netherlands, but of course people aren't just running around tripping on shrooms. Something many of these countries have noticed is that legalization doesn't mean more people will begin to take drugs, but that the people who already take drugs will only have safer access to them. Take colorado for instance. Since weed was legalized there, the rates of use of cannabis amongst teens has not changed at all. So, legalizing weed had no affect on the people who you would think may use it most.

On top of that, Switzerland decirminzalized heroine and stopped putting people in jail for using. Instead, they put heroine users in clinics, and even gave them clean heroine to inject. This program was HUGELY successful in curbing heroine usage and getting these former addicts as functioning members of society

Lets talk LSD since we mentioned it too!

Person B: Good points. I actually agree with you.

Person A: Nobody has ever over dosed on LSD. That means LSD is safer than caffeine and an array of other NSAID drugs you may be familiar with like ibuprofen and tylenol. LSD has also been proven to be extremelty affective and treating anxiety, depression, and suicidal thoughts. Studies by Johns Hopkins research institute have also shown the same effects withmagic mushroonms

Thank you!

I used to be anti drug too, but I think the actual data shows that we dont think about drugs properly in our country. The rhetoric has been very anti drug since Nancy Reagan told everyone to say no to drugs in the eighties as crack was becoming an epidemic

But drug use and abuse is very complex and its indisputable that measures against it like the war on drugs have been an absolute waste of time and money, just look up how effective the DEA is at controlling how many drugs come into this country and you will see how laughable it is

They reduce the amount of drugs coming in by less than one percent... and millions is spent on the DEA

Person B: Yes, NSAID drugs can be highly addictive as well and they aren't viewed as being "dangerous," while they most definitely are

Wow

Person A: Also, half of those in federal prisons are in there for drug related charges. Half of them!

Person B: Waste of money...

Person A: When you consider that one in every four prisoners on Earth is an American, and then consider half of the prisoners are in there for drug abuse..... oh boy

Waste of money and a waste of life

Person B: Yup

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Thank you for being so receptive

have a GREAT day

Person B: same to you

# *Pair 252 P537 & P535 – Long Text – T1*

Person A: hello

Person B: Hi

Person A: So I'm assuming that you're against having controversial speakers on campus right?

Person B: That is quite correct.

Let me list a couple of reasons why.

The First Amendment, as important as it is, technically has its limitations.

Causing violence being one.

UC Berkeley spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in hosting Milo

This is essentially money that could grant more scholarships to students of low-income

The damage and cost of reparations to the campus is another component.

Safety comes first.

Person A: Those are all really good points

And I completely agree that the safety of the students, staff, faculty, etc. on campus should be the first priority of the administration

Person B: While I agree that a limiting of conservative extremists to come on campus violates certain rights of say the BCR, throwing in these factors and applying them on the affects it has on the safety of our students, and their physical and mental health is much more important.

Person A: I do think however that it is a matter of how we view free speech

and if we can really pride this institution on being one that advocates free speech if we dont open these conversations and opportunities for other opinions to be voiced

Person B: As much as I can understand what you are saying, this university owes it to the students to put them first.

Person A: because not allowing a certain speaker can send just as clear of a message on the administrations view and stance on some opinions as allowing that speaker to come to the campus

Person B: I do believe that both BCR and UCB should come to an agreement where funding to hold events for controversial speakers OUTSIDE of the campus grants the political liberty and support from both the university and for students interested in attending out such an event.

Person A: That

\*that's a good point. Coming from a family of low income I do see that the university's money could be used much more effectively and that could be a way to mitigate costs for such events

Person B: The administration is not publicly stating their stance on any political issues, but rather assessing what is best for the student community. We are in arguably the most liberal college campus ion the nation. Hence, the outrage from hosting persons like Milo, the school needs to anticipate what the outcome will be from both students and the community.

Person A: but do you not think that turning speakers away sends a message to the students as well?

Person B: As I said, I see where placing a limitation of freedom of speech is unjust, but hosting these events off campus borders is a much safer alternative for both conservative students, and the reputation of the institution in serving and placing students' safety first.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 253 P534 & P529 – Long Text – T1*

Person A: Hi! my name is [name redacted]

Person B: hi I'm [name redacted]!

do you want to go ahead with the topic? i

Person A: Shall we debate? Lol

yes!

I can start if you dont mind

Person B: go for it

Person A: Okay, so basically the way I see it is that if someone is allowed to voice their opinions on campus then they should be aware that they will have to face another person who also has opinions that may or may not oppose their viewpoints. If we completely broke off freedom of speech then everyone would just keep what they had to say bottled up inside and things like this debate wouldn't be allowed to happen

No matter how controversial the topic, everyone should be aware of what's going on

Person B: I think it's good to discuss controversial topics with people who have opinions that differ from one's own, but in certain contexts I do think it does more harm than good. with milo especially, he came to the school with the intent to rally a violent crowd into getting his point across, which i think is needlessly dangerous on a school campus.

i also think it's important to take into account the speak

whoops lol

the speaker's actual contributions to the controversy/political issue/topic at hand. is the person starting drama just to start drama or to actually hold a conversation?

and i think that oftentimes speakers are intentionally using Cal as an arena/circus, and in this case i think it

\*\*is harmful to turn an educational institution into a battlefield4

Person A: actually you bring up a very valid point, I was speaking on more broad terms of civil opinions or you know like the people who preach jesus to everyone who passes by lol

Person B: in broad terms i agree with you

Person A: I can honestly say that I'm pretty much convinced with you reasoning and see that i

wait what

omg i was gonna say that i agree with you

wow i am so bad at interpreting things

Person B: lol what i mean is that i think that the random people who are preaching/saying whatever message do have a right to state their opinions

just not at the expense of other people's education/safety/wellbeing

Person A: oh oh right okay, yes okay i understand now

Person B: and just on a practical note, the "controversial" speakers are so expensive in terms of cost and security measures, and i dont want to pay for that lol

public funds shouldn

Person A: If it is going to cause harm to anyone or anyting then you're absolutely right, it should not be allowed

Person B: whoops i keep pressing enter when im not done lol

Person A: haha it's okay

just type whatever you need and i can piece it together

Person B: but what i was going to say is that public funds shouldnt be used for these sorts of things when they can put students at risk and dont make an actual contribution to our school/the advancement of our understanding of a topic

okay i think im mostly done, my last thing is that just because a speaker cant speak on campus doesn

'tmean that they shouldnt speak

okay done lol

Person A: Okay, I agree with that first statement about funding these things. It makes no sense to fund something that won't be of use to the students or faculty. Again, agreed. Everyone can find their own place to speak wherever and whenever

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: lol nice debate even though it came to a big agreement haha

Person B: lol yeah nice talking to you!

Person A: you as well!

# *Pair 254 P540 & P539 – Long Text – T3*

Person B: Hello!  
  
Person A: Hi!   
  
Person B: Not really sure what to do haha  
  
Person A: same lol basically I support the legalization of drugs because I think people are going to do drugs regardless of whether or not it's illegal   
and we might as well make it safer with regulations   
  
Person B: Mm I see  
That makes sense too! I don't feel super strongly about this but I do believe that we can't legalize drugs, and especially not ALL drugs, without proper education and treatment/rehab opportunities available  
  
Person A: I definitely agree, but I think the criminality/ the fact that it's illegal bars rehabilitative measures to be properly implemented   
but definitely agree with the fact that there should be proper education and treatment opportunities available to everybody   
  
Person B: It's kind of like a chicken and egg thing haha what comes first

Person A: and i don't feel super strongly about this either haha   
yeah haha, i just think with the legalization of drugs comes the regulation and the ability to address the issues that come with people doing drugs   
  
Person B: Yeah! I think the way CA is doing it is probably better. By legalizing marijuana and allowing people to get educated and support/treatment opportunities to get established first, I think that makes it safer for users in the future  
I feel like if all drugs were legalized at once, it'd be easier for it to be unsafe if a more addictive drug was introduced without proper education and such  
  
Person A: i totally agree, I just think that it's because drugs are illegal that criminal networks/gangs exploit the system and capitalize on producing more and more "new" and addictive drugs   
  
Person B: I also think introducing a drug like marijuana first makes it so that it kind of decriminalizes drug users and makes users more approachable and more human? haha I feel like it allows for time to settle and for people to be normalized to the idea of legalized drugs  
ohhh tru I didn't think of that  
THAT'S SO SAD  
do you think that if certain less addictive drugs were legalized, then people would be more willing to use those rather than the "newer" and more addictive drugs?  
  
Person A: yeah like people doing drugs is their own choice and harms themselves but criminal networks/ the illegal drug industry is like a multi million dollar industry that exploits the demand for drugs through actually harmful processes like human trafficking and literal wars that come from competing for scarce supplies   
i think if it was legalized, then the government would strictly regulate them   
so there would be no room for laced drugs or incorrect dosages in batches which are what often kill people or get people hooked   
also if it was legalized then there would be legitimate companies that would acquire and produce drugs like pharmaceutical companies which would mean that every step of their production process would have to be okayed by the government   
  
Person B: if less addictive drugs were legalized then do you think it's possible that it would discourage users from using the illegal drugs that are more dangerous?

Person A: also i personally think alcohol and nicotine kills more people yearly which is sad   
i guess so haha

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: apparently we need to finish the convo now oop   
  
Person B: LOL  
  
Person A: thanks for being so agreeable lolll   
  
Person B: thanks for your points!! really appreciate them HAHA  
they make sense

# *Pair 255 P538 & P531 – Long Text – T2*

Person A: What's your stance on reparations?   
  
Person B: I put -1 i think, so slightly opposed  
I'm assuming you support them?  
  
Person A: I put 3 so i strongly agreed, but I think I may change my decision slightly because I don't think government is in full responsibility for it   
  
Person B: Do you view your justification behind reparations from a moral standpoint?  
  
Person A: Yeah I think it's more of a moral thing for me   
  
Person B: Are the kinds of reparations you support financial reparations?  
For example cash transfers  
  
Person A: No they wouldn't necessarily be financial reparations.   
My viewpoint is mainly coming from the idea of high infant mortality rate being much higher   
Like it stated   
  
Person B: What gaps do you think reparations fill in that are not covered by means-tested welfare  
  
Person A: But reparations don't necessarily have to be financial.   
That's why I was sort of changing my stance on whether the government should be responsibly for reparations because I was thinking of it in terms of how African Americans live in society   
It's a societal issue that can be and should be somewhat addressed by the government   
  
Person B: I think solving disparities in infant mortality could be accomplished by implementing means-tested policies  
  
Person A: The reason for high infant mortality rates for African American women, despite them being well educate and is a result of them having a much higher blood pressure than white people in America   
That was found in a study within Chicago I believe   
  
Person B: What kind of reparation would help combat the problem?  
I'm also pessimistic about the backlash that passing reparations would cause  
  
Person A: What kind of backlashes do you think could arise from reparations

Person B: The perception of African Americans is already negatively affected by media coverage  
The welfare queen stereotype still exists today  
  
Person A: Yeah, exactly. Which is why I also believe it is a societal issue as well.   
  
Person B: I think it would further the stereotype that african americans are poorer/inherently need governmental assistance  
A lot of the health and educational disparities should be solved. It's hard for me to grasp how reparations would do a better job than means-tested policies  
Do you think reparations would combat stereotyping/biases against african americans?

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 273 P581 & P580 – Long Text – T1*

Person A: Hi! I'm [name redacted]

Person B: Hi!

I'm [name redacted]

Person A: What are your arguments in opposition?

Person B: Well, I feel like I oppose bringing speakers in certain situations

like i still feel like it is good except when

Person A: Like depending on who the speaker is?

Person B: it causes harm to the general public such as riots, violent protests, etc

Person A: Like if they are extremely extremely controversial?

Person B: oh yes

and it depends on the speaker

Person A: I would agree, but if you start cutting off speakers where does the line exist?

Person B: so i guess i dont oppose alllll controversial speakers

Person A: Who is to judge either too left or too right?

Person B: that would be hard, but there are some matters that can cause more violent protests

how about you? what are your arguments

Person A: I kind of thought of it as in terms of issues as libel, slander, and the Espionage Act where things could get spicy and very controversial, but again who draws the line

I think that the option must be available. Controversial speakers must be allowed because it is a form of free speech just the same as protesting the speaker would be too

Person B: Yeah, that makes sense

Person A: No one has to necessarily attend must the option must exist I think

Person B: It's hard to know where the line is, but it is pretty terrifying when there are more violent riots that could happen on campus and harm bystanders

just for the general safety

Person A: Because you can get into areas of concern with people who have such different viewpoints

No yes for sure that is totally valid because controversial speakers bring controversial issues where people will get violent and more harm will occur

Person B: Yeah, definitely has its ups and downsides

how would the campus mitigate that?

when there is the option to attend these speakers

Person A: Perhaps it is just a byproduct of inviting the controversial speakers?

Or even the campus might choose not to then, but if they are holding programs with these speakers all situations need to be accounted for

Those in favor who would like to attend and those who oppose and would like to dissent with protest

For me, I just think that offering the chance to listen to controversial speakers might be an American cliche, but is also enshrines Americanism. It pretty much boils down to free speech for me

Person B: I see, interesting point! I understand where you're coming from

Person A: Did you recognize any of the speakers they had listed in the example?

I was sort of curious if they leaned more to the left or right?

Person B: No I didn't did you?

Person A: No I didn't know them :/

I guess a good example might be Donald Trump

Person B: Yeah

well thanks for speaking with me!!

Person A: That would create major uproar on Berkeley

Person B: interesting to hear your position

Person A: and yeah for sure!

Person B: True

Person A: Are you a freshman?

Person B: nope im a senior LOL

Person A: Oh my gosh

Darn

Person B: how about you?

Person A: I'm out of my league lol

I'm a freshman

Person B: oh nice! hope youre enjoying cal

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Thank you though! Nice talking to you

Person B: You too!

# *Pair 274 P582 & P576 – Long Text – T1*

Person A: Hi

Person B: Hi

So what are your views on this topic?

Person A: hey okay so i'm completely for allowing controversial speakers on campus

what about you?

Person B: I slightly disagree with it

Person A: oh okay

Do you want me to lay out my reasons first? or do you want start?

Person B: I can start

Person A: okay cool

Person B: So I definitely support free speech and freedom of expression. i don’

t think it’s right to shut down the events because they disagree with the subject matter

however I don’t agree with the university being used as an arena for extremely controversial figures from both sides to come and cause violence

I think it’s completely at the University’s discretion to choose to stop these events if they could cause a credible threat to the safety of the campus and its students

Person A: oh okay those are valid points

so just to summarize you don’t completely agree with allowing controversial speakers because of the potential violence?

Person B: Yes

Person A: Oh okay yeah I mean the only thing I would want to point out is that the university is not being used as an “arena” for controversial figures to come and cause violence

the violence is caused by people from the community not the speakers themselves

Person B: Yes sorry i should have stated that better

Person A: so while I completely agree that it is up to the university to shut events down if they become too much of a security threat, I think that that should only be a last resort

Person B: I mean, I disagree. It doesn’t have to be the university

s job to host these events

if they present a threat to campus safety

Person A: the suppression of ideas because of their potential to invoke a negative reaction in the audience or the community is not a good precedent to set

well I think its quite apt that it it is a university that is hosting these issues because are you really getting an education if you aren’t exposed to ideas you don’t agree with?

I mean I agree that increased aid from the Berkeley PD would be helpful but I think its appropriate for these speakers to come to campus instead of another venue

and the threat to campus safety is not the speakers themselves but the reaction of the people

Person B: Yes, I agree with that

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 275 P579 & P577 – Long Text – T2*

Person B: Hello?

Person A: Hi

Person B: You’re for reparations, right?

Person A: Yes

Person B: Would you care to explain why?

Person A: Sure  
My first argument is that reparations would ensure that the disadvantaged african americans would get their rightful share that they didn’t get due to low labor wages, system of tipping in the american society

Person B: Fair enough.   
I'm for helping out disadvantaged minorities, but i don’t believe a system of reparations payments would necessarily solve the problem.  
Or be feasible for that matter

Person A: Well, I think of it this way!! We have a system here in which african americans are disadvantaged yet to this date, even a small portion of reparations to each of the families will help them get into a position of equality and equity in society.

Person B: How exactly would the reparations payments translate into positions of equality and equity in society?   
What would they be spent on in particular?   
And where would these payments be sourced from?

Person A: They would be spent primarily into education which would give african american families a better chance to compete with others.  
As education is a primary asset that one needs nowadays and these payments would be sourced from the department of education.

Person B: So are we operating under the assumption that these families will dedicate such payments for educational attainment?

Person A: Yes because in a world today we would have a majority of students who would want to pursue their education

Person B: Are you sure that is true for everywhere in the united states?

Person A: Yes because we will always get a few portion of students won’t pursue education in other cultures

Person B: Ok.   
How much would you say is sufficient to give to each family to fund such an educational investment?  
And where would the money for this come from?

Person A: I would say that the family should get about 1200 per year to ensure that their kids in high school would have access to test prep materials, classes

Person B: So act, sat, etc?

Person A: Yes

Person B: Ok

**[Experimenter says time is up]**