*Pair 87, Support P187, Oppose P190, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person B: Hi, my name is [name redacted].

Person A: Hi [name redacted], I’m [name redacted]. Nice meeting you.

Person B: Nice meeting you.

Person A: Great. So we can start on the first topic, which is the controversial speakers.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Cool. What do you think about it?

Person B: I don't think that controversial speakers with hate rhetoric should speak on campus because it’s irresponsible and dangerous. All speech isn’t equal speech. So debating about pizza toppings is different than debating about if someone should live or not, or if Jewish people or Black people should have the same rights. Those discussions are really dangerous.

Person A: Uh-huh. I see what you're saying, but the problem with that is how can we identify who's allowed to speak and who's not? Because otherwise someone has to make a list or a rule to identify who's allowed to [speak] and who's not. And then, that would lead us to -- people would pick certain people because of their preference. But we don't know if that's an absolute, correct way to decide who gets to speak or who doesn't get to speak.

Person B: I feel like there can be a pretty simple solution. If the speaker incites hate speech, violence in any way, they should not be able to speak on campus.

Person A: Uh-huh. And that's also debatable. But I see what you're saying. I agree that, as long as it doesn't spread violence, or it doesn't spread hating another person, it should be fine. But also that could lead us into another topic which is free speech and how we can allow people to speak freely and share their ideas and thoughts but, at the same time, feel that they can share that, as long as it's not hateful or violent in its nature.

Person B: To be honest, when the whole Milo thing happened two semesters ago, it was really traumatic. So I just don't even have any energy to debate about things like this. Because my positionality as a Black woman is really unique and different, so debating my experience is pointless. I honestly don't really have anything to say. I just think that reckless free speech -- everything being under the umbrella of free speech can be so damaging.

Person A: Uh-huh. Right.

Person B: And I feel like people only understand violence as a physical concept, but violence can be psychological. Violence can be symbolic. I feel like that boundary can easily be set, but people do not want to do that.

Person A: I think it's the same boundary in terms of hate speech and freedom of speech, right? There's no clear boundary in either of them, and people can have their own agendas of saying, “Oh, because I agree with him, then he has a ‘free speech’ but other person that I don't agree with, then it's a ‘hateful speech,’” you know? So that's where it becomes tricky. But at the same time, that could lead us into some sort of dictatorship where if someone doesn't agree with you, then they don't have the freedom to speak, or just because they disagree, they're not allowed to speak. And that could be potentially damaging in the long run because you just have one idea that overrules everyone's thoughts. And that's the main idea, and [that] doesn't lead us into constructive future ideas where we can freely be respectful and have different ideas, which is fine because we're all made different. But in an unprovocative way and ethical way and ethical manner, we can disagree -- that's fine -- but still be respectful and not hate each other at the same time. I think that's sometimes missing when people debate or have different ideas.

Person B: Okay. I see what you're saying.

Person A: Uh-huh. That's good.

Person B: Yeah. Sorry. This topic -- I didn't really know we [were] going to be talking about political things, and it’s just really tiring to talk about.

Person A: That's true. Yeah.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Ah. It’s -- Yeah.

Person B: Okay. I think we have to stay on the phone until [the researcher] says.

Person A: Yep, I think there are three main questions, right? That we're going to be discussing?

Person B: Oh. Yeah. Yeah, okay. Or do we have to start them now or wait?

Person A: I don't think so. Yeah. I think we're just doing the first one right now.

Person B: Oh, okay. Cool.

Person A: That’s cool. But yeah, I agree with you that the main one was the Milo [talk]. But I know Ben Shapiro came and there were also a lot of tensions, even though he came the year before and there were no issues at all. So, sometimes it's within a short period of time [that] people change a lot.

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

*Pair 93, Support P203, Oppose P201, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person B: Okay. Do you want to go ahead and start?

Person A: Yeah, sure.

Person B: Okay.

Person A: So I don't really have a strong opinion on this, and I also haven't thought about it a lot. All I know about it is from when the two speakers did come to campus last year, and then the chancellor sent out an email about it. I just thought that we should allow speakers of all different political backgrounds to come speak on campus because of the right of free speech. I get that a lot of people might find their ideas offensive or controversial or wrong, but I really like the idea of giving people a platform to speak even if you don't agree with their ideas. And allowing them the chance to speak does not mean that you support or condone or agree with their ideas. It just means that you're giving them the chance to talk. Because not allowing people to talk because of the content of their ideas, I feel, comes dangerously close to the oppression of dissenting ideas, which tyrannical governments have historically used to try to keep down any forces that would oppose them. And ideally, democracy would be an equal battleground for opposing voices. And the voices that do espouse really wrong ideas or offensive ideas would be silenced by the voices that ideally support the right things, like equality for everyone. And so I liked the idea of combating wrong or hateful speech with more speech that supports more open ideals and more progressive ideals. But I do understand the point of how hate speech could incite violence and inflict psychological harm on those that it targets. So that's why I don't have a super strong opinion on this.

Person B: Hmm. Yeah, it’s a tough topic. I wrote that universities are spaces to learn and grow and also to have thinking challenged, but not by incendiary, racist, homophobic, misogynist, or other types of speakers, whose goal is not to promote dialogue, but only to incite hateful violence, be that physical or psychological. The question I have in front of me, that I'm sure you do too, says, “extremely controversial.” I don't think “controversial” is the problem. I think the problem is when the speech that they're creating is intentionally trying to exclude certain people from a political dialogue, or to cause them psychological harm. Milo Yiannopoulos, before he came to Berkeley -- which he barely ended up coming -- had this talk where he outed some trans person. And they are not acts that are meant to promote dialogue among different people and different thinking patterns. It’s trying to cause harm to people who are not like themselves based on a political controversial opinion. So I feel like you could be a Milo Yiannopoulos and strictly stick to the political dialogue. But I think these speakers that were invited to Berkeley were not trying to promote anyone but themselves and how incendiary they could be. And that sort of damage results not only in a security risk for the students that are being targeted, but it also ended up a security risk for all students on campus. And we ended up paying for that because the group that invited them couldn't afford all of the security costs. So both the university and UCOP [University of California Office of the President] had to pay for that, and that just comes out of money that we contribute to the university. So I think that's really wrong. And I think that spaces should be provided for speech that tries to bridge gaps, but not for those that are just trying to burn all the bridges and promote themselves.

Person A: Hmm. Yeah, I see. So, what I wanted was to allow speakers to come to campus because it would keep the dialogue open. But what you're saying is that inviting the speakers and allowing them to speak actually shuts down dialogue because they exclude certain groups from the political conversation?

Person B: Yeah, I think that the platforms for most of the controversial speakers that were listed on that page -- I don’t think that those speakers actually try to promote a sort of intellectual interlocutor. They're not looking for an intellectual interlocutor. I think that those particular speakers, who are listed on the page, are simply people who are trying to be as offensive as they can and have a style that is based on trying to offend people, and, thereby, excluding those people from a sort of dialogue. So it's not like, “Oh, I'm conservative. I'm willing to debate you.” It's like, “I'm conservative and you're wrong because you're X, Y, or Z.”

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

Person A: Hmm. Okay, bye.

Person B: Bye.

*Pair 96, Support P207, Oppose P208, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person A: Hi. How are you?

Person B: Good. How are you?

Person A: I'm doing well. Thank you. Okay, I'll begin if you don't mind.

Person B: Yeah, go for it.

Person A: So slavery reparations are really an effort to assist African Americans, who, in the United States, have historically been oppressed. When I think of these reparations, I think of admittance to colleges and scholarships, such that colleges are more likely to admit African Americans because of their efforts to assist them through slavery reparations. And also, the colleges give these scholarships to these people to also do this. And although some people think that reparations are wrong because African Americans aren't on an equal playing ground, and this is because they think that African Americans are just playing a victim role, I believe that there's actually a genetic component, because if you think that PTSD or depression or some mental illnesses are genetic, then I believe that there might be some genetic components involved in PTSD. And even if it's socially learned behavior to be a victim, these people still do feel that way. And so to help them through giving them scholarships and greater admittance to colleges is beneficial. And also, some people might say, “Well not only were African Americans enslaved historically, but White people, too.” And I would respond to that by saying, “Well African Americans were the only ones enslaved in America besides probably some Native Americans and Hispanics.”

Person B: Okay.

Person A: And, okay. So, even though I'm White, I think I would sacrifice my chances of getting into colleges being lower and my chances of getting scholarships being lower so that African Americans could benefit. And I think this is also good because it would create some equality in this country because I think African Americans typically tend to be on the lower side of the spectrum. They struggle typically, I think.

Person B: Yeah. I have a slightly different view in that sense. While I do agree that slavery probably did put African Americans in a disadvantage even today, I think it's kind of a slippery slope with how we're going to handle this, because, as you mentioned, offering more scholarships and giving reparations may increase taxes. And higher taxes for everyone in America just don't seem very fair in my eyes. Why do people, such as myself, who had nothing to do with slavery -- and, back then, my ancestors actually came from a different country – why would I have to pay higher taxes for something that happened so long ago? And even if someone did have ancestors that directly contributed to it, it's not themselves. So why are they paying and why are they facing consequences for something that happened in the past? And along those lines, it can become a really slippery slope if this happens and we start giving reparations for slavery. That's a stepping stone for something that could happen in the future for, let's say, giving reparations to women for being oppressed over the numerous years in the past and all the sexism that happens in the world, especially in the U.S. So it's a really slippery slope that where this could just be for reparations for slavery, but later, in years, it could lead to reparations for women and reparations for the LGBTQ+ community. And, I just don't think it's that fair to continue this on.

Person A: Okay. And so, I think you've made some good points, although I'd like to say that I want your view of it being a slippery slope to have some friction, because to assist those who have been historically oppressed is being compassionate. And I'd be actually appreciative if helping African Americans would create a precedent. If that did create a precedent, I'd be very pleased to hear that women could then benefit later. And to say that the taxes would increase to assist those who have historically been oppressed is valid, though I think these scholarships are not always given by the government. And if they are, partly or sometimes, then I would be happy to contribute because I think it's out of my compassionate side and my desire to help others. And, while your ancestors did not cause –

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

Person B: Sorry --

Person A: -- African Americans to be oppressed -- did she say we are stopping or just to finish up?

Person B: I didn’t hear.

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

Person A: Okay. I'm going to let you go ahead and talk if you have anything to say.

Person B: Yeah. I guess the last thing I'll say is based [on] what you counteracted about compassion. I would just say that it's not a lack of compassion that causes me not to want to pay the taxes. It’s my opportunity and my struggles with finances that lead me to not want to pay higher taxes.

Person A: Okay.

# *Pair 118, Support P255, Oppose P256, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person A: All right. How are you?

Person B: Repeat that again. Sorry.

Person A: Oh. I just said, “How are you?”

Person B: Oh. I'm good. How are you?

Person A: I'm good. So, would you like to start?

Person B: Yeah. So I put myself on the opposing view to allowing extremely controversial speakers and particularly, a lot of these speakers tend to be on the right-leaning side. And I believe that their presence on campus often does active harm to marginalized students and groups. A lot of the times, they are expressing views a lot of people would find very racist, very xenophobic, very just oppressive. And it can oftentimes directly incite harm against groups of students and just community members at large that belong to these groups. I think that racism and xenophobia, they should be unacceptable in society. And so, therefore, people that hold views that are racist and xenophobic should not be given platforms to further increase their social power and spread these views to other people. I believe if we’re serious about wanting racism and xenophobia to not exist anymore, we shouldn’t provide people platforms that allow them to actively spread them. And I think it should be a moral obligation almost for people that are truly dedicated to ending racism and xenophobia.

Person A: Yes. Also, I just wanted to be clear. For me, I do not agree with people who their sole purpose is to actually try to rile up a crowd by this controversial speech. I do agree with allowing speakers of different opinions to speak to allow for more of a constructive debate. But yes, the people that you’re describing, I, of course, don’t agree with allowing them a platform either.

Person B: So, yeah. Definitely conservatives are not in and of themselves necessarily racist or xenophobic. I do believe that, of course, having debates across the aisle is important, and we should not exclude someone just because they don’t necessarily hold a left-leaning viewpoint. But, yeah. When it says, “extremely controversial,” that is what I kind of read into it, is that it’s describing people like Milo Yiannopoulos and Ann Coulter who often are pretty much only expressing racist and xenophobic viewpoints just to incite a crowd.

Person A: Uh-huh. Right. Let's see. I think if there are people who have these kinds of views, I feel like it almost could be constructive to not allow them a huge platform like certain groups have in the past, like huge auditoriums where they reach large audiences. But I almost -- I'm kind of just brainstorming here, honestly -- but [what] if we allow almost smaller -- I don’t want to say “venues” in a way -- but smaller discussions that do kind of talk across that aisle even if it is more extreme controversy. I feel like that almost could be constructive in a way also, unless you are dealing with people who just completely are totally unwilling to hear the other side, and those people definitely do exist. But I'm just very against keeping echo chambers alive and only communicating with people of the same political opinion. And so, I feel like no matter how controversial your opinion might be -- it could even be a very controversial liberal opinion too -- I feel like people should be able to talk across that aisle no matter how left-leaning or right-leaning you are.

Person B: Uh-huh. So my views on that are that, first of all, I hesitate to draw an equivalency between people on the extreme right side of the aisle and people on the extreme left. Because oftentimes, people on the extreme right side of the aisle are advocating fascism and violence, and people on the left are, most of the time, militant but have a different purpose that is not necessarily to oppress people like the extreme right often is. And also, there are some people that, even giving them a small platform, it doesn’t necessarily reduce the harm nor the impact of what they’re saying. Like this past year actually, Milo Yiannopoulos, he wasn’t given an actual speaking venue at Berkeley. He just stood on the steps of Sproul [Hall], and honestly, it did not draw a large crowd by any means. It did draw a small counter-protest, but it wasn't necessarily a place of great debate. It was the same exact thing he’d be doing in a large venue, but he was just on the steps of Sproul [Hall] instead.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: So, yeah. It was good having this conversation. Thanks for listening to me kind of just ramble about this.

Person A: Yeah, no. This was great. Thank you.

# *Pair 157, Support P347, Oppose P337, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person B: Okay, so what’s your name?

Person A: My name’s [name redacted]. What’s your name?

Person B: [Name redacted]. So nice to meet you, [name redacted]. Do you want to go ahead and let's have two minutes [of] what you say and two minutes [of] what I say, and then we’ll have a debate in the end?

Person A: Yeah, that sounds good.

Person B: Okay, so it's fifty-six [12:56 PM] now. You can go ahead, list your arguments until fifty-eight [12:58 PM], and then I’ll take over.

Person A: Sure, all right. So since we’re opposing, I assume that you’re more on the side of not legalizing [drugs] and I am slightly on the side of legalizing. And so, this is not to say that I support the use of drugs, because I do not. But I’ll just give you a little run-down of why I think that the legalization could be potentially better. First of all, I don’t know for sure. I'm not 100% thinking that that’s going to be the best way. But I do side with it because I think that many people abuse drugs, and they don’t know how to, when to, or they’re just scared to seek help. Okay. And then people close to them are also scared to help them or report them because they’re nervous to get them in trouble, right? So legalizing it will not necessarily, completely decriminalize it, but it makes it so that the person is not going to jail and instead, we’ll use the money that goes through all the allegations of sending the person to jail and keeping them in prison and everything -- Instead of using the money on that, we’ll use it on rehabilitation which I think will help a lot of people. And I also think that that money can also probably go to helping the people in other ways as well, for instance finding jobs and what not. And then finally, we can also still regulate it, and so it's going to help fight other crimes, like organized crime.

Person B: Okay. So from my point of view, I'm completely opposed to that, and I have several arguments. A lot of people say, “Okay, because a lot of teenagers -- They crave it so much and if we legalize it they’re not going to take it,” which is totally not true. It will make things even worse. It's like, “if you legalize stealing, it will be even less.” No, that doesn’t work. [It works] the other way around. The other thing [is] it's not even good for any of the health issues. There is health instability [like] mental issues that are associated with these drugs, especially marijuana, cocaine, et cetera. I'm pretty sure the crimes in the areas will spread. It will increase at a definite rate, car crashes, there will be people fading. All the scenarios we see like [those are] what will happen when we legalize drugs. Also, one of things that I really noticed would be that drug companies would have so much money and they would have so much power that they will make even ads about it that [say], “Okay, drugs are good” or maybe take up the majority of the opinions of the people. They will be in control. So yeah, it's prohibited for a reason. It's not good for any of our health. So that’s why I think it should not be legalized.

Person A: Okay. I see your point. I have a few comments back to that because -- so first of all, to kind of go in reverse, the whole thing about the campaigns of ads [that say], “Drugs are good” -- I think it won’t be that way, simply because, yes, of course, they might market it. But I think, like with cigarettes, for a while cigarettes were like, “Oh, these are the best things for you. You should totally have this. They help you diet. Blah blah.” But then, once people realized that, “Actually, wait a second, cigarettes are really bad for you,” we still have the market of it obviously because people are addicted, but people don’t advertise them as “good” anymore.

Person B: So, but you see the health issues that have been caused during that decade. There was probably a decade or so that cigarettes were being considered healthy. And if you like coffee --

Person A: Oh. Oh. It was centuries. Yeah, absolutely --

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: -- it was centuries, but the thing is that that's not how we think anymore, and it's not like with drugs we're suddenly going to go in reverse and be like, “Oh, these are good for your health.”

Person B: I think it is true that for societies that are very highly educated, they will understand these effects. But until then, you can see that from -- compare a rich neighborhood versus a poor neighborhood. Which one would have more drugs? Probably the poor neighborhood, because they need a way to escape reality somehow. And they found drugs, alcohol, something, somewhere to escape. And legalizing it, I don't think would make it better.

Person A: I see what you’re saying, but also actually, statistically, I'm quite sure that the differentiation between those two groups would not be as big. There’s actually a huge drug abuse problem within rich communities, especially rich housewives, specifically with Xanax and things like that, like opioids. They also basically seek a way to escape reality and sometimes it's quoted, “Because they’re bored.” So it's not necessarily the same reasons, but it's basically the same drugs, and the same thing with how heroin is the same thing as -- crap, the nicer version of [heroin] or whatever. But people taking the nicer version are richer, and they can get off on bail and stuff. So they can just go back home and do the same thing whereas the poor communities are --

Person B: I see your point. Yeah, I see your point. there’s obviously some rich people that are taking drugs. Whoops, sorry.

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

Person A: Alrighty, well --

Person B: Yeah. Nice talking to you.

Person A: Yeah, you too. Okay, bye bye.

Person B: Bye.

# *Pair 186, Support P386, Oppose P387, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person A: Hello.

Person B: Okay. So you were [in] support [of legalizing drugs], right?

Person A: Kind of. Yeah. What about you?

Person B: I was opposed, right? Yeah.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Okay.

Person A: What are your arguments?

Person B: Okay. So I live in Seattle right now. And when they legalized weed, it was the worst experience of my life.

Person A: Oh no.

Person B: Because they just smelled like weed all over the place all the time. And that sucked. And then, weed isn’t even the most dangerous of them, so, if you legalize all of them, then it's just opening the door to so many bad, dangerous ones to those people who are like, “Oh, it's illegal. So I'm not going to do it. I'm not going to try it.” But yeah, those people are stopped normally if it's illegal. So there’s my point. Your turn.

Person A: So I think drugs should be legalized because I think legalization reduces the amount of risk that comes with drugs. Because when it's illegal, there’s no regulation to the drugs because it's just a black market, and it's just a “free-for-all.” And plus, all the gangs that profit from this black market cause a lot of damage to a lot of different people as well. So I think legalization would allow the government to take more control over the movement of drugs and also be able to reduce the amount of usage. And I think they would also be able to make more effective programs for people that abuse drugs. And -- yep.

Person B: Okay. So I also agree that it'd be easier for the government to control and give more programs and stuff. But the point is that we’d have to give more programs to these people, and there are going to be so many more instances of it because it's so much more readily available to it. So why make it more readily available? And also, if they are sold on the black market and all the behind-the-scenes stuff now, just because they legalize it, it doesn't mean that [it’s] going to stop. It's going to still keep going. And sure, some people [might] switch to be like, “Oh, let's go to the recreational cocaine store.” But also, it might be more expensive. People might not want to do that. They might have better deals in the backside of it. So I just don't think that it would really help.

Person A: Well, I think the first thing people -- legalization of drugs would -- so your arguments are that people have more access to drugs and more people will go to use the drugs and will get addicted?

Person B: Yeah. And the black market would still be happening because it'd be cheaper. We would have to start more programs, and it just wouldn’t be better. Should there be better kept programs, but people still wouldn't be going to those programs just because it's more controlled.

Person A: I don't agree with the fact that the black market wouldn't decrease and that more people would start using drugs. There might be more people using drugs, but I feel like the amount of drug abuses would decrease a lot. And I think that's one of the major problems of drugs being illegal, because, once you're addicted, it doesn't matter if it's legal or not. But if it is legal, then legalization [allows] the government to provide more support for the people that are addicted or abusing drugs. And I feel like that would be better for -- yeah.

Person B: Yeah, but at the same time, if you make it legal, then I can just go to the store right now, buy a pack of cigarettes, and next thing you know, I'm addicted. But because I don't have the access or the convenience for people who are like, “Oh my God, it's legal. I can’t have the drugs” -- the people who are just like, “Oh, I just want to try it one time” -- those people are more susceptible to being addicted, and the government can have better control over it. But more people get addicted to it because a lot of the drugs that are still not legalized are the ones that are the super addictive, bad ones. So I just really strongly oppose it.

Person A: Yeah, I understand you. And I agree [that] the drugs that are highly addictive should definitely not be legalized. I feel like also the legalization of these drugs will allow more research into these drugs, and I think that would be very crucial to understanding the drugs more. And once we understand the drugs more, we'll be able to regulate and understand the effects they have on the human body. If it stays illegal, then it's very hard to fund research on these drugs, but once it’s legal, I think that there'll be a lot more studies that could be able to fully understand the drug and be able to really show the public -- And once we fully understand the drug, then the government can create better programs to inform people about the dangers of the drug or why they shouldn't be using it.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: That's a really interesting point, but good talk. Great.

Person A: Oh, is it over?

Person B: I think so.

Person A: Oh. I can't even hear [the experimenter].

Person B: Are we ending it? Oh.

Person A: Okay. I guess. Okay, good talk.

Person B: Good talk.

# *Pair 205, Support P439, Oppose P443, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person A: Hi. So how do you feel about supporting government reparations?

Person B: I actually oppose it, for maybe not a typical reason. But yeah, actually it was kind of similar to what the opponents said. What about you?

Person A: Well, I said I support it, but I don't mean just in the form of, I don’t know, granting money. I mean through government programs and stuff, you know?

Person B: Okay. Yeah. I agree with that too. My main issue was that I think just giving people money -- it’s a Band-Aid solution. It’s not sustainable, and is it going to reverse the years of racism that have already occurred, you know?

Person A: Yeah, I agree. I a hundred percent think that the government should -- slavery can't -- it was only [in] like 1961 when Black people really actually got freedom. So that can't be undone. So obviously, the government should do something, but I kind of agree with you in that we can't just give money to people and expect things to change. Yeah.

Person B: Yeah. My main points that I wrote down -- you know how people would have to pay more taxes? I think that just might create more animosity and just that rhetoric of, “Oh these people -- they just live off of welfare,” and that sort of thing. I think it might just worsen that for

African Americans who are low income and are receiving governmental aid, you know?

Person A: Yeah. But I still believe that there should be welfare programs

Person B: Yeah, same.

Person A: But I don't think it should be race specific, you know? It should just be by financial status, I suppose. Yeah.

Person B: Yeah. I completely agree. I think that any kind of welfare program that specifically targets certain races just doesn't make sense because there are successful people within that race who won’t need that welfare.

Person A: Yeah, exactly. This might be a little bit unrelated, but I kind of feel the same way about affirmative action, or basically any program that is meant to target disadvantaged people.

Person B: Oh, yeah. I completely agree that it should be based on --

Person A: Nonracial factors, basically.

Person B: Exactly. Socioeconomic factors are more important than race in terms of the opportunities you receive and stuff.

Person A: Yeah. But I do understand why a racial target, I think, could be desirable because America has had such a dark history of slavery. But yeah, the topic doesn't really specify like, “Do you support race-based government programs or something?” But I do think the government should do something, you know?

Person B: Yeah. I think it's the whole, “Teach a man how to fish,” kind of thing. You need a sustainable solution. My ideas were, instead of giving reparations, investing in more low-income neighborhoods, investing in their educational system, professional growth opportunities that connect people to jobs instead of relying on welfare, and that sort of thing.

Person A: Yeah, that's exactly what I was thinking. I was thinking maybe invest more in schools in predominantly Black neighborhoods or something because those are pretty infamous for being shitty quality.

Person B: Yeah, like, “inner city stuff.”

Person A: Yeah, that's what I had in mind when they were talking about reparations. I wasn't thinking of just giving checks out to everyone who's Black, you know?

Person B: Yeah. Okay. That makes more sense.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: That's funny because I feel like we were supposed to be on the opposite sides [for] this stuff.

Person A: Yeah, I know. We’re agreeing on most of this stuff. So yeah, this is a little awkward.

Person B: That's okay. That just means we're -- this isn't anti-Berkeley, you know?

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: We’re agreeing.

Person A: But I don't know. I feel like most of the Asians here kind of feel the same way because we all are a little salty about affirmative action.

Person B: Yeah. I mean, Berkeley doesn't have affirmative action. That’s why there are so many of us here, which is funny. But yeah, I know. The Ivy [league schools] and stuff -- when you see the people who get --

Person A: Yeah, it’s crazy. I’ve had so many superstar Asian friends who get rejected from Harvard, and it doesn’t make sense to me.

Person B: Yeah, they deserve to be there, you know? They’ve worked so hard.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: But at the same time, I think, especially with jobs and stuff, we’re all going to get great jobs in the future. It’s not something that I’m super worried about. But I think it’s important to have a diversity of perspectives, so I’m kind of okay with there being racial quotas in companies, especially -- just so you have a diverse group of people there, you know?

Person A: Yeah, I kind of agree with you, but I still think it’s not really fair because people don’t go to college, or people don’t go to companies, in order to experience a diverse group of people. That’s almost never someone’s priority. I feel like college should be whoever’s best qualified, given their circumstances, should be allowed to attend.

Person B: Yeah, that makes sense. I think where I’m coming from is it’s not so much as what you want to experience as much as what would be best for society as a whole. I think it’s productive for society to have -- like with researchers and stuff, if you just have a bunch of super qualified Asian and White people doing research, you’re only going to do research on topics that affect those people. You’re not going to be looking at society as a whole, and that’s why I think it’s important. Especially with companies and stuff -- companies aren’t going to try to solve problems that affect communities that aren’t represented by the people who work there, you know?

Person A: Yeah, no, I agree. But I can see the perspective of other people when they’re saying, “I’m not paying all of this tuition to help society. I’m doing it for myself [and] my own growth.”

Person B: Yeah, I get that too. I’m sure if I’m in that situation, I’d also be kind of salty.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: If I get rejected for --

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: Oh, wait.

Person A: Oh, wait. Yeah, I think we’re stopping.

Person B: Okay, cool.

Person A: Okay, yeah. [The experimenter] is saying, “Finish your conversation.” Okay, alright. Nice talking to you.

Person B: Yeah, you too.

# *Pair 159, Support P339, Oppose P346, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person B: Hey, what’s up?

Person A: What’s up? Okay, what’s your stance?

Person B: Okay, when I filled this [survey] out, I assumed it meant just monetary reparations which I don't think is a good idea, but I wrote that I could get behind things that were incentive programs, like college grants, career centers, and other institutions to ease the racial disparity.

Person A: Okay.

Person B: Yeah, I don’t know. What did you have to say?

Person A: Same thing, I think. I said that they should have more resources and things like that -- like you said, college grants and all that kind of stuff -- just because they’re underrepresented. But I don't think that they should be getting money if that makes sense. Direct money all the time -- I don’t think that that’s fair.

Person B: Yeah. That's what I was saying.

Person A: Yeah. I guess this doesn’t make this a debate.

Person B: Yeah. I don’t know. I think they probably put me with you because I put “strongly disagree” [in the survey].

Person A: Oh, did you? Okay, I put that I wasn’t really sure. I put the “2” [option in the survey].

Person B: Uh-huh.

Person A: I didn’t agree strongly, but I was like, “Okay, I kind of agree.”

Person B: Oh, did you see me earlier when I did the actual video call?

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Yeah, that was my bad.

Person A: It's all good, I don't know if we’re not -- does that affect this in a way?

Person B: I don't know. It's just going to be on the screen recording later.

Person A: Oh, that's true.

Person B: Yeah, I don't know. Is there anything else you wanted to say about this?

Person A: I don't know. I guess they should maybe have more centers, if that makes sense.

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: I know that there are a lot of Native American camps where they can be there to talk about the things that their families have been through and stuff like that, and I think that that’s fair [and] that they should definitely have more of those -- I wouldn’t call them camps -- resource centers where people are able to talk about how it's affected their families and stuff. But also, slavery was a long time ago, so I don't think anyone was directly affected today, if that makes sense.

Person B: Yeah, that's what I'm saying. I don't know if branding it as “slavery reparations” is necessarily the best way to get this kind of stuff to happen.

Person A: Yeah, I agree.

Person B: And there are also a lot of other people of color, and even White people, that are in similar situations.

Person A: Exactly.

Person B: So I don't know.

Person A: No, yeah, I agree. I agree. I think slavery was too long ago to continue reparations. Maybe when it really did happen it would have probably been a good idea to pay families who were affected and couldn’t get educations and stuff like that. But I really don't think that, right now, it's appropriate to pay people.

Person B: Yeah, because they did a similar kind of thing for the Japanese that they locked up in internment camps in World War II.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: They just gave them money, but it wasn’t 100-200 years later. I don’t remember when it was. It was actually not that long ago, but still, it was 50 [years] -- within that range, I think.

Person A: Yeah. Mm-hmm. For sure.

Person B: So.

Person A: Also, I mean, come on. I think if you’re still affected by slavery in your family, that means that you’re not really taking advantage of the resources that you have in present day, if you’re still thinking back about your great, great, great grandparents?

Person B: Yeah, it’s been a minute, so there’s a certain level of personal accountability.

Person A: For sure.

Person B: Yeah. Well, that was pretty chill.

Person A: Yeah, I know. I was afraid that you were going to be someone who was like, “Oh, you know, I’m super opposed to it.” I was like, “Ah.”

Person B: Yeah, I don’t know. I like to think most people are relatively reasonable.

Person A: Yeah, right? I don't know. I've met some people who are seriously insane about not being cool with any of that kind of stuff.

Person B: Yeah, I know this one guy. He definitely wouldn’t be about this.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Yeah, I don't want to try to describe him because he's kind of hard to.

Person A: It's okay.

Person B: His name's [name redacted].

Person A: Oh, okay. Oh, wait. That's so funny. I know a [name redacted]. He has a different last name. I can't pronounce it, but I know a different [name redacted] who's super opposed to stuff like this. He's really Republican.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: And last night he was saying things, and I was like, “Oh shit.”

Person B: Well, I wouldn’t consider [name redacted] to be a Republican. I'd just say he's very -- he's this Jewish dude. I swear he was born when he was sixty. He just is -- I don’t know. The only thing he's ever watched is PBS News Hour. He's that kind of kid. I don't know.

Person A: What a nerd.

Person B: Yeah, it's funny. I'm honestly going to talk to him about this and see what his opinion is later.

Person A: You should, you should. That's good. I don't know. I try not to talk to people about politics sometimes.

Person B: That's his shit.

Person A: Sometimes people get really heated.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: And I don't know how to react then.

Person B: Yeah, I was kind of nervous for this when they said we’d be Skyping people.

Person A: Yeah. Me too. I was definitely afraid. I was like, “Okay. Alright.”

Person B: How’d you hear about this thing?

Person A: So my friend -- funny story actually -- [name redacted] told me about it. He's like, “You’d be so good at this.” I was like, “I don't know what you mean, but okay.” So, I signed up for it.

Person B: Yeah, my friend is MCB Pre-Med, and he does stuff for this XLab. So he's like, “Yeah they pay you to do stuff.” So I was like, “Alright I'll check it out.”

Person A: Yeah, and I don't know. The description was super vague, so I wasn’t actually sure what we were talking about.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: But it's fine. [It’s] totally good. I'm glad I don't have to really convince you.

Person B: Yeah, that was pretty easy.

Person A: Yeah. Okay. Well, are you a freshman?

Person B: I’m a junior, actually.

Person A: Oh, shit. Okay, I’m a freshman.

Person B: Oh, damn.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Hopping on this XLab shit pretty quick!

Person A: Yeah, free money. I'm all there.

Person B: Yeah, that's dope. What’s your major?

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: Oh, is [the researcher] talking?

Person A: Oh yeah, she is. Okay, so I’m a psychology major. How about you?

Person B: Oh, I’m a civil engineering major.

Person A: Nice. Cool.

# *Pair 160, Support P343, Oppose P336, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person A: Okay, well, hello. My name is [name redacted]. Nice to meet you.

Person B: Nice to meet you. I’m [name redacted].

Person A: [Name redacted], awesome. So, we’re talking about campus speakers, correct?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Cool. So I was a person who said that I support allowing extremely controversial speakers to speak on campus, and I also said that I strongly do support that belief of mine.

Person B: I think I was in the middle [of the scale], or I was like, “I don't support it, but I oppose it.” But it was not so strongly.

Person A: So you slightly oppose it?

Person B: Yeah, I guess.

Person A: Oh, okay. That makes sense. Well, I put down a couple of notes, so I'll just read them off to you.

Person B: Yeah, sure.

Person A: First thing I thought about is freedom of speech. That’s kind of one of the main points that our nation was built upon. And I feel like that should be respected for all individuals, regardless of whatever they wish to be speaking about -- well not all individuals -- I guess to a certain extent. Like hate speech and racism, and sexism, things like that, [I’m] definitely not in support of, and I feel like as long as these extremely controversial speakers are speaking respectfully and are not supporting hate speech, that they should be allowed to speak about what they believe in. I also put down that it's important to consider all ideas and opinions, regardless of whatever their viewpoint and that controversy is really what sparks change in a society. I also said that we sort of maybe reject their message because we fear the bits of truth that might lie within. They might be sort of the hard facts that we don't want to face, but that are important to hear, so that we can consider these things. I also wrote that the very fact that they raise controversy is evidence that there’s value in what they’re saying. The fact that some people really don't want them to be able to speak their mind just shows the importance of what they might have to say. But I do concede -- I remember when Ben Shapiro was here last year -- security money -- they spent multiple millions of dollars or actually maybe it was six hundred thousand. I don't remember the exact amount, but it was way too much money that didn't need to be spent. And also, maybe there are some underlying motives by administration of campus to have these controversial speakers come and talk and kind of stir things up on campus, and I’m not really in support of that. I’m just more saying that everybody should be able to speak their mind.

Person B: Yeah, alright.

Person A: Sorry. I went on that long little --

Person B: No, you’re good. I actually agree with you on a lot. But the question said specifically, for example, Milo Yiannopoulos, Ann Coulter, and you talked about Ben Shapiro, and I totally agree with you on the controversial part having some sort of truth. And I think that it's really important to have these conversations and get different perspectives, and, even with things like safe spaces, I guess I'm like, “Oh, well, is that really effective when shouldn't we be facing this?” But at the same time, I think constructive debate comes from being very educated about topics. Because I personally feel like people like Milo Yiannopoulos, for example, he considers himself a troll. And so, in my idea of hate speech, I think of that where it's actively attacking other people to make a point, whereas a more constructive debate where we can address controversy is to have educated views, which is what I think the biggest difference between Milo and Ben Shapiro was. I actually watched Ben Shapiro’s thing, and, although I disagreed with him on a lot, I saw his points and saw where he was coming from. And he just seemed like -- it was legit -- the things that he was talking about, whereas Milo or Ann Coulter attacking people, or Ann Coulter specifically attacking people’s sexuality and the -- I don't know. It just seemed like not something constructive, and I feel like obviously this whole debate about speakers coming to Berkeley is a very -- and with the Berkeley Republicans dilemma, whatever -- it’s definitely very political. But even that, I feel like there's definitely a difference between “Republican” and “controversy” and “debate,” and that's so different from “hate speech,” which is what I think some of these speakers do. And so obviously, it's hard to draw a line and be very specific about where is it “hate speech” and what is and what isn't. But yeah, I feel like extremely controversial speakers like that shouldn’t be allowed.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Just because it created so much division.

Person A: It does. I agree with you though. I see where you’re coming from with that, and I agree. Yeah, some of the ways that they bring about their viewpoints and express themselves can be kind of hurtful, or maybe inconsiderate, so --

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Oh, yeah.

Person B: No.

Person A: I know. I was just going to say that yeah, I agree with that. I totally see where you’re coming from and think that it should be more about the discussion, not really about the people and trying to attack people.

Person B: Yeah. Right. Good call.

Person A: Alright. Yeah, it was a good talk. Thank you.

Person B: Yeah, Bye.

# *Pair 162, Support P348, Oppose P340, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person A: Okay, so seeing as I support reparations, I guess that would mean that you oppose them?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Okay. So.

Person B: Yeah, I do oppose them.

Person A: And why?

Person B: I just think that we need to treat all people equally, and, if we do reparations, in my mind, that kind of puts African Americans above everyone else -- not morally, just -- I don't know. It's just like somehow we need to give them more than everyone else, even though slavery was hundreds of years ago. At this point, we’re basically the same, in my mind.

Person A: Okay, so, let me ask you a couple questions. You understand fully that whether or not it was hundreds of years ago or not, for a very long time, they were treated as not human at all and had no basic rights, no money, no places to live, no food, nothing like that, right?

Person B: Yes, I do understand that.

Person A: And so, even though in this current society, I guess we’re technically equals, there's no way -- think about whether it’s possible to, over 150 years, to build up an entire community that started at basically 0 and expect them to actually be our equals. I think the idea that we’re all equal now because we apparently fall equally under the law is a total misconception, and I think that there’s no way for that community to ever even get close to us. I don’t think that giving them money or giving them shelter -- whatever form the reparations would come in -- I don’t think that would ever, in any situation, even get close to them being ahead of us, in any way. If anything, it would be to equalize.

Person B: I see where you’re going. I get that because of what has happened, they’re obviously behind us, I guess is what you’re saying.

Person A: Yes.

Person B: I get what you’re saying.

Person A: In every domain --

Person B: But, I mean --

Person A: They don’t have as much shelter, they don’t have as much food, they don’t get as far in life as us --

Person B: I mean, I --

Person A: And that is directly related to the fact that they were enslaved. That has everything to do with the fact that we live so unequally now.

Person B: I don’t know. I think they’re capable. I think that obviously, even though they’re disadvantaged, that doesn't mean they're not capable of just pulling ahead.

Person A: But then again, this idea of grit, this idea of working hard is also -- sorry, I was going to cuss -- is also something that has been fed to you. That is the dogma and the rhetoric that our current system feeds people -- is that everybody has an equal chance, when, in reality, it's not true. Put yourself in the position of someone, hundreds of years ago, who had nothing, absolutely no food, no money, no work. A lot of people, after they were freed from slavery, continued to work on their plantations because it was the only means that they had to even get food, water, shelter. And so, if you want to put it down to grit and working hard enough, no matter how hard people work, progress will be very slow, and there’s probably not going to be any glimmer of equality for another thousand years, and --

Person B: Well, I don't know about that. I mean, when you say hundreds of years ago, obviously, yes, hundreds of years ago, there was no way that they were going to be able to catch up. But now, yes, they’re still at a disadvantage, but I think that they have the means to work hard. And yes, they will have to work harder than us, but they can do it, and I don't think it --

Person A: But do they have to? Why should they have to work harder than everyone else when they have been working harder for hundreds of years, when this country was built on their backs? Our infrastructure [and] our wealth came from plantation workers. That’s why our country is so prosperous. Because Black people did that work.

Person B: Yes, what happened in the past sucks. Obviously no one would ever say that was good, but it happened in the past, and it sucks and --

Person A: And so what?

Person B: I think --

Person A: Tough luck?

Person B: Yes. Life just isn't fair sometimes, and sometimes you have to work hard because of things that happened, and it sucks, but you just kind of have to do it.

Person A: Okay, let's use your idea a little bit, this idea of working hard, right? So, let's take two kids. One is Black and one is White. The White kid, generally speaking -- this is a stereotype, but it's true -- probably has more money than the Black kid. The White kid probably has a cleaner home, a parent who works, parents work [so] maybe there's a maid. So, they come home from school, right? These are two equal kids. They go to the same school, they get the same education. After school starts, the White kid goes home, their maid makes them food, they have all afternoon to watch TV, to play, to do all of their homework, get a good night's rest, have their meals, play with friends, go to sleep -- that's their work, right? Now, let's go to the Black kid. The Black kid most likely doesn't live in a nice enough home, probably has more responsibilities than the White child because their parents work, they can't afford a maid, and so when that kid gets off of school, their work is only just beginning because chances are, they have to take care of their siblings, they have to either cook for themselves or cook for their siblings, and they have less time. They have less means. They can't afford tutors and chances are, they probably won't do as well in school. And so, for starting at the very basics, just talking about education, at the end of that child’s even elementary school or middle school career, the Black child has already fallen behind the White. So explain to me how we can ever reach some semblance of equality?

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: Wait, what did [the researcher] just say? I didn't hear.

Person A: I’m just asking for you to consider what you actually think us having equal opportunities as Black people looks like.

Person B: Okay.

Person A: I think that’s it.

Person B: All right. Yeah.

# *Pair 212, Support P457, Oppose P444, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person B: Okay, who should start?

Person A: It's up to you.

Person B: Okay. It's really loud. I don’t know how to --

Person A: There's a lot of echo. Yeah.

Person B: Okay. So what was your position?

Person A: So I’m guessing you’re negative? You opposed?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: And then I support.

Person B: All right, so let's start with you. You can go first.

Person A: Or, I’m like, “Okay” with supporting. Do you want to start?

Person B: No, you can start.

Person A: Okay, well I think in general with reparations for slavery -- let’s be on -- or do you want to do a back and forth conversation instead of just --

Person B: Yeah, yeah, we could definitely do that.

Person A: Okay, so I feel like nothing could actually fix the problem innately. And right now, the purpose of supporting reparations is just to bridge the gap that has been created by slavery.

Person B: Yeah, I understand your point. At first when I read the [question prompt], I was like, “Oh, support.” But then I kind of thought more about it, and the issue obviously isn't just, “Oh my god, having a background that has slavery in it.” It's just the fact that there's inherent, institutionalized racism and stuff like that. And government reparations are just a way for the government to remove the blame from the -- they're taking away responsibility by placing a value on it.

Person A: Oh, okay. Yeah, I do agree with that. I think instead of reparations for slavery, it's more of a reparation for the institutionalized racism. But I think from the other hand, instead of removing the blame, it's more about fixing the problem and trying to improve the situation.

Person B: Yeah, I get you. On one hand [the experimenters] kind of worded this specifically for slavery. So they're talking about like they're going to only give reparations to people who have descendants that were slaves, right? Racism in general is directed towards African Americans and Black people, right?

Person A: Yes.

Person B: If you just focus on the people -- for one thing, how are you going to get like actual, legitimate information connecting someone to a descendant who was part of slavery? That's kind of sketch and then --

Person A: I think --

Person B: Oh, sorry, what?

Person A: Oh, continue.

Person B: I don’t know. I just think they're marginalizing a specific group of people even if they try to do this.

Person A: Okay, yeah, I can see where you're coming from. I feel like, at the same time, even though slavery is something very specific, I think it's a huge portion to racism, and I think it's the beginning. It could be the beginning to a larger discussion in regards to racism. And then, yeah, when you actually think about the details, it could be kind of sketch, but I'm pretty sure there's actually a lot of documentation, at least [of] the more recent generations who came from an enslaved background.

Person B: Yeah. Okay. Yeah, I see your point. I do believe that slavery is a part of racism. That's true. But I feel like, just the question in general, it's focusing on slavery, and it doesn't really go into the actual issue. You know?

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: And if government reparations are made, they're going to be made on the premise that it's just going to be for slave descendants. I like your point, how you brought up, “Oh, this is just the opening to more issues being resolved and talked about.” But if I compare this to the Native American situation, so now Native Americans are given reparations for all the land they lost and all the crap they went through basically. But basically, that's about it. In general, the government really doesn't try or do anything for Native Americans except for give them like a thousand dollars occasionally. But in reality, Native Americans are still -- a large portion of the population’s in poverty, and they're not really -- there are just a lot of things going wrong with that. And the government's doing nothing.

Person A: Yeah, I completely agree. I think, yeah, so it would depend on what type of reparations because I think with, for example, the Native Americans, their reparations weren't actual reparations. It was just more like a band-aid on the surface to make it seem somewhat moral when in reality it wasn’t. Yeah. But then I feel like -- so I guess this is parallel to the whole Native American situation, is that I think being where we are today, we've had so much privilege and resources which they won't have, especially coming from a background and everything compounds on each other. So coming from a less privileged background, your future generations will most likely be very much affected by that.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: So I think any bit of aid would be important, but it has to be a well thought out aid or reparation.

Person B: Mm-hmm. Yeah, I get what you mean. Yeah. I feel like ultimately the reason why I’m mainly against the idea of a reparation isn't because -- I hope I'm not coming off as racist by saying I’m against government reparations. But I feel like the bigger issue isn't going to be really resolved.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: That's what I learned in most of my education classes when we talk about a lot of global affairs.

Person A: Oh, wait same. I’ve taken a bunch of education classes.

Person B: Oh my god. Yeah. Yeah.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: Wait, what?

Person A: I think time is up.

Person B: Okay. It was nice talking to you.

Person A: Yeah. That was cool.

Person B: Very interesting conversation.

Person A: Yeah, it's interesting how we had like similar backgrounds but have different perspectives.

Person B: Yeah, yeah, it is really cool. Okay. Bye.

# *Pair 213, Support P445, Oppose P455, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person A: Okay, so the topic I guess is reparations for slavery. Right?

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: Okay. Actually, I think I’m going to raise the volume. I can’t hear you that well.

Person B: Okay, cool.

Person A: Okay, I don’t really know how to do it.

Person B: Yeah. I can hear you quite clearly so that’s good.

Person A: Okay, that’s good.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Okay, so I’m assuming that you are opposing government reparations for slavery?

Person B: Yes.

Person A: Do you have any specific reason as to why?

Person B: I think one concern is if we help these people again using government, and I don't know how we're going to help them --

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: I mean you might have a better idea on this. Yeah.

Person A: Mm-hmm. Wait, so what's exactly your argument as to why not?

Person B: Yeah, so I think I just don't know whether slavery is a direct causation of this sort of inequality among Black Americans. So yeah, I was just wondering your thoughts on that.

Person A: Yeah, it's true. Not all African Americans are below the poverty line. But I think that slavery can be accounted for as a big cause for poverty in Black Americans because they pretty much entered into society with a disadvantage for them. Because after slavery, they had nothing in their possession, and they had to start over from basically nothing. And probably the biggest cause of poverty is, I guess, your family wealth. So if their families started with basically zero wealth, that will probably, not always, but it will continue into further generations. So these descendants of slaves will, in a lot of cases, be poor, and that's my stance on it.

Person B: Okay.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: How about Asian immigrants?

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Or other immigrants who came to U.S. with nothing? Then they slowly build their wealth, and they establish some really wealthy background here in the U.S. What's your thought on that?

Person A: I can say I do agree with you in that there are really similar situations where people are coming basically with nothing in their hands and just like starting over. But I think the difference between slavery and immigrants coming from other places is that the immigrants don't come with a preexisting condition in a way. But from slavery -- it was caused by someone, and so in that case I think there should be some sort of, not reward, like some sort of reparation given for it. The immigrants weren't done wrong in any way. They started with nothing and they built it up and that's true. But no one ever put them in poverty in a way. And so that's why I think, specifically for slavery, there should be reparations because it was allowed by the government and it was caused by the people.

Person B: Oh, okay.

Person A: So what do you -- yeah.

Person B: So it was caused by other people. Therefore, they need to get some sort of reparations from the governments. For immigrants, they chose to come here. So you are saying that they are different situations or something like this?

Person A: Yeah, it’s kind of the same situation but different sources of the same idea.

Person B: Oh, okay. Different sources of --

Person A: Of starting from zero.

Person B: Starting from zero. Yeah, okay. Yeah.

Person A: So how strongly are you in this stance and the way -- I just want to know.

Person B: I actually -- I’m a son of an immigrant family, and, whenever I get this kind of question, I question about individual responsibility.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: And I think that slavery -- well, of course, we had this inequality in the U.S. over many, many years, since the beginning of our nation. And I think my main concern is, is this really the reason why there are so many poor families among African Americans or are there other reasons why they're poor? Maybe that's the reason why -- I mean I just don't know whether reparations actually help these people to become better or become wealthier in our society.

Person A: Yeah, I definitely agree with you in that not all the poverty in Black Americans stems from slavery. I can agree with you on that because you do see wealthy Black Americans. You also see immigrants who started off from nothing who also got rich too, so it's definitely not just slavery, right?

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: Yeah, and I agree with you that reparations might not actually help these people that much.

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: It might not be a substantial amount of money or whatever. But I think it has to do more with a social responsibility from the government.

Person B: Hmm, okay.

Person A: It would be really good if the reparations were effective in pulling these people out of poverty, but, at least in my point view, it has a lot to do with social responsibility. So just helping all these people in some way because of slavery is a good way to fulfill that.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: All right, sounds good.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Thanks so much, man.

Person A: Yup. Yeah, yeah.

Person B: All right.

# *Pair 183, Support P397, Oppose P391, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person B: Okay, so I’m [Name redacted] by the way.

Person A: I’m [Name redacted].

Person B: Hi, so nice to meet you. Do you oppose or support requiring government reparations for slavery?

Person A: I support it but not super strongly. It's kind of a vague question for me.

Person B: Okay, elaborate. What do you define as reparations then? Maybe that's a good way to start.

Person A: Yeah, I think the question that we answered on the website mentioned structural reparations, and I think that would be better than financial reparations.

Person B: Okay, so structural. What do you mean by structural then?

Person A: Like have you heard of redlining?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Yeah, fixing that and reversing the impacts of that would be something that would help lift up people who are still oppressed, and, yeah, I think that would be a really good start.

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: What about you?

Person B: Well, it's funny. I definitely took “reparations” way more literally in terms of money because, yeah, I was definitely not for that. But I think, just kind of my opinion, it's definitely more -- and I'm also interested in, [as] you brought up, redlining because I did a project on that last year.

Person A: Oh, cool.

Person B: And, yeah, it's a really messed up system. But something else that's kind of tough about it is -- yeah, I totally agree -- is that it's kind of hard to fix because also a lot of people don't want to uproot their communities. It's a kind of particular topic that, sometimes it seems like it makes sense but also --

Person A: You mean people of color don't want to upgrade their communities or White people?

Person B: Whoever lives in districts.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Redlining is a hard thing to just fix because you can’t just move thousands of people and tell everyone else --

Person A: Totally.

Person B: Yeah, I understand where you're coming from. I think, yeah, kind of at this point why I'm pretty against -- I guess, given we're talking about reparations like [in] the literal sense -- is just because, one, I think that I understand [slavery’s] influence on today's society and that we can't deny that fact. But also I think it's something, it's kind of more of just a general thing, that I think if we're ever really going to move forward, we have to get past that, you know?

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: It can't be like this black cloud looming over our heads because of something that happened in the past. Especially now because -- that was another thing I really thought about -- is at this point, it can be so hard to define who gets reparations. And that's also more of a testament to how fucked up our country is sometimes. But I just think it's like --

Person A: It’s a melting pot.

Person B: Yeah. I don’t know. Yeah, exactly. And then someone's going to be like, “Well I feel like I should have -- ”

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Yeah, well, I'm curious. So then what more would you say about -- because I think we both kind of agree that just handing --

Person A: Yeah, that wouldn't do anything. It's kind of like I don't always just hand homeless people money on the streets for the same reason.

Person B: Yeah, I’d give them food.

Person A: Giving someone money isn't really going to do anything.

Person B: Yeah, I'll give them food, but I’ll never give them money.

Person A: But structurally, people of color still don't go to college as much and don't get as high paying jobs. It's the similar fight for feminism.

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: So just equality is the fight that -- I would consider that “structural reparations.” That's why, [to] the question, I was like, “Yeah, I support certain things."

Person B: So do you think then reparations are, okay, instead of like, “Let's just give everyone money,” are you saying, “Okay, let's fund specific programs?” Or is that kind of what you mean? “Let’s fund programs to help kids get to college?”

Person A: Yeah, like fund public schools. If you're not going to be able to change these neighborhoods right away -- which obviously you can't, that can happen slowly -- but if you can't, then fund the -- they're defunding public schools right now. The public school system is jacked. So if they could fund these public schools instead of taking money from them and help them get to a place where their communities are just as good as White communities, in the sense of public services that they have access to, then yeah. Especially healthcare too. Our healthcare has been largely privatized. So you have to have a good job in order to get healthcare, really. And if you're a person of color, you have a harder time getting a good job and that's a harder time getting healthcare. So it's just this spiral. It starts from birth, it starts from public school, and it just keeps people down.

Person B: Mm-hmm. In honesty then, we kind of agree. Just out of curiosity, have you seen Colin Kaepernick's new Nike ad?

Person A: Yes. I love it.

Person B: It's awesome. But it kind of makes me sick but also really -- you have to accredit that this is happening. Because so many people have denied it based on this whole idea that --

Person A: Police brutality, you mean?

Person B: No, no. They've said that they don't support him kneeling for the national anthem because they don't think there's any injustice that he should be kneeling for.

Person A: Yeah, I’m just like, “What?”

Person B: Yeah, that's what I mean.

Person A: Just the fact that it’s mostly people of color in sports.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: Oh, yeah. Especially for the cash cow sports like football and basketball. Exactly.

Person A: Ridiculous. It's like modern slavery. It’s crazy.

Person B: Yeah. I actually read a story basically saying the exact same thing.

Person A: Damn. What was it called?

Person B: That's such a good question. It was in a book as a collection of best sports writing from last year, but it's cool because it's not actually about sports. It's just about how it kind of relates to other issues.

Person A: I’ll have to check it out.

# *Pair 184, Support P394, Oppose P393, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person B: All right, what's your name? Let's start.

Person A: Sounds good. My name is [Name redacted]. What's your name?

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

Person A: [Name redacted]. Nice to meet you, man. Where are you from?

Person B: I'm international. I'm from Qatar.

Person A: Qatar, man, that’s like --

Person B: Oh, yeah. That’s like halfway across the globe.

Person A: Yeah, I was going to say that's more than an hour away, if you ask me.

Person B: Where are you from?

Person A: I'm from Utah.

Person B: Oh. Okay.

Person A: So far away, but not quite as far as Qatar.

Person B: Okay. More than an hour away.

Person A: Right on. Well, hey, do you want to start on the topic?

Person B: Yeah, let's start. All right. Reparations for slavery.

Person A: Quite the topic.

Person B: Indeed.

Person A: Do you want to go ahead?

Person B: Right, what is your position? Do you oppose or support the reparations?

Person A: I support but definitely not in the fully, exactly what they're saying way.

Person B: Uh-huh.

Person A: But I think it's a good way to get the ball rolling. How about you? What are you feeling?

Person B: Well, I would lean more on the opposed side, but yeah, I do acknowledge that obviously maybe the position that they were detailing might've influenced me. Maybe I would be okay with a softer thing, you know?

Person A: Yeah. I kind of feel the same way. It's like they're trying to get you to choose a black or white. Which side you can take? I’m like, “Well man, there's quite the gray zone in the situation,” you know?

Person B: Of course.

Person A: So what makes you more on the opposed side?

Person B: Well, we can start with the point that they mentioned over there as an example. Obviously, the people who practiced slavery died in the 18 hundreds. Why would their descendants be held responsible for something that they had no control over?

Person A: Yeah, that is true, man. That was a while ago. You're right. But I feel like in certain -- you can kind of see it from the geography or the economic status in the U.S. There are parts of the United States which through history seem to have not been able to get out of this poverty spiral or whatever it might be. And I'm not saying that's totally simply because of slavery in those parts of the country, but it is an interesting relationship if you looked at where slavery was versus where those places of poverty quite frankly are.

Person B: Right. Yeah. That's obvious. I have also read about school segregation and how the parts that were at the highest segregation still do have the highest segregation even after we banished it. So yeah. I do agree that those things obviously have their artifacts in today's political, geographic and economic, you know?

Person A: Yeah. I guess, for me, what I'm feeling is [that], obviously, there's quite a bit of inequality going on in the country or wherever it might be. And I do feel like something needs to be done because it hasn't been -- Well, frankly, it's been maybe getting slightly better but then it gets worse. And we're at a point now where we're years after a lot of the civil rights movement, and yet we still seem to be facing similar subjects, you know?

Person B: True, true, true. Another of my concerns was that I didn't really understand how are these reparations going to be paid for. Is it going to be a tax or we charge the people and then part of it just goes towards reparations? How is it happening?

Person A: That's a really good question. Actually, I thought about that too. I think in the prompt it talked a little about how it might increase tax dollars, whatever it is, but it was not specific as to how that tax is going to come about. And I think that'd be really important in order for this to go forward.

Person B: Yeah, like are we only going to tax White people? Are we going to tax everybody?

Person A: Right, right.

Person B: Right. Because obviously, there are Black people, Hispanic people, and Asian people in America who were not a part of slavery but who are taxpaying citizens. So they should not be charged for this.

Person A: Absolutely. I even say, in a lot of those situations too, they're not in a place where they can even contribute a lot, you know what I mean?

Person B: Oh. Yeah.

Person A: That might get it going bad on another side.

Person B: That too. And then the White people might say, “Well, this is racism against my people.” And then there are people who might say, “Well, I'm not actually White. I'm kind of Native American. So should I still be taxed?"

Person A: Right.

Person B: There are all those complications. So looking at this as a black and white issue, I'm not really sure if we can understand it completely to --

Person A: I actually agree with that. I think, I guess my opinion on this topic is I just feel like if we can get that conversation going -- like this is a very intense -- I don't know if you want to put [a] bill or whatever you want to say to enforce because you're going to have pros and cons on both sides. But I think the reason I'd put more on the support side -- and I wasn't like fully gung ho 100% -- but I feel like, if we put this out there, it would start that debate to a point where people would actually be willing to make some changes. I could see them putting this out there and starting the taxing thing, and all of a sudden, we run into all these issues. But because of that, everybody's able to see that we're actually trying to make a difference, that we're trying to do something, and in doing so, hopefully we can have a conversation to make it a little bit better, if that makes sense.

Person B: But do you think we still need to have a conversation about slavery or maybe it's about the inequality in general?

Person A: Hmm, I see what you're saying because the slavery was a long time ago.

Person B: Yeah. I thought instead of taxing people and then paying it as reparation for slavery, what if you tax people and have social programs that help not just Black people but everyone in a position of poverty. That way you're helping Black people. But then also there are some Black people who don't need obviously the help because they have managed to get out of slavery in some places. So they wouldn't be unfairly benefited while there are some White people or Hispanics or Asians who need such help, but they won't get it because they were not subject to slavery.

Person A: Right. I guess I'm trying to debate even myself on whether or not the repercussions of slavery are still in effect today. I think they are, [but] not to that this extent where it's like everything's depending on whether or not you were a slave or not. But I do feel in those parts of the country, maybe it's my great grandpa or great grandma or something was enslaved. That generates this cycle where I still feel that. And the cool thing is those that get out of that cycle, like go to college all of a sudden, or doing all these things, it changes their lives forever.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Oh. Looks like, we're still -- Just kidding.

Person B: Wait, what was [the experimenter] saying?

Person A: I have no idea.

Person B: Shit.

Person A: She said free pizza after this.

Person B: Oh, okay. That's all I need to know. All right. Good talking to you, [Name redacted].

Person A: Hey, man. Good talking to you, bro.

Person B: See you, dude.

Person A: Bye.

# *Pair 185, Support P395, Oppose P396, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person A: All right. So I assume you are against legalization?

Person B: Yes, for the most part. Yeah, so do you want to go first?

Person A: Do I want to go first? Sure. So my main issue with keeping drugs illegal is oftentimes people who want to do drugs regardless of if they're legal or not -- and often [they are] young adults whose brains are still forming and can't find access or easy access to safer drugs that don't have as many side effects or naturally occur in the environment like psychedelics. And instead, [they] find cheap, synthetic drugs such as spice, or there's this new thing going around called monkey dust that goes for two pounds an entire bag. And they buy it because it's cheap and it's the only thing they can find, and they have seizures. It causes death. It just ruins their psyche and yeah.

Person B: Okay, cool. So my main argument in terms of keeping drugs illegal is mostly based on the fact that the war on drugs occurred. And that was a big thing that kind of kept certain communities within inner cities oppressed, and I think that if that didn't occur, I would support the legalization of drugs. But because of the war on drugs and because of the fact that our community and just our society in general is so deepened by that -- People who were affected by the war on drugs are just too oppressed to kind of pursue any other route outside of illegal drugs. So if drugs were legalized, for example, the people that often do drugs are usually either individuals who are very, very poor or very, very rich. So just legalizing drugs, in my opinion, would have no effect besides decreasing the incarceration rates. Even though decreasing the incarceration rates is good, communities within those cities that have lower incarceration rates would still have collateral effects, like lack of educational access, increased crime, and just a bunch of things that you wouldn't expect out of lower incarceration rates. And additionally, I think that economically, by legalizing drugs, even though it will increase profits for companies that do sell those types of illegal drugs, I don't think there are a lot of companies in general that would benefit from that. Because currently, the drugs that are being sold over the counter are through companies that sell acceptable drugs, right? So the only markets that would possibly economically benefit from it are the underground markets in those kind of niche markets that sell illegal drugs.

Person A: Okay, that was a lot.

Person B: Sorry.

Person A: I'm trying to break it down. There are multiple parts to that. Let me think. So you're more concerned over opiates and stuff as opposed to cartels who sling drugs. Because I think a lot of -- yeah, I understand the war on drugs and economically speaking, but with drug trafficking, there comes a lot of violence. And yes, incarceration rates would go down, which is very nice because we are severely impacted.

Person B: Right.

Person A: And, especially because incarceration does target minority communities, I think that is a huge fault in our system. So if we can attack that from a different angle, whether that be drugs or not, I think whatever we can do to fight that is an advantage. The violence that comes with drug trafficking just on a day to day basis or even large scale, like international drug commutes and not even within American borders, it's horrifying. And I personally can't condone when human individual rights are attacked like that. So I think, when a monetary source is taken away, another opportunity to gain capita is going to be found, whether that be creating different jobs or something. I don't think that one market is just going to disappear entirely.

Person B: Right, right, right. Yeah, I totally agree with you on the point that violence is very prevalent in drug cartels, but, in my opinion, I don't think that the fact that it's illegal is the main reason behind these drug cartels. Although the fact that the drugs were illegal in the first place was the reason why the cartel started, I think nowadays, cartels are more just about the maintenance of power and just like the power structures within the cartels, within these, I guess, gangs of drug violence. So I think although the legalization of drugs for currently illegal drugs would improve the situation, I still think that drug cartels would exist because it is a structure that involves a lot of power nowadays. Especially, not even in America, but other developing countries, it's a very, very big part of a lot of people's wellbeing although it's very immoral. It's true. It's the kind of the motivating factor for a lot of these individuals who don't have proper access to other things like education that we in America are so lucky to have. Because I feel like people resort to these activities because they have no other way of improving their social status. So this is really the only way they can do it.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Right, is [the experimenter] telling us to wrap up?

Person B: Okay. Cool.

Person A: All right. Nice talking to you.

Person B: You too, you too.

# *Pair 224, Support P465, Oppose P473, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person A: Okay. So do you want me to give my point of view first or do you want to go first?

Person B: You can go ahead.

Person A: Okay. Personally, I'm really liberal and I grew up in LA, came from a super liberal background, and I totally completely disagree with what the speakers that they hired had to say. However, I think that it's really important that we allow all students the right to listen, or to have speakers that they like come. And so, while [the] majority of students on campus are obviously very liberal, there are some students that actually really wanted those speakers to come. So I feel it's kind of unfair to take away their right because can you imagine if, let's say, you go to University of Alabama where most people are very Republican and conservative and would actually really probably want to see Steve Bannon. I just feel it'd be unfair if you went to that school and let's say you really wanted Hillary to come and they wouldn't let her come. It'd be unfair to you, even though -- you know? And then another thing is that I think it's interesting to learn from opposing views. If you already are stuck to one standpoint, [like] you grew up very liberal, I don't really think that listening to Steve Bannon talk is going to completely change your mind. I think that it would actually be insightful. And yeah, while the protests are really dangerous, I think that it would also be important to probably have some campus education on that to prevent them from being so bad. And it's not the worst thing that they happen. It shows that we disagree, but I just think that it's unfair to not let them come to campus, you know?

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: What's your take?

Person B: My take on this would be I actually am against this whole idea. I think that's what you were trying to say as well. And before we go on to actually talk about this, I wanted to define what extremely controversial speakers are.

Person A: Okay.

Person B: I believe -- oh, wait, I haven't introduced myself. I'm actually from India.

Person A: Okay.

Person B: And I'm a freshman and my name is [Name redacted]. And what I wanted to say was extremely controversial speakers are those speakers whose perspectives can initiate violence and can be dangerous for the society. And that’s where I feel things go out of hand and the clash of perspectives leads to major conflicts. So I believe that's not actually what a free speech campus, which includes a majority of diversities and perspectives, wants.

Person A: Yeah, I agree. I think that people don't want them, but, if they're coming, I think it's almost weaker to not let them come to our campus. I think that the mature approach is to just let them come do their thing, and if you disagree just don't go. That's what I think, but I totally see why people think that it's wrong if they come because their views are dangerous, but we kind of are in this bubble where we believe that their views are dangerous. However, honestly, [the] majority of America agrees with their views. So I feel it's just unfair and it's kind of weak if we just don't allow them to speak because I feel we need to be accepting of everyone because that's what we pride ourselves on. We pride ourselves on being a diverse campus and being accepting and if you're not going to accept these views then that's kind of going against what you're saying.

Person B: Mm-hmm. Yeah, yeah. That's an interesting point. Yeah, I don't have much to say about this. That’s all I could connect with this topic.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Yeah, that’s about it.

Person A: So do you think that your mind is changed or do you still think that they should not be allowed?

Person B: I think they should be allowed, but if they still are not able to agree, then it's up to them.

Person A: Definitely. Yeah. I think it was cool that we were able to say, “look, you can come,” but they backed out and then that makes them look bad, you know?

Person B: Yeah, those guys actually deserve a say. That's what a free speech campus is known for.

Person A: Totally. Did you go to any of the speakers? Oh, wait, they cancelled most of them, but Milo was able to come.

Person B: No, I haven't been for any speaker.

Person A: Oh, wait, you are a freshman. Yeah, yeah.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: I'm a sophomore, so last year I actually went with one of my friends. Again, I'm very liberal but we were just really curious. We were like, “Oh my God, what's this huge line for?” And we're like, "Oh my God.”

Person B: Yeah, yeah.

Person A: So we went in line and actually went and saw him speak, and my friend started crying because his views were really, really offensive towards her.

Person B: Oh my God.

Person A: And a lot of his supporters were there and were holding these posters that said “feminism is cancer.” And her mom was actually dying of cancer at the time. And she's a feminist and it was just really disgusting, and it made us feel so horrible to watch this. I was like, “How could this guy be allowed?” But then at the same time, there are people that support it, and I have to get it through my head that, while I completely disagree with this guy's point of view, there are some people that I personally love. Like Bernie Sanders, for example. He came to speak at my high school, and at the time, I was definitely a big supporter. But there are obviously some people out there that completely disagree with what he says, that think he's disgusting, [and] a bad influence. And who am I to judge them if they -- you know?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: It's so hard to get it through my head and to let myself not judge. But I think the mature thing to do is to let -- everyone can have their own opinion. You can't force your opinion on other people, but you can educate people to make the right decisions.

Person B: Oh, yeah. That's so true. That's a really good point that you've made here.

Person A: Yeah. And it’s hard because -- oh, wait are they telling us to stop?

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: I’ll just ask. Do we stop? Oh, yeah, they’re asking us to stop.

Person A: Oh, okay. So do I hang up?

# *Pair 225, Support P467, Oppose P475, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person A: Would you want to continue first?

Person B: Sure. Well, how about we first just get on the same page about what each of our opinions are in the first place? So I put “disagree moderately.” What about you?

Person A: Okay. I support it strongly. And yeah, I support government reparations for slavery.

Person B: Okay. So did you want to go first?

Person A: I'll hear your arguments first and then I will edit mine as I go along.

Person B: All right. I disagree moderately first of all because I think slavery is kind of too limiting of a condition for reparations. People with non-slavery backgrounds also faced discrimination and I don't know how these reparations would take that into account. For example, someone whose family identifies as Black American but doesn't have a slavery background in their family history. Do they get included in this as well since discrimination against African Americans or Black Americans also affect them?

Person A: Mm-hmm.

Person B: [The] second point is how do you -- or I don't know how you would quantify systematically the effect that race has on a group of people. For example, like a monthly quota. You get a check from the government defined on what race you are. That seems kind of divisive and backward to me. Can you quantify how much more discrimination a Black American faces versus say, a Chinese American or a Latino American or a White American?

Person A: Okay.

Person B: Like that kind of thing.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: And the third point was: how do mixed race people play into this? Since -- do they have -- say if you're half Black, half White, do you have more privilege than a Black person or how does that work out? And also I feel like having a specific reparation in, I guess the financial sense, I think it will breed resentment by treating the issue of racism kind of without nuance. It's kind of just saying since you were born x race, you have this much, the government owes you this much. I think that's sort of heavy-handed and it's not handling the situation with nuance when [the] issue of racism and discrimination is very nuanced.

Person A: Okay. Is that it?

Person B: Yeah. Those are my main points.

Person A: So I actually quite agree with your points. I think you thought about more how it will actually play out in action, whereas I thought about the morals behind it.

Person B: Mm-hmm, I see.

Person A: Because I've heard an Oxford debate about this between British colonization of India and how it was their moral obligation to pay reparations, but it doesn't have to be quantified in money. It could be other resources, not necessarily limited.

Person B: Mm-hmm. I see.

Person A: My arguments were that due to slavery, Black Americans were given less opportunities to succeed and thus there was lesser economic status. And this sort of creates a loop because if you don't have access to these resources such as education, then your other generations will also sort of face similar consequences. And also I’ve -- in my class, there was also a geographical bias due to slavery because if you were poor you were more likely to be in an area that was poor and more dangerous such as New Orleans. And thus they have more environmental consequences because, with Hurricane Katrina, Black people suffered more because of slavery. So there was this gentrification that continued with slavery between White people and Black people. And I also feel that slavery is sort of contributing to this cultural and racial superiority that's sort of present today. Like we can see in our political climate that there's more police brutality and violence towards Black people and there's also a higher rate of criminal record for Black people, whereas they might not also re-commit these crimes. So some of my arguments were that slavery has sort of provided less opportunities to Black people and thus they may also be suffering right now, but I never really considered it to be in action. So I think your arguments are correct in that in action it's a lot more complicated to pay reparations. But there's also a moral belief that we should, we owe it to them, but I'm not sure how they would quantify it and actually be able to pay it.

Person B: Mm-hmm. I guess another question I have is, this would be coming from the government, --

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: But then there's the question: is that equivalent? Since is the government now, the same --

Person A: Responsible?

Person B: As the government before?

Person A: Yeah, exactly.

Person B: Since the government right now is made of the people of right now, correct?

Person A: Mm-hmm.

Person B: But saying the government, I guess, directly owes reparations is sort of, I don't know, it kind of comes off as like imperial, almost? Like a kingdom or a king or queen owes reparations to their people? But now it's democratic government [which] continually shifts. Where does that come from?

Person A: I think it's so much different when you think about it in action versus just supporting the idea.

Person B: Exactly. I do agree that of course, discrimination and racism does come from the history of slavery and all that. It's just the actionable -- like who's responsible for it? I think part of the argument was: should all Americans pay for this, considering they might be the ones who are affected by it as well? How does that work? It's sort of fuzzy, you know?

Person A: I think we're on the same page on the idea of reparations but --

Person B: The nature of those reparations.

Person A: Yeah. I completely agree with you, and it's a lot more difficult to put it in action.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: Nice talking to you.

Person A: Wait, can I recommend something?

Person B: Sure.

Person A: Okay. There's a similar concept or argument with Oxford debate between British colonization in India. It's really interesting how he says there are amoral reparations.

Person B: Mm-hmm. I'll look it up. Thank you.

Person A: Yeah, no problem. Bye.

Person B: Goodbye.

# *Pair 84, Support P181, Oppose P180, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person B: Would you like to start to share your opinion?

Person A: Okay, sure. So I didn't really formulate an entire argument here, but I guess the way I answered the question was that I am an advocate for allowing controversial speakers to speak on campus. So I am an advocate for it.

Person B: Okay. So I'm kind of iffy. I wasn't polar opposite on [the scale of] opposite and support. But I kind of oppose it because of various reasons.

Person A: Okay. Okay, so I guess I'll just start here. One of the reasons I do have for being an advocate for it is just because I am of the opinion that I think it's an argument of freedom of speech, and I think a lot of people should just be allowed to express their opinions. Whether we don't agree with them or not is for us to decide. But I think for them to voice that should be allowed.

Person B: Yeah. Well, that's the thing when I agreed. Of course whenever we have Ann Coulter and Milo coming, they're always bringing up the topic of freedom of speech. But I feel if you're very --there's a difference between free speech and just straight hate speech. And I think my problem with allowing controversial speakers -- because obviously if we invite President Trump to speak, that would cause chaos.

Person A: Yeah, that would be unsafe.

Person B: And for some reason I'm like -- I don't want to say we can't allow him to speak because, yeah, everyone deserves to speak. But if you're just saying like, “I hate Muslims,” what is the take-home message for that?

Person A: Yeah, totally, totally. If there's no point behind what they're saying, then they shouldn't be allowed to speak.

Person B: Yeah. I agree there's some -- like military spending. Like, okay, if you really believe in military spending, go for it. But my problem with the Milo thing is he threatened to expose undocumented students. So I'm kind of -- I don’t know.

Person A: Yeah, that's a little wrong. But why did he threaten to expose them? Because I didn't know about that.

Person B: I'm not sure about it. I'm not sure. I don't know much about that topic. Just the fact that he threatened. And I think it goes back to the question where it's like, freedom of speech. But if you say -- if you yell “fire” in a movie theater, that's not allowed. Because it's not freedom of speech. Because it's harming the students. I’m going back to this Milo thing -- harming the people there and causes a safety hazard, which is another thing why I oppose it. Because we're spending lots of money, unnecessary amounts of money, to keep people safe. And I don't know, at the end of the day, you have to weigh the pros and cons, you know?

Person A: Yeah, I totally agree. If safety becomes a matter of it, then we should just not be allowed to. But why do you think safety becomes a matter of just someone trying to share their opinion?

Person B: I think it just goes back to hate speech, you know? That's why I lean towards oppose, because it's extremely controversial.

Person A: Mm-hmm. Okay. Yeah, yeah, I think extremely is a little -- Yeah. That throws it off.

Person B: What's someone that's kind of moderate? Like if -- whatchamacallit it? If -- okay, George Bush is kind of controversial. I'm trying to think.

Person A: Yeah, it's tough to come up with an example. I agree. See but that's where I come back to. If these people are going to be -- if it's hate speech then that's a different story. But if they're just spreading their opinion -- and I guess some people do want to go listen to that -- I just think they should be allowed to go listen to that. You don't have to go if you don't want to go. And I would not go, but I still think he should be allowed to speak because this is where freedom of speech was founded. We have a cafe after it. So I just think for it to end here would be sad in my opinion.

Person B: Yeah, there are just a lot of people that are just really polarizing. You know?

Person A: Yeah, totally. Totally.

Person B: Which is kind of sad, if you think about it. I wish we can just have free speech for all, but some people just are kind of reaching the boundaries of trying to test people. You know?

Person A: Yeah. It doesn't ever need to get physical. I feel like a boundary needs to be laid out before. And yeah, a lot of people don't get that, which is a huge problem.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Yeah. I don’t know, that was literally all I had on my sheet.

Person B: Yeah. It's a hard topic.

Person A: It is. It totally is.

Person B: I think it’s not black and white. As some people might think, you know?

Person A: Totally, totally agree. Yeah. All of these topics are going to be.

Person B: I'm not a Republican, like hardcore Republican. I’m not a hardcore Democrat either. But some people are. And I don't agree with the fact, “Oh, that person's Republican, therefore no Republicans allowed at UC Berkeley.” No, I disagree with that.

Person A: Yeah, you definitely need both opinions I think, just because it allows you to kind of take and evaluate just different perspectives, and kind of see what you truly believe in.

Person B: But at the end of the day, this is a school, people want to get their degrees.

Person A: Yeah, true. Nobody needs to get hurt either.

Person B: Yeah, exactly.

Person A: Yeah.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 260, Support P553, Oppose P551, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person A: All right.

Person B: Okay.

Person A: Do you want to start?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Sure.

Person B: Yeah, yeah. Hey, wait. What was your stand on this topic first?

Person A: So I do support legalizing drugs, and I assume you don't.

Person B: Yeah, yeah.

Person A: Okay. All right. Would you like to start?

Person B: Sure. Yeah, I don't mind. So my argument basically was that drugs have historically resulted in a higher crime rate. Wherever there have been drugs, there has been a higher crime rate, in general. And introduction of drugs in neighborhoods generally tend to make the neighborhoods unsafe. And when drugs are abused, they could have very negative mental and physical effects, which obviously is not a good thing. And especially the psychological effects. The drugs are known to have a drastic negative toll on your brain, and can severely damage your brain functions. So these are [a] few of the reasons why I am against legalizing drugs in the U.S. I would like to hear your standpoint.

Person A: All right. So I think [in] the first part you say that the introduction of drugs causes unsafe neighborhoods, right? I think that the reason why is that it’s because these drugs are illegal. And so, first of all, there is the black market underground dealing of drugs. The sale of drugs is very illegal, and so gangs are often involved, and hence violence as you mentioned. Which makes it unsafe, right?

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: And another problem of drugs comes from overdoses, right? And that sometimes has to do with the production of drugs, of how, I don't know, mixing glass into cocaine or other unsafe methods of production. And so what I think is, when you legalize something, you're able to regulate both the production and the sale of the item more closely. For example, instead of having gangs produce drugs and [sell] drugs, you have private corporations doing that. And that would also make the production and sale of drugs a little bit safer, which allows for people who want to enjoy these drugs to be able to do it in a safer environment. Second thing you mentioned is about addiction, right? I think that is to do with a lack of good resources for people to get off of drugs. Prison is not really a solution. You’re just punishing people who are taking drugs. But I think other methods such as rehabilitation to actually reduce the addiction to drugs, which is a key problem in illegal drug use, would allow for a safer environment for people to take drugs. And also, because these drugs are deemed illegal, often times drugs are a taboo subject. So in terms of understanding the consequences of different drugs and the consequences they have on our bodies, in education and really allowing the conversation for drugs to be open, I think in terms of that, that would also help with illegal drug use. What do you think?

Person B: Okay. Yeah. So I partly agree with some of your points. However, I know you mentioned that making drugs legal would result in more safe dealing of drugs. However, I feel like when you make it legal, you're going to expose the drugs to a larger population pool. And by doing that, basically you are exposing every single person to the possibility of drug abuse, which would have been less likely if it was illegal. And I think in that sense it could expose young children or some other people on whom drugs’ effects could be very negative. And that could obviously lead to severe repercussions in their lives. Then the second point you mentioned about the rehab facilities. I feel like there are enough rehab facilities in this country where you could go to after you have been abusing drugs. But the part about the rehab, I don't think it's that bad. It's about the drug abuse itself. It leaves a really negative impact in your life, so you honestly don't want to get involved in that. And then I feel like that could be prevented with more strict rules about drug use. And the third point that you mentioned about education, I feel like there is enough education about drug use. They do teach that in health classes to kids: what drugs can do to your brain, how drugs can affect your physical appearance, your health, your mental health, your physical health. However, legalizing or illegalizing drugs would have more direct impact on the people, you know? I feel like there is enough education.

Person A: Okay. I think the thing is, with legalizing -- I think it's not really completely legalizing for young children to be able to do drugs as well. Similar to alcohol, right? You have those age restrictions. You have people who can sell them, people who can buy them. And those restrictions I think should be put in place. But more of the legalization side, I think it's more to do with the production and sale of drug use. I understand that it might be exposing more people to doing so. But also with the -- I think when you have the opportunity to do so --

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Oh. Okay.

Person B: Oh, okay.

Person A: Nice meeting you.

Person B: Yeah, it was nice to talk to you.

Person A: All right. Bye.

Person B: Bye.

# *Pair 210, Support P451, Oppose P452, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person A: Do you want to start?

Person B: Okay. So I said I oppose legalizing drugs because the ones mentioned in the example were mostly highly addictive ones, and they're known to have chemical effects on the brain. I thought that making it legal for everyone, of age obviously, would make the risk of overdose and addiction too high. But I do understand, if it's for medical reasons, there should be separate regulations and laws on it because some people actually do need it. But I don't see why recreational drugs need to be legalized.

Person A: So I said I support legalizing drugs in the United States because the U.S. needs to stop writing arbitrary morality into its criminal codes. Addiction is a mental illness and a symptom of the failings of society. People are proven to use fewer drugs and to opt not to use drugs when their conditions of life are better. So to end drug addiction and abuse, the better strategy is to put all the money we currently spend enforcing drug policy into social safety net programs and addiction treatment.

Person B: Mm.

Person A: To respond to your point about making recreational drugs legal and accessible for people of age, let's say in the United States, the thing is that anyone of any age basically can access heroin, meth, marijuana, cocaine on the streets of any city in America unquestionably, at a given cost. And the problem with the way that that distribution system works now is that there's no control on it. A lot of addiction and overdose happens because of ingredients that users don't know are in recreational drugs like fentanyl and heroin. Yeah.

Person B: Mm-hmm. So basically, what you're saying, if I'm understanding it right, is that instead of using the money for our law enforcement to basically stop people from using these illegal drugs, we should make it legal, make it safe so that it wouldn't be mixed with other random drugs, and spend our money instead on the mental health and psychological help so that people wouldn't be addicted to it in the first place.

Person A: Yes, that's right.

Person B: Okay. That's a valid argument. I do agree. I mean I didn't really know that much about it. But yeah, I do think the black market in general is already a problem, and the only way to really deal with it at this point is by legalizing it. Because there's also a problem of too many people going into prison for this and getting such a high sentence for [not that] big of a deal of an issue.

Person A: Definitely. I definitely agree that all the money spent -- it's not just the cost of funding police officers to go enforce drug policy on the streets. It's the cost of incarcerating people and then all of the money we spend in South America and Central America, like chasing cartels. And another point is that the whole cartel system and the profits that those criminal gangs in Central and South America -- most of their funding comes from the black markets in the United States. So it would honestly be a good thing for the whole globe if the United States at least decriminalized drugs.

Person B: I guess my argument would make sense if it was under the circumstance that we don't have black markets and we don't have any of these issues. But now that I think about it, because we already have such a big black market and we can't really stop it other than making it legal and the government is in more control of it, I guess your argument makes more sense in that way.

Person A: I guess one point of evidence is that in California, now that marijuana is legal, it's a lot harder to find on the street. There's a lot of data about that. People are given the choice to buy from an illegal dealer versus go to a dispensary where they know what's in it, and they know it's not going to be dangerous, and they know they're not going to get arrested for it. People will opt to do that, which has caused the black market of marijuana in California to stop. So.

Person B: Yeah, I guess the only issue after legalizing it would be which industry and which businesses [should] get the rights and patent for all of this. But I guess that's after legalization.

Person A: That's true.

Person B: Yeah, because I heard arguments about marijuana, and I agreed with legalizing it. But yeah, that was another issue that came up after legalizing it.

Person A: Right. Although, there are a lot of people who are effectively employed in the United States in the illegal distribution of drugs, so if society were to truly fix the problem, they would legalize slash decriminalize drugs, like maybe decriminalize the worst ones. I know that this question is specifically about legalization, but I think heroin and meth are different from like marijuana, cocaine, and acid. They’re two different levels of dangerous.

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: But a truly effective solution would give the job of selling those things legally to the people who were dealers who had to be in that place economically.

Person B: Yup.

Person A: But I just saw data about a really interesting experiment that researchers did where they took rats in a lab, and they put these rats in two different boxes. So one box had nothing in it except for a food bowl and then two water bottles, and one water bottle had just regular water and one water bottle had water that was laced with heroin.

Person B: Mm.

Person A: And in that box, with nothing to do but eat and drink --

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Oh, okay.

Person B: Thank you.

Person A: Thank you.

# *Pair 211, Support P446, Oppose P454, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person B: Okay. Hi.

Person A: Hi. Okay. Do you want to go ahead and get started then?

Person B: Sure. Do you want to talk first or do you want me to?

Person A: I'll just say my standpoint. I guess I support allowing extremely controversial speakers speak on campus. And I'm guessing you oppose?

Person B: Yes --

Person A: Oh, okay --

Person B: Oh wait, sorry.

Person A: You can go ahead.

Person B: Yeah, so the way that [the researchers] worded the question made me lean towards the side of opposing it. They use the word ‘’extremely” which probably, like I said, pushes me to a certain side. And yes, I agree with the idea that there should be freedom of speech or freedom to support whatever, but if it has the potential to escalate to the point of violence, like extreme backlash, then it should be avoided I think.

Person A: Mm-hmm.

Person B: And there are other mediums for which students on campus can hear from or about these controversial speakers. And I think if they can explore these mediums that are probably safer to the general public, that maybe aren't involved in this at all or don't want to be involved in this, then that would be a better alternative.

Person A: Right. I agree with you on that. That was the only thing I had [for] opposing it -- is that if it causes harm to bystanders or affects the daily lives of the students.

Person B: Right.

Person A: Because when they did have that riot in 2017, it caused students who were walking on campus to get involved in whatever the police were doing and then in MLK [building] and everything. But the reason why I do support it is -- I mean I'm not super for it -- but I think the freedom of speech is just the outside layer of it. Of course, that's part of the Declaration of Independence, but I think it just allows space for people to just get to know other ideas. Because there are not a lot of opportunities to hear extreme opinions about different topics because it's very sensitive.

Person B: I agree with that.

Person A: And people don't really want to get out there and expose themselves. So this is one way I think people who might be single-minded or just open to the idea of learning about different sides have the opportunity to get to hear about those topics. And then just the fact that this is college, especially one that's like Berkeley which is very liberal and open to ideas. I think it's a great place for people here especially to experience that kind of freedom of expression and just all these diverse pool of thoughts that you wouldn’t find in smaller areas or less liberal schools who are more reserved to talking about sensitive topics.

Person B: Yeah, I agree with that. I like how, in the very beginning of what you said, you had said that you're not super for it. Similarly, I'm not super against it. And yeah, I agree Berkeley is probably the best place for that to happen among many other schools, but what I was thinking about this actually -- I don't know, have you seen the Handmaid's Tale, like the TV show?

Person A: Oh, no.

Person B: There is this one scene where there is a controversial speaker that goes to talk in a college campus, and she ends up getting shot. And I just immediately thought of that scene when I read this, and I was like, “Oo, yeah.” But, yeah.

Person A: Yeah. There's a lot of cases like that, not just with speakers, but just other renowned people as well.

Person B: Right.

Person A: But I think that's just the risk they pose on themselves for just wanting to go out there and do that.

Person B: That’s true. Get their ideas out.

Person A: Yeah, I think my issue more was, rather than the speakers, the innocent bystanders.

Person B: Yeah, that’s what I was thinking of.

Person A: Because even if there are protests, people who are just walking around could get pulled along for no other reason.

Person B: And they end up being involved in it somehow just because they're passing at the wrong place at the wrong time. Yeah, that's what made me toss this over in my head. Yeah.

Person A: Yeah. So, but yeah, I guess overall I support this idea just because it's a good platform for people to have this experience and learn everything, but the boundaries are when it gets to --

Person B: Safety.

Person A: -- the harm. Yeah, safety of people. Yeah.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Yep.

Person B: That was interesting.

Person A: Yeah. I mean these are all pretty mellow topics.

Person B: Yeah, yeah. We're the only ones [discussing] campus speakers.

Person A: Yeah. I think [for] the other [topics], I was not as strongly for or against. I was kind of mediocre.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Yeah, because the drug topic is always talked about.

Person B: Oh yeah. I’ve never seen it presented in that light before though.

Person A: Oh, for legal or illegal? Or?

Person B: Like, “Legalize everything” and then, “Don’t legalize anything.”

Person A: Oh, right.

Person B: I’ve always seen it like -- well, here it was presented as an umbrella for all the drugs.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: And should we legalize all of them and it’s like, “Wow, that’s kind of” --

Person A: That’s a lot of drugs.

Person B: That’s a lot of drugs. Yeah. But that was interesting too.

Person A: Yeah, because I think before it was just only weed.

Person B: Yeah, only weed. Only one of them. And it would be a small issue. That is a very big issue.

Person A: Mm-hmm.

Person B: Or a very big topic. But, yeah. I wonder how much time is left.

Person A: Yeah, I don’t know. I feel like this has been 6 minutes, but I guess not.

Person B: I know.

Person A: Cool. At least they backed up the drug ones with an example from -- I forgot which country they listed.

Person B: Yeah.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

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

Person B: You too.

# *Pair 158, Support P345, Oppose P344, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person A: Okay. So, I’m assuming you disagree with government reparations?

Person B: Mm, yeah.

Person A: Okay. So, I’ll start really quick.

Person B: Okay.

Person A: So I do support government reparations. Part of the reason I do is because I believe in affirmative action. I think it provides equity, because there’s a difference, for me, at least -- the difference between equality and equity. Equality is kind of the definition of, “Everyone’s equal. There's a level playing field.” But because of some historical things, like slavery, there are a lot of potholes or obstacles for certain communities, and in this case the Black community, that allow them to not go forward. And so, equity is kind of allowing some kind of step over that pothole or that obstacle in order to provide some sort of form of equality. So, to me, government reparations are kind of a way to do that. And so, that’s the reason I believe in that. So, I’d love to hear what your thought is about this.

Person B: I suppose that I was thinking, when you say government reparations, I wasn’t only thinking about affirmative action. There are a lot of different things the government can do, and one of the things listed [on the handout] was just providing financial aid. And I think that’s really irresponsible to basically just blanketly provide solely financial aid to people that are descendants from slavery. And I also feel like it's kind of difficult to judge now. It's been several generations. It can be difficult to judge who is a descendant or not. And people that are descendants have different financial situations, so if you’re just providing solely financial aid, it's really difficult to say who actually needs it, and yeah.

Person A: Sure, absolutely. So your argument is that there should probably be more [of] an analysis of -- depending on, even if you are a descendant of a slave, that your socioeconomic status may not inherently be bad. It just is that. You would just want to analyze that a little bit more before you just blanketly give aid.

Person B: Yes. Because there is definitely a trend which people of different races tend to be in different socioeconomic statuses, but there’s a lot of -- obviously that’s not everyone. Even when it comes to affirmative action, when it comes to individual cases, it can be very controversial. Because as a policy, it seems like it makes a lot of sense, like you’re trying to help a group of people. But when it comes to individual cases, people have very different circumstances. And when you make it a solid policy, sometimes it can put people that are also of low socioeconomic status at a disadvantage, or yeah.

Person A: Yeah. For sure. I get that. And I can totally understand what you mean. I've had conversations with friends about the idea of, if you are a person of color but have high income and you come from educated parents, should you necessarily have an advantage in the college admission system versus someone who may be White but from a lower socioeconomic status with less educated parents? And so I totally get that you may not want to apply it in that situation because, in that case, who are you really providing -- are you providing more equity versus equality? So I kind of get that debate, but would you support, for example, if there was a demonstrated need for a community, like in a Black community, that obviously is still dealing with the remnants of slavery, would you support giving aid to them then? If there was a demonstrated and documented need for that? Or would it still be, “No, I don't think I should give preferential support in that case”?

Person B: I think there are a lot of statistics that actually basically do say that there is sort of a definite inequality. So in that case, I would say there actually is a need. So, I would understand that this is a problem and perhaps some action should be taken to resolve it, but I also think that a lot of government policies can be very blanket.

Person A: Mm.

Person B: And it doesn't really cater to individual cases. So, when it happens, a lot of, I think, good will come out of it. But also, a lot of controversy will come out it, and there will be a lot of very morally grey situations. And it will just be very difficult for people to judge what you think is right and what is unfair, I guess.

Person A: Right. Right, right, right. So, I think it's nice that we both understand that there's obviously a clear disparity between some socioeconomic groups. And, in particular, groups like people who have been affected by slavery or people whose ancestors were slaves. And so, I think it’s good on that end.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Oh, shoot. Okay, you’re awesome. Bye.

Person B: Okay.

# *Pair 229, Support P487, Oppose P481, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person B: Hi.

Person A: Hi. What’s your name?

Person B: I’m [name redacted]. What’s your name?

Person A: I’m [name redacted].

Person B: Nice to meet you.

Person A: Yeah, nice to kind of meet you, yeah.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: All right. So, what's your opinion on this campus speakers topic?

Person B: Well, I think it really depends on who the speaker is. The fact that it's controversial isn't really the problem, but if you get someone like racist or something like that, they're really representing the school. And so by having them at the school, the school is endorsing them.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: But if it’s just someone of another political party, I think that's perfectly fine.

Person A: Yeah, I agree. I'm kind of in a similar vein. I think that, as a general rule, speakers should be allowed unless you kind of see otherwise that they either pose any danger to students or -- like especially a speaker that would incite violence.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: That's something you really don't want. Or a speaker that, yeah, could [incite] hate speech.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Like homophobic or racist remarks. Stuff like that. Yeah, it is a reflection of the campus. But I think, especially at Berkeley, there's kind of -- it's where a lot of people share a similar viewpoint, and it's much more kind of homogeneous. Like, most people here are liberal-leaning, you know?

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: So I think a lot of people would be inclined to say that, if a right-wing speaker came, I'm sure people would show up and start yelling, or there will be some people that wouldn't like it. And I think speakers like that should be allowed to come, even if they have a viewpoint you don’t agree with. As long as it's not hurting anybody, I think people that want to listen to that should be allowed to listen. And if you don't want to, you don't have to. But I don't think it reflects negatively on the campus, just having a speaker that kind of is outside the general norm.

Person B: Yeah, I agree. I totally agree on the hate speech [point] and if it's going to harm somebody on campus. But yeah, I think if it's just like the local Republican, I don't have a problem with that.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: But I could also see how some people might.

Person A: Yeah. I see. Especially at a school where there's a big majority of a certain political party, you can kind of get into a problem. Sometimes there's like a mob mentality almost.

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: Obviously, not like a riot or anything. But just, if you know that other people are backing you up, you're going to be bound to be a little more bold.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: But it sounds like we agree for the most part.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: That's good. So I thought of some speakers and their positions, and I'm just wondering if you think it'd be okay. So like one of the hot button issues right now is the pro-life/pro-choice argument.

Person B: Uh-huh.

Person A: Me, myself, I'm pro-choice, and I think most people at Berkeley are.

Person B: Yeah, me too.

Person A: So what would happen if a pro-life speaker would come? Do you think that should be allowed? Would that constitute, I mean, probably not hate speech, but would you think that would constitute harmful speech?

Person B: I don't think so. I think it's just a different view. How about you?

Person A: Yeah. I think the same thing. I mean I wouldn't go listen to the speaker.

Person B: Same.

Person A: But I think that a lot of people have that opinion, and while I don't agree with it, I think you have to respect other people's opinions.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Yeah. So, what about if you had like -- Hmm, let me think. What about if you had someone who was like -- Okay, no, I can't think of anything else.

Person B: What if you had someone come and talk about immigration?

Person A: Oh yeah, good one. What if you had a really big border wall advocate or somebody?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: That's interesting, because while it might not affect anybody here, I'd imagine that's a much bigger issue by the border, especially.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Where things like the wall or immigration are actually really a part of daily life almost.

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: Yeah, I really don't like the idea of separating kids from their families and everything.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: And I think not many people do. But a lot of people are, for whatever reason, are kind of just xenophobic.

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: And I think that speaker should be allowed to speak. I don't know. I don't think it really is harmful just having them speak there.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: What do you think?

Person B: Yeah, I'm still thinking about it. I mean, if they’re particularly saying things about immigrants being drug dealers and rapists and stuff, then I feel like that's going too far. But then, if they're just talking about like, “They're going to take our jobs” or something, I feel like that's just another opinion.

Person A: Yeah, but how do you tell before someone comes if they're good?

Person B: I know.

Person A: That's kind of an issue.

Person B: Yeah, true. I don't know.

Person A: Yeah. My initial kind of gut reaction is, “Yeah, allow them to speak.”

Person B: Uh-huh.

Person A: Because I generally like to hear both sides of the story. But I can see how it'd be very upsetting and potentially dangerous, you know?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: I think it depends on the speaker mostly. Like, in general. And the university or whatever organization is holding the speaker probably has to do their research and see if they really want that speaker there.

Person B: Yeah, yeah. Because even though free speech is a thing, they are representing the university, and the university is basically endorsing it, in a sense.

Person A: Mm-hmm.

Person B: So I feel like they definitely need to do their research.

Person A: Yeah. It's also hard, I think, for the university to shut down a speaker in the middle of whatever they're doing.

Person B: Yeah, true.

Person A: Because then you can kind of think, “Oh, they don't like it, so they're limiting my freedom of speech or whatever.”

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Which is sketchy.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: All right. It was very nice talking to you.

Person B: Yeah, it was nice talking to you, too.

# *Pair 208, Support P437, Oppose P436, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person B: Yeah. Hi.

Person A: Okay, hi.

Person B: Okay. So do you want to state your point first, or?

Person A: Yeah sure. So I said on the survey that I support legalizing drugs in the U.S. And I mainly said this because I feel like we should -- it was talking about in the [survey] how proponents believe that legalizing may be able to help reroute people who may be addicted to drugs into mental hospitals, or other ways to get help instead of criminalizing or penalizing them. But I do see, now looking back, how it can be an easier way for people to become addicted since it may be -- if legalization happens. But I feel like we should -- if they want to use the drugs, there shouldn't be a block for them. They should be given the choice. Yeah.

Person B: So maybe legal past a certain age?

Person A: Yeah. Yeah, that's what I'm thinking.

Person B: So I said I oppose legalizing drugs, because I thought it would cause more addiction and more overdoses. Since doing drugs can cause worse health effects, that in the long term will not benefit people. And I also stated that more younger people are going to be drawn to doing drugs, because it'll probably be marketed more on social media sites, since it's legal. So kids seeing advertisements or billboards on drugs, they might be more prone to wanting to start drugs, which will cause overdoses and stuff.

Person A: Right. Yeah and I think, to your point, we've definitely seen that. I can remember at the beginning of the summer there -- I think it was San Francisco -- they were trying to pass a law to stop allowing the sale of like e-cigarettes. And I remember seeing all those ads about -- it's clearly directed towards people under the age of 18. And they make the different flavors. I think that what you're saying, if it is legalized, it may give the drug companies more leeway to mass-market around everywhere.

Person B: Yeah, I agree. I also think that if you need drugs for a medical purpose, then you should be able to get them somehow and not have to go through a hassle. But only if you're using them for you and not just for pure entertainment or just for fun.

Person A: Yeah, I guess I don’t really have that much knowledge about how that works in the medical area. But I think that there are definitely ways to improve the system where -- I don't know, maybe more background checks or more ways to get them legally, but without them taking advantage of that. I feel like that's kind of hard, because you don't know how a person -- or like, what their motives are. I'm not saying they all have bad motives, but yeah.

Person B: Yeah. I get you. I also wrote down [that] we don't want people doing drugs on the street and just walking around everywhere if drugs were legalized.

Person A: Yeah. Honestly, I think that after like talking about it, I think I'm more on your side. Which is funny because I think a lot of times for me, I always think I have a point on an issue, but I tend to think very impulsively. And after re-looking at things, I'm like, “Oh wait, I didn't think about that.”

Person B: Yeah. I feel like the argument can go both ways and it's definitely controversial, which is why nothing's really being done. Because no one really knows what the right thing to do is.

Person A: Yeah. And I think that it might stay that way for a while, honestly. I don't know how a real solution would be reached, because obviously either way it's going to make the drug companies angry or the drug users angry. And I feel like there isn't a lot of middle ground for that to happen.

Person B: Yeah, I feel like if they legalize drugs for people over the age of 25, or over a certain age where people are more mature and won't use it just for their own purposes and will actually do something with it.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: So I think if they decided to legalize drugs past a certain age, then it won't harm their brain or anything or it won't stunt their growth. So it's really up to them what they want to use it for.

Person A: Yeah.

# *Pair 209, Support P456, Oppose P448, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person A: Hi. Nice to meet you.

Person B: You as well. Okay, so I guess we have opposing viewpoints on this. So what do you think about legalizing drugs?

Person A: So I guess when I filled out the little survey, I indicated that I support legalizing drugs in the U.S. I didn’t indicate that I felt very strongly about that. I feel like I fall a little bit more moderate, but I guess nonetheless, I kind of have to stick with it now.

Person B: Yeah. Absolutely.

Person A: Yeah. I mean I guess that's where I stand. I know when we filled it out on the screen, we were presented a brief argument for legalizing drugs. Basically, my main points kind of had to do with countries where drugs have been decriminalized. I guess my main point isn’t so much legalizing rather than decriminalizing is where I would want to place an emphasis. Just because I kind of start from the premise that drug addiction is a more medical issue than a criminal issue. And while it can be a criminal issue, at its root it's a medical issue. And the consequences that come as a result of a drug charge, I don't think are adequate. Especially when you consider race, minority, poverty, all of those groups.

Person B: Absolutely.

Person A: Yeah, that was basically -- I don't know how I feel about all drugs necessarily, but in general that’s my stance.

Person B: Okay, yeah, absolutely. I totally understand that, I think, a little more. I think my general consensus on this whole thing is that I would prefer to not legalize it, obviously. I think that it can become really dangerous if you do, because then people grow up thinking that it's the norm and it's okay. And it’s kind of what you were saying, it becomes -- it's a health issue. So if you do think it's okay, and you learned from a really young age it's legal so therefore you can do it, I think I'd be really worried about the amount of addictions that are going to start because of that or the amount of people who are going to overdose. And then I don't know that our healthcare system is adequate enough to deal with that spike in people that have those types of addictions. Because I do agree with what you were saying, about how it is a medical condition. It shouldn't be criminalized because it's not going to help the situation if you throw them in jail. They're still going to have the same addiction when they come out.

Person A: Yeah, I absolutely agree.

Person B: So I definitely do agree with that. It should be decriminalized. I just don't think it should be legalized, which I guess is probably similar -- I'm assuming is similar to what you more or less think.

Person A: Yeah, I hadn't considered the whole healthcare thing which you brought up, but that's definitely a big part of it too that I hadn't considered. And I would be interested to see that -- recently in a lot of countries marijuana for recreational use has been legalized, so I would want to see statistics about what have been issues that we've run into?

Person B: Yeah, absolutely.

Person A: Because I feel like a lot of the proof that we have is in other countries. Like in another country, there's been lower HIV and other diseases that are associated with the marginalization of being a hard drug user.

Person B: Absolutely.

Person A: So I would want to be interested to see with marijuana, in U.S. culture, what has the impact been? Definitely right when I was thinking about this issue, the first thing that I thought of was kids. And nobody wants to think about kids doing drugs and hard drugs. So I definitely agree. I also would want to think about -- for example, my roommate, she's Muslim. Alcohol is completely legal in the United States, but none of her family drinks alcohol. So I kind of think that, in my mind, I put the family and the community as a primary form of socialization and the primary form of developing a moral compass that the state doesn’t necessarily have to do right away. I don’t know how to explain it.

Person B: Yeah, that makes sense. Yeah, and I think that we're just in the stages of this being just such a new problem, especially with -- California just legalized marijuana. So I think that the data's going to take a while to come in. I think they'd probably have to follow a group of people, and honestly just see what happens because we don't know. And it’s really hard to control for external factors that could be biasing the data or that are causing results to show up a certain way. So I think it's definitely going to be awhile before we can form a conclusion. I think it's kind of similar to the way that cigarettes took a while for all the research to come through and to realize how bad it is. I don't think that marijuana is nearly as bad as cigarettes, but I do think that there's a reason why they banned -- it was illegal prior. So I'm just curious to see what are the real health effects. Because it is more natural than a cigarette for sure. So I’m assuming the health effects cannot be that adverse, but I guess you never really know unless you ran a case study.

Person A: Yeah. Also with a lot of -- I mean people that I know -- I don’t want to be like, “I’m talking about a friend here,” but I know a lot of people who experiment with different kinds of drugs. And a lot of the times, the way that they talk about how they're okay with themselves doing these drugs or experimenting is that, for some drugs it's a natural thing that comes from the Earth. And for other things it's synthetic or man-made. And so I definitely feel like -- not by necessity -- just because it comes from the Earth doesn’t mean that it’s a good thing. There are literally things that the Earth makes that are super toxic and horrible for us.

Person B: Of course. Yeah.

Person A: But in general, that's also -- maybe not a guideline, but another way to kind of measure this and think about it. Because, when you look at it, for example, not cocaine, but the cocoa plant --

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Oh sorry. Okay -- cocoa plant in South America that ancient tribes have been using for decades for energy -- and they're thriving, you know?

Person B: Absolutely. Yeah.

Person A: Cool. Well nice talking to you.

Person B: You as well.

# *Pair 230, Support P478, Oppose P486, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person A: Hi.

Person B: Hi.

Person A: So, did you want to go first? You want me to go first?

Person B: It really doesn't matter. You can start.

Person A: All right. I'm always bad at starting these things.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: So, I clearly am for legalizing drugs. I don't use drugs myself at all, or anything like that. Probably one of my arguments would be that there are actual case studies, like in [the] real world. You've got Amsterdam, you've got Portugal, where the legalization of drugs has actually caused the drug problem to be less than it is. [There are] examples where [in] Amsterdam, usually you find people going there from countries where it's illegal to use drugs. And that seems to be -- at least to me, it kind of points to maybe a bigger social issue in countries where it's illegal.

Person B: Mm-hmm. Okay, yeah. I also have never taken drugs or -- but my stance is leaning more towards the side of not legalizing drugs. And I think just to clarify, maybe I just misread the question, but the reason for my stance was more because of the stronger drugs in the list, especially heroin and such. I just think that it is opening a Pandora's box once those drugs are legalized. And I do acknowledge that there have been case studies, and they [the experimenters] cited an example where legalizing drugs has decreased, perhaps, overall drug use. But also, it has to be with personal values. I just don't know if that would be the best. All right, yeah. What do you have to say?

Person A: No, I actually can completely respect that. I could see how someone's value system would be really important and, yeah, the fear of things getting out of control. Yeah, I'm sure we've all had the experience where we've seen some wacked out somebody doing something off the wall, being a danger to society and stuff. My argument -- and I guess it comes down to what is more important on that -- would be, as a community, are we safer by having them illegal? Or are we safer by legalizing them? And I bring this up because oftentimes because they're illegal, this brings up crime rate. So this means you've got drug bosses, you've got neighborhoods where it's being pushed, you've got competition trying to fight each other not by business means because they're not a legal business. So they have to usually do it through violence, and intimidation, and this and that. Whereas I think if it was something legal, you might see a safer approach in business practices when it comes out.

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: Also I think the argument for me would be it saves taxpayers money to have it legal.

Because then taxpayers aren't paying for law enforcement for it, are not paying for prisons to hold these people up. Prisons are thus less impacted because you have no law. It's legal to do drugs. And I can see the other side of that too, where you would ask yourself, “Is society truly safe with that?” So, your thoughts?

Person B: Yeah, I think that's a pretty good response. For me, I don't know exactly if opioids classify in the same drug category as we were discussing, but recently I've been learning more about the opioid crisis. And perhaps the way it was presented was a little more skewed, but to me it was a very serious issue and something that maybe people are not necessarily talking about as much. And so again, legalizing drugs can lead -- perhaps it could improve the opioid crisis, but it does have a strong chance of just worsening it in terms of more people being exposed and then more people becoming addicted. And I think we can both agree that being too addicted to a substance is inherently going to be very negative and very harmful, both to the person and to society.

Person A: Right. No, no, yeah, I completely see that. In fact, that's funny you bring up the opioids. I was actually thinking of that. I was like, “Oh, next thing to talk about.” Yeah, in fact, I oftentimes wonder even -- and I think it was brought up in the question too, that, for the arguments for legalizing, it is that people would be less likely to leave people who were overdosing and stuff. They'd be more likely to get them help and stuff like that. But this is probably a bigger umbrella that comes under this question, is that oftentimes drugs tend to be -- I mean, not in 100 percent of cases, but a good portion that is definitely worth looking at -- a symptom of economic issues within communities as opposed to necessarily a problem just by itself. It tends to be more of a symptom of a bigger problem, which is the economics. And you do find that drugs tend to -- with the rich and the upper class you have drugs there, but it doesn't seem to be as big of a problem as it does with poorer people who live on the bottom tiers of society.

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: And I feel by -- I'm not really sure if the argument for making this legal would work for this, but perhaps the legal/illegal issue isn't really the issue, but it’s more of an economic issue. How do you feel about that?

Person B: Hmm. Yeah. I actually haven't thought about the issue in that way, and I think as of now, I wouldn't have a proper, good response to that. I think that's a very strong argument to bring up.

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

Person A: Oh.

Person B: All right.

Person A: Well, it was a pleasure meeting you.

Person B: It was a pleasure meeting you too.

# *Pair 231, Support P482, Oppose P489, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person B: Okay, would you like to start by expressing your opinion on the question?

Person A: I feel like I should introduce myself. I’m [name redacted].

Person B: Okay. My name is [name redacted].

Person A: Cool, okay. All right, what do you have to say about the topic that we have?

Person B: Well, first of all, I would like to start by analyzing the question to first understand what it means.

Person A: Mm-hmm.

Person B: So we're living on campus, we go to classes, and there are also people who are not part of the school but who wander around the campus. And the question is, “Do you oppose or support allowing extremely controversial speakers to speak on campus?” So although I totally support freedom of speech, I do not support allowing extremely controversial speakers speaking on campus because I believe that not everyone might be comfortable with that. And that means I support that everyone's consent should be taken, and it is impossible in that case. So I support restrictions on extremely controversial speakers on campus.

Person A: Mm-hmm.

Person B: How about you?

Person A: So I have a similar thought as to what you're saying, except I differ a little bit in that I think there should be a clarification when they say extremely controversial, like what that means.

Person B: Yeah, exactly.

Person A: Because I think that there are some figures that are controversial, but as long as they're not offensive, I think that you still should be able to have controversial people speak on campus. You know what I mean?

Person B: Exactly. I actually agree with you on that topic because the reason I wasn't supporting this idea is that [the prompt] says “extremely controversial.”

Person A: Mm-hmm.

Person B: And although I value diversity and I want people to hear about controversial issues, they might not even have a plan and they might not even have a clear stand, but they should still be able to hear other ideas. But when the topics are extremely controversial topics, I think that might be too much because everyone's coming from different origins, different countries, different cultures. So some people might be affected psychologically by extreme --

Person A: For sure, yeah.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Yeah, I think on behalf of the university, it's kind of dumb and not productive to have someone too controversial to where they know that they're going to get backlash, or they know that there are going to be problems, you know?

Person B: Exactly.

Person A: I think that at the end of the day -- it is actually also cool though, because I thought into the thing where [the prompt] referred to 2017. I think that even though they did have a specific incident where there was someone controversial, I thought it was cool to see the reaction by the students and how maybe, sometimes when it gets violent, it’s not good, but I think it's also cool to see people come together in that sense. And go against -- and come together in that way. But yeah, I agree with you in that.

Person B: Yeah. And we're talking about ideas. The fact that you did not make someone express their idea doesn't mean that the idea doesn't exist. So, whether you agree or disagree with an idea, I think it should be heard by everyone, but again it goes back to the same topic. If it's an extremely controversial idea, that might be harmful against some people because of their psychological background. And also, I think it really depends on the topic and to what extent it's extreme.

Person A: Yeah. I mean if people don't feel safe with the ideas that these people are putting out, then that's just not productive. It makes going to a university not a safe space, you know?

Person B: Exactly.

Person A: It's good to have productive conversations, but certain conversations don't need to be had when they're being presented by people that are not positive figures.

Person B: Yeah. I think the point of expressing yourself should be to express your idea, not to force people to believe in what you're saying.

Person A: Mm-hmm.

Person B: And when I hear the word extreme, maybe it's a wrong interpretation, but I think about some kind of enforcement, trying to convince people to believe in what you believe in.

Person A: Mm-hmm.

Person B: And I think especially because we’re on campus, that should be limited to some extent. We're here to study, we're here to live, and yes we want to hear about ideas, but I would not support if someone was trying to convince me or trying to force me to believe in an idea.

Person A: Yeah. Or even if the thing that someone stands for is not perceived as good.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: I don't know. I always envision, not to bring up certain people, but if Hitler were brought to a university and to speak, certain people would not feel comfortable with that idea because he's very extreme.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Yeah, yeah.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: We did good.

Person B: Yeah, I guess so. So, which year are you in?

Person A: I’m a first-year, how about you?

Person B: First-year. So am I. I’m a first-year too.

Person A: Oh, nice. Where are you staying on campus?

Person B: Foothill, you?

Person A: Ooh, that’s kind of far. I’m on Unit 3.

Person B: Oh.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Well, I’m a chemical engineering major, so I take classes in the College of Chemistry, so it’s pretty close to Foothill.

Person A: Oh, okay, that’s nice.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Okay, yeah. For me that would kind of suck. It’s super far. For GBO [freshman orientation] we had to eat lunch there one time, and my legs were burning.

Person B: Do you eat at Café 3 or Crossroads?

Person A: I eat at Café 3 because I’m too lazy to walk to Crossroads.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Café 3 is just so convenient, but maybe one day I’m going to try Crossroads because Café 3 is getting pretty repetitive.

Person B: Yeah, I think it’s the same anywhere on campus.

Person A: Do you eat at Foothill?

Person B: Yeah, Foothill is the same. I mean, I like the food but still, sometimes -- as you said, it becomes repetitive.

Person A: Mm-hmm.

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

Person B: Oh.

Person A: Oh?

Person B: I think we need to stop.

Person A: Do we end it?

Person A: Yeah, I guess so. It was nice to meet you.

Person B: Nice meeting you too. Bye.

Person A: See you, if we can.

# *Pair 214, Support P453, Oppose P450, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person A: Okay, well hi.

Person B: Hi.

Person A: Okay, well do you want to go, or do you want me to start?

Person B: You can start.

Person A: Okay. Well, I supported this because people are going to use drugs no matter what. So I feel like they might as well be legal because you can tax them if they're legal. So that's a lot of government money. And then you can use that money and redirect funds towards better health programs and more addiction centers and stuff like that, instead of focusing only on arresting drug users.

Person B: Absolutely.

Person A: And you could redirect law enforcement efforts towards other issues and other types of crime instead of focusing so much on drug use. Also, for health reasons, if [people] overdose or need help or anything drug related, they're usually too scared to call for help because they're afraid of police, or getting jailed, or anything like that. So it would increase people reaching out when they do need help. People would be more informed when they're using it because it's not so like, “Sketchy black market.” And it's a lot cleaner since they would be buying them from actual stores instead of in random alleys from a dealer. Also, there'd be more programs towards addiction and stuff, and, since it would be legal, it'd be a lot less stigmatized for the people that do struggle with that. So yeah, that's what I was thinking.

Person B: Yeah. I want to just kind of define the terms a little bit more because it wasn't very clear about which drugs and everything. And I think for me, what I was thinking was hard drugs, not including marijuana because I think that's a little bit different, and I do have more of a similar view to you. So I guess my opinion  that it doesn't make sense to legalize things that have no benefits at all. And I understand the whole problem with the black market, and people are going to get it anyway. And I think that there should be -- first of all, I do oppose hard sentences for drugs, and incarceration, and looking at drug use as a felony. I think that is not a good approach. And I think that we should be focusing our efforts onto more rehabilitative programs. But I think that drugs themselves, hard drugs, should -- it doesn't make sense to legalize them. One of the points in the gun control debate is the fact that guns can be used as protection. Guns also kill people and harm people, like drugs can do, but they can also be used as protection. So it was one point people use like, “Okay, maybe here's a benefit.” I see virtually zero benefits that hard drugs can be used for. Which is, for me personally, not dealing with weed and not dealing with prescription drugs, which are kind of a different category. Also, our government -- we go to lengths to regulate GMOs, processed foods, chemicals that we ingest, sugar -- things that people agree that the [FDA] decides aren't good for us to be putting into our bodies. And I think, if those things are regulated, then anything harder than those has to be.

Person A: No, that makes sense because if they're going to regulate something like sugar or something as simple as that, it's kind of silly that you wouldn't regulate drugs. And I definitely agree with you that there are definitely drugs that actually do have benefits to them for more day-to-day stuff. And then, there are other drugs that don't have the benefits other than just getting high. So if it was up to me, yeah, it would obviously be only some drugs and not others.

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: Because we obviously wouldn't need to legalize stuff that's super hardcore because what would be the purpose of using those, other than to only get high?

Person B: Yeah. I think the main thing is that if you did manage to somehow ban heroin or whatever, what are you going to do with all the supplies that are still out there? Of course, then it's just going to create this black market. It's just going to create kind of a worse system [like] we have now, because that's kind of how it is.

Person A: Yeah, yeah. That's my main thing. It's more just that the black market for that kind of stuff is so sketchy. And so you could definitely do a lot more harm buying stuff from people like that than if it was regulated.

Person B: But I think, for me personally, I think there's two options that they're saying. There are definitely a lot of options that can be taken, but the way this question phrases it is like, “Do you support the option of legalizing those drugs as a way to?” And for me, it's not. For me, it's no. I support putting more efforts into helping the people who are addicted get help and get rehab and --

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: Wait, what did she say? Okay.

Person A: Okay. Cool, good talk.

Person B: Yeah. Thanks for sharing.

# *Pair 216, Support P463, Oppose P458, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person A: Do you want to start or do you want me to?

Person B: No, you can start because I'm pretty sure I'm the weird one.

Person A: So personally, I feel that we should be allowed to have controversial speakers on campus. I think that controversy allows us to grow as individuals because you grow resilience when you hear opinions and you're forced to face things that you aren't comfortable with. It allows us to point out flaws in an argument in a public forum. So if you allow speakers to come to campus and you have places where they can debate each other, then you're allowed to point out their flaws in the argument. And so I don't think it's harmful in that way. And then there's also the argument about [how] hate speech, unless it's supporting immediate violence, is still covered by the First Amendment. So everyone does have a right to speak no matter what their opinions are and how vile they are. Not only that, but not allowing controversial speakers to speak really plays into a lot of controversial speakers' narratives, things like the left wanting to stop free speech, being anti First Amendment, and all that stuff. And then, if we have laws that outlaw controversial speakers, we're only going to go to banning more and more people, and there's not really any clear way of knowing when that will stop. And then we could just end up completely getting rid of the First Amendment. Obviously, that's way down the road and everything, but, yeah. And it alienates certain people because a lot of these more controversial speakers also have some opinions that are less controversial. And the right often feels already alienated on a lot of college campuses, obviously especially our own. And so that's not really good to say that -- again, getting back to the not a lot of -- you don't know when it's going to stop with what counts as controversy. And yeah, finally, you can only find common ground through talking and engaging in these debates. And, yeah.

Person B: So I just want to say that I agree with you, and that I also champion the idea of diversity in political thought. Because I also think that being exposed to ideas that you aren't normally exposed to, for sake of political correctness or just because you don't have wackos in your area, it helps strengthen you. Because the world is actually very varied in opinions that aren't shared. But I do believe that, in times with volatile political environments such as now, allowing controversial speakers on campus poses a safety risk that we shouldn't just wave off.

Person A: That's true.

Person B: And I'm from Virginia. So the whole Charlottesville thing, that definitely hit home for me. So I don't think that the incoherent, incendiary babble that a lot of the modern pedagogues are speaking is worth -- it doesn't have an intellectual contribution that’s worth partially compromising our safety on campus. So I would say that in all other times besides now, I think controversial speakers -- because controversial speakers doesn't always mean Donald Trump. It can mean Bernie Sanders, but, it's not the speakers themselves that are the issue, I believe. It’s their followers and this frenzy that follows them.

Person A: Mm-hmm.

Person B: So I think that if -- because I'm not opposed to it, but I think we should be very cautious about it -- if there is a way that the campus can instill some kind of law and order to these followers, who aren't part of our campus, who are just sort of like groupies, then having these controversial speakers, whether or not they really do believe or understand what they're talking about can be a very enlightening experience. It's just that, in reality, that's very hard to maintain. So that's my worry about it.

Person A: How would you feel if there was a space somewhat off campus but still technically Berkeley students inviting them and things like that?

Person B: So I think we're in a very unique position because Berkeley is controversial in itself.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Anywhere else in the country, you say that you're a Berkeley student, you say that you're at a Berkeley campus, and immediately they think of protests. We are the center of progressivism, and, at the same time, we, in and of ourselves, are a trigger to a lot of [people], especially conservatives. So I would say that having a space off campus, while geographically it would be safer, the -- we had the free speech week last semester, and no one got particularly hurt by it. There were some protests, and it was a little bit dangerous. But it was definitely not Charlottesville. I think it's a mindset. I knew freshmen that were very uncomfortable. They were very scared about the idea that their first exposure to college was going to be a protest. So I would say that there are ways to mitigate this, and it doesn't have to be police officers holding AR-15s on the GBC [Golden Bear Café] rooves. But we just have got to be careful.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B. Yeah. So do you have any other last comments?

Person A: No, I think that makes total -- Yeah, I think you had some good points. I agree. We need to do something about safety and stuff.

Person B: Yeah. I actually did go to Milo Yiannopoulos's thing. I hate his guts, but I still went, and it's a shame

# *Pair 219, Support P472, Oppose P469, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person A: Okay. Do you want to start or should I?

Person B: Why don't you go.

Person A: Okay. So, I say, I wrote that I'm a strong, strong supporter of free speech and I'm a huge fan because I think that campuses are supposed to prepare you for life. The purpose of going to a campus, going to UC Berkeley specifically, is to prepare you for the society. And that is the primary goal of education, as well as to enlighten you and educate you, and if you are not equipped -- I mean if you're a person saying, “I'm not going to allow this person to speak,” then they're not allowing themselves to broaden their mind. And that is the purpose, I think, of a liberal arts education which UC Berkeley provides.

Person B: Mm-hmm. Okay. For me, I think I put I was slightly opposed to -- oh my God I can’t really hear myself that’s so weird --

Person A: Right?

Person B: Anyways. So I'm slightly against, but I think mainly I was looking at the word “extremely,” so extremely controversial speakers. So then, I believe that the proponents of different sides of an issue should be allowed to come. However, if the speaker that comes is only here to create hate or rile up the group, then I don't feel like they should be allowed unless they have a very comprehensive, logical speech.

Person A: Yeah, yeah. For example, like with the example of Milo Yiannopoulos, all the people saying that he is just inciting hate speech, but the thing is, I feel like, even that, saying that, invalidates what they're saying even though, honestly, I agree. I'm super liberal. I marched [in] a women’s march. I'm super liberal, but I do think that you -- also I'm Jewish -- I think that Nazis should be able to say they hate Jews and that all Jews should be killed. I think that just as long -- there's that amendment or something, there's a law that’s saying as long as it's not inciting a riot right there and then, as long as it's not encouraging violence immediately, then it's free speech. And I kind of agree with that. So if Milo Yiannopoulos came to campus and he was talking about how all immigrants are bad, and my parents are immigrants, I think that should be allowed even though that is extremely offensive. Just because also if you don't hear that opinion, then you're just kind of hearing your own opinions that you have. And then it’s just kind of a hive mind, and an echo, which I've seen a lot from Los Angeles.

Person B: Yeah, yeah. I also went to an extremely liberal high school program, so then yeah, I agree. They were liberal to the point [where] I feel like they were going a bit too far.

Person A: Yeah? Wait, which city was it in?

Person B: It was in Woodland Hills, Los Angeles.

Person A: Wait, I'm from Woodland Hills. El Camino Real Charter High School?

Person B: Oh no, I'm Cleveland.

Person A: Oh my God. Wait, what? That's so crazy.

Person B: Oh, that’s fun. Yeah.

Person A: Oh God, okay.

Person B: So in Cleveland there's this liberal arts program --

Person A: Magnet.

Person B: -- Yeah, yeah. So core, and it's just so liberal that sometimes you just think they're liberal to the point of being unreasonable.

Person A: Oh my God, wait, that’s so crazy.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Wait, I can’t. Okay, oh my God. I have some people --

Person B: I was, I think it was when Milo was here, I was living in an apartment and I saw the riot rush through my street and breaking stuff. It was really interesting to see. Yeah, I feel like it is a very good opportunity. If you have people from opposite views come and talk about their thing -- I don't know exactly how this works. I'm not really, I'm usually not very political. But then I feel like if maybe there's a structured debate that can happen during these speeches then it would be kind of helpful also just to see the other side, but then I'm also afraid of being like – I guess kind of something like Milo happening again.

Person A: And I think that's exactly the point, though, that when people protest to such a degree that just proves all the stereotypes of, for example, the conservatives in this case have about liberals. That they're careless and that they don't really think things logically, and that they're actually creating more violence and harm than would have been originally incited if they just let him have his speech. But I'm all for protesting, as long as it's not interrupting the actual event. I remember also I went to the Democratic conference in Oakland, and it’s the California-wide [conference], and there were so many protestors that we couldn’t even hear the speakers. I think that's the point where it's debilitating and like I said before, you need to have a variety of opinions. Because especially at Berkeley, I want to hear from Republicans because I've never been able to. You know. You know how L.A. is.

Person B: Yeah, yeah. It's like, I don't know why they think that. Why are they opposed to this thing, when I think it's like, “Why not?”

Person A: Exactly. Yeah. We agree. We can’t debate because we have the exact [same] view.

Person B: I don’t know. Because I said “slightly,” maybe I should've just put it different or something because I was more like, I agree that controversial speakers should come. However, for the word “extremely,” I'm not sure how extreme they're going. So if this extremist who -- I was hearing news saying Milo was giving out personal information about students that would be harmful to people. I'm not sure if that's real or not, whether he actually did it or not. I just remember reading that somewhere. So if it's something that would hurt other people in the future, or by coming here he would hurt specific people, then I don't think that -- that's not very good. But then if he can just come and talk about the topic in general, I would welcome that and I would love to have a listen. Like, “Why do you think that way?” Yeah, so we agree, it's just that -- I was just like “extremely controversial” -- I'm not sure exactly how extreme “extreme” goes. And then when I think of controversial speakers, I don't know if it's because I'm a liberal or I'm mostly liberal, I don’t know.

Person A: Yeah, me too.

Person B: I don't know what political affiliation. But when I think of extremely controversial speakers I think of people like Milo. I think of the more conservative people that disagree. Is she [the experimenter] saying something?

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Oh, that was quick.

Person B: Oh, damn.

Person A: Shit, okay.

Person B: What’s going on? What?

Person A: Okay, it was nice talking to you.

Person B: Yeah, I agree. Bye.

# *Pair 220, Support P477, Oppose P474, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person A: Okay. Do you want to go first?

Person B: Okay, I'll just read the question, I guess: “Do you oppose or support allowing extremely controversial speakers to speak on campus?” I'd probably say no just because I remember last year, I think it was Ben Shapiro or someone came, and it just caused a whole bunch of tension and a lot of people were saying it caused the university to lose a whole bunch of money and all this. And students of color and stuff like that, or minorities, felt kind of scared. It just caused a whole bunch of tension between everyone. So I would say no, it's – no. Mostly it didn't help bring people together. It mostly was harmful to them, I guess. So yeah, no.

Person A: Yeah. Okay. I sort of -- I agree with you on that point. Especially here because it's so liberal here. I don't think it's a good idea in this situation. But I answered this question based on just me personally. Like what I personally would support or oppose. And I chose that I support it, because what I was thinking was just because I know what my values are and know what I believe in. And even if they [the speaker] may be on the complete opposite end of the spectrum, it doesn't mean they're going to make me change my opinion.

Person B: Yeah. That's true. I feel like I've never been that much of a political person.

Person A: Yeah, me too.

Person B: I don't really get involved. So last year, remember, I didn't really care. And everyone was like, “No, it's this huge deal.” I was like, “No, but okay.”

Person A: Yeah. I don't get involved politically. I'm sort of super -- obviously I would not support white supremacists, but also at the same time I wouldn't really get that mad. Well, I wouldn't like them, but if they were to come speak, I would probably not really care.

Person B: Yeah, exactly. There were people literally watching it live, or whatever it was, and I was like, “Okay.”

Person A: Oh my God. That's really scary.

Person B: Anyways, yeah. I was just -- it's kind of like -- sorry, hold on. Sorry, I had to cough. Anyways it’s more of like, yeah, I don't really care. It's just kind of going off of how I saw other people around me react to it. I was like, “Whoa.”

Person A: Yeah. Wait, was that last year?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Oh, and there was this -- also I heard about that other guy, like Milo or Melo or something.

Person B: Oh yeah.

Person A: Was that here?

Person B: I think it was. Was he the one where they hired tons of security and all that?

Person A: Oh yeah, yeah.

Person B: Yeah. I mean, well, I don't really understand why we invite speakers in general. Just why?

Person A: Yeah, I don't really get the purpose.

Person B: Yeah. Like what relevance do they have in our education?

Person A: Yeah. If people care, they could watch them on YouTube.

Person B: Exactly. I'm just like, “Why does the university pay money to invite these people?” Most people don't want them here or don't care.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Okay.

Person A: Especially -- I feel like they were almost doing it on purpose, like to get a rise out of the students or something because it's so liberal here.

Person B: So true. So true. Yeah, I also never go out to like -- I don't know, oh I forgot what they're called. I think they're the protests or whatever?

Person A: Oh yeah?

Person B: Yeah. I've never gone out to those because I know we've had a few of them here, or the marching, I don’t know. I've never done any of that.

Person A: Yeah, I don’t think I would either.

Person B: Yeah. And then I think it was last year where there were -- I don't know, my dad saw it in the newspaper but I wasn’t -- I didn’t really know about it because I wasn’t there. But they were throwing bricks and stuff inside of buildings and windows and --

Person A: Oh my God.

Person B: Yeah, it sounded very chaotic.

Person A: Wait, what year are you?

Person B: I’m a sophomore.

Person A: Oh, okay. I’m a freshman so I was never here for any of that yet.

Person B: Oh nice, nice. What building are you living in?

Person A: Clark Kerr.

Person B: Oh!

Person A: It’s so far.

Person B: Yeah it is really far. It’s nice though.

Person A: Mm-hmm. Where’d you live last year?

Person B: Unit 1.

Person A: That’s the dorm I wanted.

Person B: You wanted that? Oh!

Person A: Yeah. It’s so close.

Person B: Yeah, but okay, are you in a double or triple?

Person A: I’m in a quad. We’re in a suite.

Person B: Oh.

Person A: I like the suite though. I like having private bathrooms.

Person A: Oh, okay.

Person B: But Unit 1 suite would’ve been perfect.

Person A: Yeah, I was in a Unit 1 triple and it was awful because it was so small.

Person B: Oh, yep.

Person A: And then I remember one of my friends was in Clark Kerr and she was in a triple, and I was like, “Oh my gosh, you have all this space. Like, so unfair.” And the dining hall is better. It’s just, it’s all better.

Person B: Yeah. But you guys are so close to campus and all the food. I’ve been Uber-ing to school every day, which is not good.

Person A: Really? Oh my gosh.

Person B: I need to figure out how to buy -- I mean ride the bus.

Person A: No, yeah. I live on frat row now.

Person B: Oh, okay.

Person A: So kind of similar distance.

Person B: What sorority are you in? Or are you in [one]?

Person A: Zeta. Yeah.

Person B: Oh okay, cool.

Person A: Yeah.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: Oh, are we done?

Person A: I think so.

Person B: Okay. Bye.

Person A: Bye.

# *Pair 226, Support P488, Oppose P485, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person A: Hi.

Person B: Hi.

Person A: Hey.

Person B: Do you want to go ahead and start?

Person A: Sure. So just to make sure, we’re both talking about legalizing drugs?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Okay. So obviously my position is that I support the legalization of it, and, while I do take into account that some drugs are lesser or even worse than others depending on their use in the situation, ultimately, I do believe that they should be legalized. What about you? What's your tidbit?

Person B: I don't think that they should be legalized.

Person A: Okay.

Person B: Because, well, there's the concern that if drugs are more accessible, there would be more people who would be able to use them recreationally more often. And that has some serious social ramifications.

Person A: Okay.

Person B: What if the number of people who get addicted goes up?

Person A: Right, right.

Person B: That's not exactly great for society.

Person A: Yeah. And this is where I'm going to start, so one thing that I do want to note is that the World Health Organization actually estimates that 70 percent of the people who use don't actually ever report [themselves], and no one ever knows that they do use. So one thing to consider is the number of people that use and we just have no idea. And a lot of them don't just come from poor backgrounds. They're from all walks of society, and often it is the richer people who are able to afford these things. But what I do want to say about legalization is that it's been shown to help the population overall. In Portugal, [they] actually decriminalized all drugs. They didn't go so far as to legalize them, but they did decriminalize them. And the usage rates went down, especially after people were able to get help. When you no longer treat using drugs as a sort of crime, healthcare and help to kind of dissipate that habit is a lot more accessible. In Vancouver, they've done that too. In the city, they did a legalization test. And basically, what ended up happening was, because it was legal to use methamphetamine for a while, people were able to get clean needles. They were able to get healthcare. HIV rates and deaths were going down. It's not just there. In Switzerland, they have a voluntary program where if you pretty much want to get off, you can get off a drug. So these types of instances where places do choose to at least decriminalize them are of use. If I'm going to keep going -- or would you like to rebuttal that? Or do you want me to keep going?

Person B: No, I just want to ask a question.

Person A: Sure.

Person B: What do you mean by meth was legal for a while? Does that mean it's not anymore?

Person A: So, no, no, no, no, no. So they decriminalized it for an experiment, essentially, is what happened for these groups of people. I'm not exactly sure how they did that, but essentially what they did was they kind of just decriminalized it to the extent to where, if they [drug users] wanted to seek help, they wouldn't be criminally charged. Does that make sense?

Person B: Right.

Person A: Okay.

Person B: And also, a lot of these countries you're mentioning are a lot smaller than the United States. Do you think that contributes anything in terms of managing this kind of policy? It might be hard for the United States to implement something like this nationwide just because there's too many people to keep track of. Just being a big nation, it's just harder.

Person A: Well, I certainly think that the smaller a program is, the easier it is to manage. And maybe the answer would not be a nationwide program, so much as a statewide type of program, because I think you do have a really good point there. The larger a program like this gets, the more difficult it must be to maintain. But if we took all the money that we were using for the war on drugs, for example, and used it to sort of run these sorts of programs, I'd be curious to see as to where that would lead. And so far, at least on small scales like you've suggested, it seems to at least improve and not immediately be at worse. Now again, theoretically, yeah, these rates of use could rise, and I'm sure that in some instances that would certainly be true. But overall, so far, it's shown not to be the case in the areas that have tried it.

Person B: Interesting. Well, what are some of the current problems we have with drugs? Why make it illegal in the first place if you’re so bent on -- Why would it be considered illegal in the first place if there are people who are okay with legalizing it? What is the point? Why was it illegal in the first place? There has to be some sort of problem with it there, right?

Person A: Yeah. Yeah. I think part of it is, morally, are these things good?

Person B: Right, and that’s -- sorry -- that's my next point. I'm also kind of opposed to it due to a moral reason, just because it feels wrong to me.

Person A: Right, right.

Person B: Like on a principle level.

Person A: So, and I would say to that, there used to be a prohibition on alcohol. And then people realized, “Hey, you know, maybe that's not necessary.” And I think part of that was financial, an incentive financially.

Person B: Well, it's also because they realized it just didn't work --

Person A: Well, and I wouldn’t --

Person B: -- and it was difficult to regulate.

Person A: Right. And I also don't think that this regulation of drugs has worked exactly. If the goal of the war on drugs was to lower drug rates and stop people from using, I don't think that that goal has been reached, and I think that that's why it continues to be a problem.

Person B: Yeah. To be honest, I don't think there is a solution or even a perfect solution to this, at all.

Person A: Right.

Person B: So that's my stance on it at least.

Person A: Yeah, my thing, being a bit on the line --

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: Alright.

Person A: Wow.

Person B: It was nice talking to you.

# *Pair 227, Support P484, Oppose P479, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person A: Hello.

Person B: Hi.

Person A: What was your view on this topic?

Person B: It's really more like I'm not sure if this is the best way to go about making up for slavery, but I definitely agree that people are still suffering from it even though -- well, I don't know if I would say that doesn't happen anymore. But yeah, I'm on the fence about if this is the best way to fix things.

Person A: Yeah. I think for me, honestly, I'm not sure exactly what is outlined by government reparations. So, what kind of financial or support programs are we talking about?

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: But I guess for this debate we could figure out what -- I think we probably both agree that there's major racism and issues facing African Americans in this country.

Person B: Yep.

Person A: So, the way that I thought of government reparations, of what programs it would be, was like more funding for education programs, maybe more affirmative action, sending more funding to African American communities just to support them in general, whatever basic needs that might be, like supporting local groups and political activism. And then, outside of funding, also increasing awareness and training for police brutality and changing journalism as well. And with police brutality, it's kind of interesting because that wouldn't be necessarily a reparation going directly to an African American community, but it would be indirectly affecting the issue. So I'm not sure if that would really count as a reparation to be honest, but that's kind of where I stand.

Person B: Oh, okay. Yeah. I was thinking more of like -- yeah, because I wasn't sure exactly what do reparations even look like. But yeah, definitely. I was thinking, if it doesn't fall under reparations, then the better course of action would be stuff like you said, like police brutality training.

Person A: Mm-hmm.

Person B: Which is like, yeah -- I agree with you.

Person A: Okay. So I think, yeah, that my concerns about the reparations – honestly, I don't know what these programs would entail. I haven't really read up about it or really heard about this actually being a program being considered heavily. But I could see issues arising like deciding whether an African American is from a slave time, like history or not. And do you just assume everyone is, because that's terribly racist as well. So the whole program seems already redolent with many issues. So maybe rather than this being reparations for slavery, it's just reparations. It doesn't even have to be -- we should acknowledge the history, but it should also be addressing what issues African Americans are facing now and fixing those. And it is important to consider the long history of slavery. But I think getting caught in the slave history would be reductive from just the issues that African Americans are facing now, regardless of their provenance or what their personal family or ancestral history is.

Person B: Right. Yeah. Exactly. And I think another thing that makes it kind of messy, if it was a government program, is where to get funding from? Because I think they mentioned in the survey or whatever, one of the arguments was, “If there was an increase of taxes that would pay for this, people who technically haven't done anything would be paying for this.” And I don't know if that's right. I know a lot of people probably wouldn't be happy with that.

Person A: Yeah, definitely. As this with the case of any kind of increase in taxes that people deem aren't necessarily directly correlated to their actions. But I certainly think there could be funding cut. Maybe it's not from taxes, maybe it's a little bit from taxes, but things like pharmaceutical drugs can be cut or the prison system. Why don't you just take all the money out of the prison system and put it into supporting African Americans? That would be fucking great. And also, just any minorities or communities that have been ostracized or put down.

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: But yeah, I agree it would be challenging to know where the funding would come from.

Person B: I'm all for taking the money out of the prison system and using it for this kind of stuff.

Person A: Yeah. And also, like Space Force or other things like that -- take money out of all of that. That is terrible. And yeah, put it into this kind of stuff. So it doesn't even have to be necessarily an increase in taxes. It could just be re-allotted from somewhere else, of programs that are being created right now that have no basis in any scientific facts or potential for the future, you know?

Person B: Yeah, definitely.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Hmm. I think we hit everything that was kind of mentioned in the prompt or whatever you want to call it.

Person A: Yeah. I agree. I mean, I think I would love to talk about it more. I honestly just don't know what they really mean by government reparations. I need to understand more what this program would entail to debate it.

Person B: Yeah. Same here. So then, it is something that people have been working on? I thought it was just made up for this study, but now that I think about it --

Person A: I also thought it was made up for this study, but, it's definitely, I'm sure it's a thing that people have thought about. It just seems kind of like -- I get why you -- because I said “agree” and I get you probably said “disagree,” which is why we're debating. And I totally get why you said “disagree” because I would also in many cases say “disagree.” But I think the general sentiment that I tried to follow in this is, “Should African Americans be supported because of all of the terrible things that our current system and past system has posed on them.” And my answer was “yes.” But yeah, specifically for this issue, I honestly, I don't know if it's a real program or not. I feel it’s like --

Person B: Yeah. Okay, I see. Yeah. And then, you probably already know, but I really just hit “disagree” because I was thinking more about the logistics of it, like “How are you going to do this?”

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: But are there things we need to fix? Yes, I would agree with that.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Nice. All right. Great debate. We did a great job.

Person B: Thank you. It’s been a pleasure.

Person A: Yeah. Is this your first psych study?

Person B: Yeah, it is.

Person A: Oh, mine as well. I was just like, “I definitely want this $13.” And now this is being

recorded, and someone’s going to listen to this and be like, “Ha-ha.”

Person B: Well, I am definitely here to encourage research at UC Berkeley.

Person A: Oh yes, me too. Me too indeed. That is why I’m here.

Person B: But $13 is nice.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Okay, bye.

Person B: Okay, bye.

Person A: This has been fun.

Person B: Yeah.

# *Pair 221, Support P476, Oppose P464, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person A: Hi.

Person B: Hey.

Person A: So I can assume that since we’re partners that you are opposed to the government requiring reparations.

Person B: I guess. Well, this is one of those questions where I was kind of like, “I'm not quite sure what to think.” So I just kind of put one of the answers.

Person A: Yeah. No, yeah, I get that. I think a lot of times, like especially in these debates, I just feel like I'm not super informed enough to feel strongly about it. You know?

Person B: Yeah, yeah, yeah. Yeah, I get what you mean.

Person A: Yeah. But I just want to know, what's your logic? Your thinking?

Person B: Yeah. Okay. So, well, first of all, I think that, in terms of reparation in general, just looking at the last century, we can see the progress America has made going away from the whole slavery idea and how African Americans used to be inferior. But obviously, the culture still runs pretty deep. There are still scars because it's pretty evident that there are a lot of areas still affected by it. I feel like Americans in general are moving away from the idea, and, just from all the movements up and happening in the last 50 years, we could see that African Americans are already under equality, especially with White people and pop culture.

Person A: Yeah, I get what you're saying, but this really boils down into an issue of social equality versus social equity. And, right now, you're talking about social equality, which is that, right now, African American people are now given the same rights as everyone else. And I guess that is progress. But to begin with, they were placed in a very disadvantaged thing. Right now, if you look, I'm sure there are correlations between African Americans -- and also just a lot of minority and non-White populations -- having lower income [and] living in terrible residential areas. They're less likely to have white-collar jobs [and] less likely to succeed in school. And that plays a lot with systemic oppression we see, and, even within ourselves, the implicit bias that none of us can really control. So a lot of our policies still kind of perpetuate this idea of structural racism. I was actually learning about this in one of my classes. We were talking about Hurricane Katrina and how it exposed a lot of the disparities between Black and White communities, like red lighting and how a lot of White communities lived in less vulnerable geographic regions. So they were less susceptible to the flooding, and therefore, they weren't as afflicted by this massive natural disaster.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: And if you take a look at affirmative action -- that's like the academic equivalent of social equity, right?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: And I know there's a lot of controversy behind it, but ultimately, I feel like it's justified in doing so. Obviously, you know how a lot of African American and Native Americans and the Latino community are having more representation in the academic community? But there's the opposite of the Asian community.

Person B: Yeah, I know.

Person A: And that's problematic too because really also Asian -- okay, I don't know where I'm going with this but also Asian Americans were marginalized throughout history. But I do think that the government needs to have reparations. Because it doesn't matter that White people today aren't proponents of slavery because it’s morally wrong, but, from the moment African American people regained their rights, there were White people and African American people starting off in very different places. And so there's no way for the African American community to really catch up and have everyone be on the same level.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: So -- I don't know.

Person B: Yeah, well I definitely agree that the cycle of poverty and low income is really hard to break. Studies show that low income families, most of the time when their kids grow up, they're also low income too.

Person A: Exactly, yeah.

Person B: Because lack of education and everything. I don’t think reparation is a bad idea. I just think it's not like --

Person A: The most effective thing?

Person B: I guess effectiveness goes into that too. Because I forgot what percent of America is African American, but there are a lot. So to be able to help every single African American out in the country would not only cost a ton of money, but also resources and energy. And then, also if let's say one community gets it but another doesn’t, then that’s going to cause a lot of problems too. So I feel like it’s --

Person A: But that’s the point though because ultimately White people can be like, “Oh my God, we're not given the same financial resources or benefits that Black people are. That's not fair.” But were they ever disenfranchised throughout history? Were they ever marginalized? No, they weren't. And if, objectively speaking, the average White American is in a far better economic, social, even health --

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: They’re better off in every single sense than the average non-White minority members. So without these solid reparations within our policy, that's never going to change, you know?

Person B: Yeah, I see.

Person A: Oh, but anyways. It was nice talking to you, bro.

# *Pair 223, Support P468, Oppose P470, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person A: All right. Would you like to start?

Person B: You can start first.

Person A: Okay. So we're talking about drugs and the question is, “Do you oppose or support legalizing drugs in the U.S.?” And I guess to start with, I am not strongly holding this position, but I was leaning towards legalizing drugs in the U.S. just because the current system isn't working. And I think the broader issue is the way that we deal with problems in our society in the sense that we have a very strong police state. And I think there are alternatives to having a strong police state that just goes around and arresting people and unfairly penalizing people for breaking the law based on biases. So one way to mitigate this is, instead of focusing on penalizing people, it's to focus on rehabilitating people. And, in this sense, you would be caring for people who have a drug problem, and, instead, flipping the script and thinking how should we focus on helping those with the drug addiction as opposed to punishing them.

Person B: Yeah, I kind of disagree with legalizing drugs. I understand your viewpoint that we need to focus on rehabilitation, but I don't think legalizing drugs is the way. Because I think if we legalize other drugs -- apart from weed, alcohol, and nicotine -- I think it will encourage more people to try and to take these drugs which will cause more problems. Because drugs often make people make misinformed decisions. So, after taking drugs, you're not really in the best state of making decisions and doing things that you do every day which may affect people around them. It's not really just about the people who take drugs but also about the people around them. So I think it will encourage people to take drugs, which is not really a good thing. And for rehabilitation, I think different approaches can be made to strengthen this point of rehabilitating the people who are affected by drugs, but I don't think legalizing drugs is the way.

Person A: Gotcha. Yeah, I totally hear you. I think that makes sense that, if something is legal, it will encourage people to try it, but then I guess the model is where do you draw that line? So nicotine, alcohol, and now marijuana are legal, but back in the day, marijuana was not legal. And it was just a higher up decision that was made by those in power who think, “Oh, all of a sudden, marijuana used to be this terrible, awful gateway drug. But now maybe it might be okay.” So then I guess the question is how do you determine which drug is a hard drug that's crazy enough to be deemed illegal and the other drugs that might be okay. And, as society and our views on drugs change, how do we determine, “Maybe this might be okay in this time and age,” when it wasn't back then. And yes, you're right, people who do drugs are going to make bad decisions, and they might hurt others around them. But I think [of] the fact that having them be legal would actually have society as a whole look out for people who end up taking drugs. And instead of hiding their addiction or hiding the consequences when they take these drugs, and bad things happen and they don't seek help -- Instead, if it's legalized, people would be more willing to say, “Hey, maybe this person needs our help.” And we were willing to reach out and say, “They took drugs. It might have been a one-off bad decision, but at least, since it's a whole legal practice, we’re okay reaching out and helping folks who need the help.” And folks who do take the drugs, who have done this illegal act, won't be afraid to reach out to authorities to say, “I need the help.”

Person B: I guess that's right for people who want to reach out for help. But I think it should be more of an encouraging act for people who reach out instead of legalizing people who are doing the, in quotations, “wrong” acts -- not necessarily wrong. But I think legalizing it won't make it better. Instead, we should put more work into social work which supports these kinds of people and encourages them to speak out. And one thing is that, instead of legalizing other drugs, I think minimizing the penalty for drug-taking might be a way to encourage these people to come out of their hiding [and] of their addiction. And also maybe adding a compulsory medical treatment that they have to take after they are penalized with taking drugs. I think this will be a more effective way to deter people from taking drugs instead of legalizing them. And one point I want to make is [that] drugs that are on medical use are already legalized. So I don't think there's an extreme need to legalize it if people use it for leisure because personally I don't think that actually weed should be legalized as well. But if you asked me if I want to legalize more drugs in the future, I will say that's the way to draw the line now -- that no more drugs to be legalized.

Person A: Gotcha. But what if like say in the future there's some weird medical use for LSD, and all of a sudden there were future research findings [that] determined that maybe this might be a cure for something.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: So would you then switch and say, “Okay, it might be legalized in the future if that happens?”

Person B: No, some of the drugs that are used for medical use aren't legalized for leisure use. So I think we should separate the uses for medical and leisure so that people can put the drugs to good use.

Person A: Oh, I see what you're saying. Okay, got it. Yeah, I think you have a really good point there. I see what you're saying about, if we minimize the penalties, it would be one way to ensure that people start speaking out. Oh wait, I think we’re done.

Person B: Yeah. Okay.

Person A: Well, it was a pleasure talking to you.

Person B: Yeah, you too.

# *Pair 232, Support P496, Oppose P492, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0*

Person B: Hi.

Person A: Hi, how are you?

Person B: I'm doing well. How are you?

Person A: I am doing well as well. Yeah. Okay so based on this question, what is your stance on the matter?

Person B: I oppose this and my main reason is that I don't think it would help. I totally agree that the repercussions of slavery still affect African Americans today, but it's really not as obvious. And I think a lot of people don't think of it, so I think there would be a lot of negative consequences for enacting these kinds of reparations. What are your opinion and reasons?

Person A: Well I think I share that same idea that it does still affect African Americans or Black people in general today. But I kind of feel that if the government were to enact something that maybe it would help just the status or at least the situation at some level.

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: So I understand what you mean. At least we both agree that there are lasting effects of it. But I also think that we look at police brutality or at least the people who still hold a prejudice towards Black people, and I feel that, if the government were somehow to be a little stronger or to impose a certain penalty or something, that it may help alleviate the magnitude of the issue.

Person B: Mm-hmm. Okay.

Person A: Yeah. So what do you think?

Person B: So one of my first thoughts is, where is the government getting the money for the reparations from? If there's increased taxes in order to pay for the reparations, I could imagine that creating major resentment and escalating racial tensions, possibly inciting violence.

Person A: Uh-huh. Okay. Yeah, well for me personally, I think that the reparations don't necessarily have to be through funding or anything but maybe more so in terms of legislation. So maybe you go more of that approach. Especially with -- you look at incarceration rates and crime and that stuff and how it's perceived through the media to the public and that stuff. At least for me, I think that if there were to be some sort of legislation that helps deal with that issue, then maybe that would be more with reparations than like you were saying through funding and other stuff in that sense.

Person B: Okay.

Person A: So, yeah. I don't have much else besides that. It's just more of through laws or at least through code of conduct, maybe that would be a way to address the issues and repair them.

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: Do you have anything else? Anything more or?

Person B: No, I guess our main disagreement was what we thought the government reparations meant.

Person A: Yeah, yeah.

Person B: Yeah. I guess we can use the remaining time to get to know each other?

Person A: Yeah, sure.

Person B: Keeping with the discussion of politics, where do your parents stand on these issues, and how has that affected your political views?

Person A: Well I think, for me, personally, and also for my family, we’re not very outspoken about our political beliefs. But I think we kind of hold some more conservative views like the drug question. That one, I’m really not sure where I stand. There are obviously both pros and cons to it. And for the reparations, I think, at least my family, we would want to mend this issue and get rid of the negative stigma around certain races. What about you?

Person B: So my dad is pretty liberal except on gay marriage, and then my mom is all-around socially liberal but fiscally conservative.

Person A: Okay.

Person B: And when I was growing up, actually the main source of where I formed my political opinions was from school because we didn’t really talk about politics at home. So it was kind of interesting, when I finally did start to talk about politics at home with my family, to see where there were some surprises in there.

Person A: Oh, yeah. Yeah, thinking back on it, my family doesn’t really talk about politics very much either. We still don’t. I know maybe your situation has changed a little bit, like you said, like you’ve been introducing it a little bit more into your conversations. But I’m fine with other people expressing their political opinions, but I’ve never been one for going out and really publicly addressing my personal beliefs.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Oh, all right. Well it was nice getting to know you.

Person B: It was nice getting to know you too. Cool.

Person A: Take care.

Person B: You too.

Person A: All right, bye.

# Pair 233, Support P491, Oppose P497, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0

Person B: Okay. Do you want to go first or I'll go first?

Person A: I'm fine either way.

Person B: You can go first.

Person A: Okay. So I'm arguing that we need to legalize drugs in the U.S. First of all, there's no evidence to support that criminalization of drugs works. There are plenty of cases where decriminalization of drugs has led to good things. For example, the example we were given in the prompt where HIV rates went down because people that used in-vein drugs were able to get safe needles and things like that. There are lots of cases of allowances being made for drug use and it becoming safer. So for example, in Portland, there are different needle areas where people are able to get safe, clean needles. And everyone knows that these needles are for drug use for things like heroin and such, but there's an allowance made for this drug use in order to keep people safe, and it ends up keeping people much safer than they are when drugs are kept completely illegal. Drugs are everywhere. If you want them, you can get them regardless of legality, so it's not a matter of finding them because drugs are already everywhere, especially in college. And so, if somebody wants drugs, they're able to find them. I would compare it to the debate around abortion because there are people that don't like abortion and argue that abortion should be illegalized so that people can't get it. But the thing is that people will still be able to get abortions, they will just be able to get abortions less safely. The same is true with drugs. People are able to get drugs that are less safe, that are cut with more dangerous things, that they don’t know how to use when they are illegal because they aren’t able to go to an authority to check and make sure that their drugs are okay. I personally used to have a drug problem, and in treatment I was never threatened with legal action because that doesn’t work. Legal action makes people feel like they can’t have a safe place to talk about their drug use and to reflect on their drug use. And so when I was personally in treatment, they never threatened to arrest me or to alert the police of my drug use because they know that creates an unsafe environment and it creates a sense of danger in an addict’s mind, and with that it causes stress. And oftentimes with stress, the solution for an addict is just more drugs. And so that’s another complication that comes with the illegalization of drugs. Lastly, there’s no reason for drugs to be illegal. If safety was the concern, then tobacco and alcohol would also be illegal. Those are some of the drugs that, per percentage of users, there are the highest amount of negative side effects and things like that. And so if safety was a concern with drugs, both of those drugs would be illegal. Safety isn't the concern with drugs. The concern with drugs is that people don't know enough about them yet. And so people demonize them and act like the drugs are the things that are causing these bad effects, when oftentimes the reason that people overdose. The reason that people have negative side effects with drugs, is either because the drugs are cut with something that isn't that drug or isn't what they expected, or second of all, they don't know how to use that drug. And if drugs were legalized, first of all, we would be able to check drugs to make sure that there isn't anything in there that they weren't expecting, and second of all, there would be resources accessible to people to make sure that they knew how to use these drugs and knew what they were getting into before they got into them. Lastly, many drugs have medicinal uses. Specifically, with MDMA, recently there have been a lot of studies come out showing that small doses of MDMA may help treat or even reverse the effects of PTSD. And so drugs have medicinal effects, and when we illegalize them, we stop these medicinal effects from being able to take their course.

Person B: So is your prime concern about safety?

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Oh, okay. I didn’t really – I mean I thought of it before but not deeply. And it's cool that you have that insight in that I'm assuming you've recovered since you're out of treatment.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Yeah. Okay. Well I'm coming from a different standpoint. I've never done drugs. I've never touched that stuff or anything like that because it's just the conditioning I had growing up. And I think if something's illegal it gives it the connotation of being bad. And I think that discourages behavior when you know that there's legal repercussions and federal repercussions, and I just think if something is legal then it's kind of saying that it's okay versus if you say it's illegal and it's not okay. I think when you're young and then you grow up with that sort of mindset like I did, then you become conditioned and just learn that it's probably not the best thing for you. And I understand that there could be good stuff that comes out of it like for marijuana and helping people destress and other things like that. But there's a lot -- I used to volunteer at a hospital, and the security guard told me that the doctor said that there are a lot of people who end up in the emergency room because of marijuana. It's just we don't know much about it. Like you said that it's a lack of research, so maybe we have to figure it out first if it's okay and then legalize it. But I understand also what you're saying about it always being available to anyone. But I think once you start accepting something, especially legally, it becomes accepted in the culture itself, and then that would encourage more drug use. And not that drugs are necessarily terrible in and of themselves because we use drugs to take care of ourselves too and medicine and stuff. But the reason that there's just a really bad rep is because I guess it's very common to abuse them and then subsequently have all these negative repercussions on our health. So I'm very mindful about being healthy and having the rest of the population being pretty healthy. So yeah.

Person A: Mm-hmm.

Person B: That's where I stand.

Person A: Yeah, I think that’s reasonable. I think one of my questions.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: It was nice talking to you.

Person A: It was nice talking to you too.

Person B: Okay.

Person A: I know when I hear that it's a debate, I'm always nervous that it's going to be a very heated conversation.

Person B: Yeah, I know.

Person A: So I’m glad this was a nice conversation.

Person B: I know, it was really chill.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Do we say bye?

Person A: I think so.

Person B: Okay, bye.

Person A: Bye.

# Pair 217, Support P462, Oppose P461, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0

Person B: Okay. So I guess you think that free speech should prevail over controversial speakers, right?

Person A: Yeah. And then you're probably opposing, right?

Person B: Yeah. Do you want to start?

Person A: Sure. So first of all, I think that it's important to get to know both sides of any issue because being educated and having knowledge isn't just one way. You have to have a more thorough understanding of both sides. And also, just in a sense, “controversial,” that word is all in perspective because if you're on one side of the spectrum, you could say the other side is controversial but vice versa it's also the same way.

Person B: Yeah. For sure.

Person A: Mm-hmm. And so then also if someone's so outspoken about it, then trying to ignore it is like that classic saying, “There's an elephant in the room, why not address it?” It's only going to get worse. You can't kick things under the rug and expect them to go away. And you should always have an open discussion. That's how ideas are created and how thought movements occur. Without an open discussion, we would never even have the Free Speech Movement. And so also there's no one absolute correct viewpoint in the world. Everything is so subjective that even morals are subjective. Not everyone has the same morals because it's all based on your own experiences and whatever access to education you have.

Person B: Yeah, I was kind of borderline on this. The reason I chose that I think -- I don’t know. Okay. I think that the controversial issue is kind of circumstantial, because I think it depends on what they deem is controversial. And I think if a person comes and they want to speak about slavery and the institution of it and be like, “Oh, it was great,” then I don't want that kind of hate speech here. I don't think it's necessary and I don't think it's right. And I think that certain topics shouldn't be approved to be spoken about in a positive manner because they’re things that are inherently wrong. And I guess that's kind of hard to say something's inherently wrong, but something such as racism, sexism, homophobia, things like that. I just don't think those have any beneficial aspects to them. But when it comes to just political debates like Republicans versus Democrats, I definitely think that those should be entertained and thoroughly investigated. I don't think it's fair to just deem one thing better than another, which is why I was kind of borderline on the issue.

Person A: Mm-hmm. I feel. But I feel like also that even if someone is so outspoken for such a sensitive topic like homophobia or racism, like slavery, I think that the discussion doesn't have to be pursued in a positive manner. I think you can create a sense of neutrality or if it's a discussion you can even inform the other person why maybe that topic is so inherently immoral.

Person B: Right. I just think that for things that people can't control, I just think it's completely unfair to -- it depends on what the situation is, but I don't think having a really hardcore Catholic or something coming to the school and being like, “Gays are going to go to hell.” I don't think that would be very productive in any sense. I can't see how that would be an educational experience in the least. I just think it would be hateful speech.

Person A: Mm-hmm. But then the question arises: when is it just toleration and then when is it too controversial?

Person B: Right. So that's what I was saying. That's why I was kind of borderline because what is controversial? It depends. Some things are more applicable than others. And I think I would draw the line at things that people can't control, like income, sex, gender. Those are the same thing. But what else? Like skin color, sexual orientation, all of that. I would say that there's no place for people to come in here and deem something better than another thing. Especially if they come at it from a hateful point of view. And I don't really know the circumstances of what the speakers wanted to talk about. I'm not that caught up on it. But I know that if their premise was in a negative manner, just definitively negative, not educational, just attacking it, I definitely would have backed up the people who didn't want them here.

Person A: But then also at that same rate, those people don't have to go to those discussions.

Person B: Right. But why would you want a discussion that is -- if someone came to our school and was like, “I really liked slavery, I think we should reinstate it,” you would want that person here.

Person A: Of course a majority of the people wouldn't want them here, but it would open up a very good discussion. Even if it's about that one thing, it can lead to other ideas. Like just, yeah.

Person B: Yeah. Okay. So I guess that's where we definitely split, because I would never want someone who is a proponent of slavery to come here and spread their views. I don't see the point in it. I don't see how it's fair. I'm not a proponent of slavery. I'm sure you're not either.

Person A: Oh, of course not.

Person B: But I'm just saying --

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: -- I guess that's it.

Person A: All right.

Person B: All right. Do we take off our headphones?

Person A: I'm not sure.

Person B: Me neither.

Person A: I think everyone else is finishing up.

Person B: Okay.

# Pair 218, Support P459, Oppose P460, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0

Person B: Yes. So which stance did you take on this topic?

Person A: I took the stance that I support legalizing drugs in the US.

Person B: Okay. So we have a debate here. I oppose legalizing drugs in the US.

Person A: Mm-hmm.

Person B: So you can go ahead and start your statement and then I can start mine and then we can start debating.

Person A: Okay. So my major points for legalizing drugs are that for those who are already using the illegal drugs, there would be more government regulations and protocols to make it safer for those who choose to use them. And then there would be more resources put towards education and awareness about those drugs and rehabilitation for the people who are already addicted. And there would be -- partially because of that and partially because people won't be afraid to call 911 if there's an overdose, it would result in less death due to addiction and overdoses.

Person B: Mm-hmm. Okay. Okay, that's it?

Person A: Yeah, for now.

Person B: Oh, okay. So the main reason I oppose is, I guess it’s a perspective thing that I’m personally – none of my friends do drugs back in my culture. So from my perspective of a non-drug user, I believe that legalizing drugs means that the government is putting more potential drugs around the people who don’t want to get touched by drugs. And so that’s one thing that bugs me. If you say, “Oh, let's” -- when California legalized marijuana -- so I feel like legalizing all drugs will pose a threat to the social justice and overall what's going on in the society.

Person A: Mm-hmm. Like it's essentially promoting drug use among non-drug users? Is that what you’re saying?

Person B: Well, not to that extent --

Person A: Like the legalization would -- okay, okay.

Person B: -- would definitely not help a society of getting less drug users. But from my personal experience [in] my suite hall I can smell drugs from my room. So yeah, it's kind of like -- personally I'm fine with it but it still kind of bothers me because I don't know what's going on if I'm used to that smell. That's kind of scary.

Person A: Yeah. I do think it is a perspective thing because based on how I grew up it was always around and even though it was illegal, people would still use these sorts of drugs. And they would get into very dangerous situations that no one could help them with because they felt like they had nowhere to go, essentially. And I feel like that's -- I would really like to make it so that less people are in those situations because in certain areas where I lived it doesn't matter if it's legal or not, people are just still going to do it and you're still going to be around those drugs. So if they were more regulated and people were more educated about what to do when someone overdoses and potentially save their life or not be afraid to call 911 if you don't know what to do. Then that's just one more life saved. And then more resources towards rehabilitation is really important to me as well.

Person B: Yes. I agree with you on that point. On my initial note sheet I put down that even though I oppose legalizing drugs in the U.S., I would still say maybe the government can make the punishment for the drug users less severe and also maybe --

Person A: And more towards like, “You have to go through rehabilitation.”

Person B: Yeah, yeah, yeah. Exactly. Like the drivers who speed on the highway. They were forced to go back to school and re-learn the laws. And then maybe drug users can, instead of going to prison, go back to rehabilitation or at schools about drugs. So that’s probably a better solution for that. But I don’t think that’s a reason why we need to legalize drugs in order to make that happen.

Person A: Mm-hmm. I guess for, like take marijuana as an example, a lot of people in California obviously have been using marijuana for a long time. And personally, one of the benefits I've seen of legalizing marijuana is that it --

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: Finish?

Person A: Oh, okay.

Person B: Okay. You can just finish your sentence.

Person A: Oh, okay. Well it’s brought more awareness towards the conversation on subjects about using marijuana and how to do it safely if you are going to be using it. And then there's regulations on people who grow marijuana so that there's less toxic stuff in the drug, like pesticides and whatever. Okay. That's it.

Person B: Got it. Yeah. Thank you.

# Pair 257, Support P547, Oppose P543, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0

Person B: Okay, do you want to start first or should I?

Person A: You can start.

Person B: Okay, so I said that I oppose having controversial speakers on campus. One, because it’s not that they shouldn’t be able to say their views, but it causes more safety issues than it should. So they should be allowed to say it but it’s just having safety against the students and people that live in the area. So, you know, damages to property or clashes or injuries. People’s lives or daily schedules are interrupted by having street closures or stuff like that. I also said that individuals don’t necessarily have to support the views, but it’s just that having the clashes on campus or putting people in danger. That was my view.

Person A: So I said that we should have controversial speakers. I think I’ll just start off by talking about some of the things you mentioned. So you talked about how it causes more safety issues. I am currently a sophomore so I saw what happened last year with Milo and like [inaudible] and [inaudible] like Steve Bannon et cetera, et cetera. So there were a lot of safety measures, right? There were a lot of police officers there and Sproul Hall was closed off, or certain parts were closed off so there were no injuries. Yeah, there was commotion made, but I don’t think there were any injuries. There weren’t any injuries taking place. There was a commotion made for sure, but there was always an alternative route to go anywhere. And I think regarding the whole thing about our daily lives, I agree. Yeah, it did cause slight hindrances. But then you have to weigh those hindrances against the fact that bringing these speakers -- because like you mentioned yourself, the speakers’ views aren’t necessarily the problem, it’s more like their daily lives. Bringing the speakers into campus is important because in Berkeley we really respect free speech and we have people from so many different types of majors and so many different types of backgrounds. And it is really important that they get exposure to those different backgrounds. And there is no way to do that that is as direct as bringing these speakers over here. So when we are in politically controversial times, as we are since the past couple of years, bringing these speakers allows everyone to get exposure to these different issues, to these different policies that they are supporting or to these social choices that they are supporting. And I think that if we have pride having been a center of free speech at Berkeley, this is a really important step to take.

Person B: Yeah, yeah. I see the point, yeah.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Are you a second year?

Person A: Yeah, I’m a second year. What about you?

Person B: I’m also a second year.

Person A: Cool, cool. What are you majoring in?

Person B: I’m hopefully trying to do Business. But for right now, I might do Econ.

Person A: For sure, for sure. Yeah. I’m doing Data Science and Econ or Data Science and Business.

Person B: Okay.

Person A: So what classes are you taking right now?

Person B: I am taking Econ 1, a Native American Studies class, Nutritional Science 10, and I always forget this one, Global 10A which is about poverty and development.

Person A: Got it. I took Econ 1 and Nutritional Science 10 my first semester freshman year. So do you have Martha [as an Econ Professor]?

Person B: Yes, I do. Yeah.

Person A: She’s great, yeah.

Person B: How were the tests? Because I have a midterm on Wednesday.

Person A: Yeah, I heard you have a midterm. I’d say it wasn’t that bad. I did a bit worse than I wanted to and that’s probably because I just made a really stupid mistake on one of the graphs. So know your graphs really well. I’d say go through every single practice test that she has on her website. And go through the -- I think that she has extra review worksheets, and then she posts the solutions for those too. So you should definitely go to those. And for the practice tests, they have review sessions. If you go to that then you’ll be fine.

Person B: Okay, cool.

Person A: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

Person B: What classes are you taking?

Person A: I’m taking Econ 100B and Data X. What else? Computer Science 61B, a breadth class and then some Haas [Business School] special topic social entrepreneurship class.

Person B: Okay, cool. Yeah.

Person A: Yeah. Cool, cool. Yeah. Where are you from?

Person B: I’m originally from Los Angeles.

Person A: Oh okay, what part of Los Angeles?

Person B: Like Downtown.

Person A: Got it, got it. Okay.

Person B: How about you?

Person A: I’m from Fremont which is like 45 minutes down from here.

Person B: Yeah, yeah. Uh huh.

Person A: Yeah. Yeah.

Person B: Cool.

Person A: What high school are you from?

Person B: It’s a small little high school in Pasadena. It’s called Blair.

Person A: Oh, okay. I haven’t heard of that. Yeah. Got you.

Person B: Yeah. Was Berkeley your first choice?

Person A: Like a realistic first choice, yeah.

Person B: Okay, yeah.

Person A: Yeah, what about you?

Person B: I didn’t even know what Berkeley was to be honest. Like I wasn’t thinking about college until I had to.

Person A: For sure. That’s amazing then. Yeah.

Person B: Yeah, so I just applied because one of my cousins forced me to apply. Yeah, so and when I got in, I was like “Yeah, I guess so.”

Person A: Going to one of the best schools. “I guess so yeah.”

Person B: Everybody was like “Of course you are going to have to accept it.” I was like “Yeah, I guess I don’t have a choice.”

Person A: Yeah. How do you like it so far?

Person B: I really like it. I came up here during Cal Day before I was a freshman and I just fell in love with it. How about you?

Person A: Yeah, I mean I like it too. I guess it can be stressful at times but I think it exposes you to the real world pretty well, like the stress and the ups and downs you go through academically and other stuff. But I just think it’s fun and I’m kind of lucky in the sense that I am kind of close to home too. It’s nice to be like – yeah. And there are a lot of people from my high school who are going to Berkeley so --

**[Experimenter says times up.]**

Person B: Yeah, for sure.

Person A: For sure. All right.

# Pair 234, Support P493, Oppose P494, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0

Person A: Hello?

Person B: Hi.

Person A: Hi.

Person B: So I didn't realize we weren't supposed to start yet. So oops. I said that I somewhat oppose the government giving out reparations for slavery.

Person A: Okay.

Person B: And my best friend and I have talked about this a lot. And she is African American, and we go back and forth on this. But the biggest thing for me was the questions the scenario poses, that people who oppose it say like, “Oh, well, I've had nothing to do with slavery. Why should I still be paying for it?”

Person A: Mm-hmm.

Person B: And I feel like that's kind of a valid argument. And maybe people who are still struggling, like maybe there are some people in the South definitely still struggling or even in inner cities. And I feel we could invest in certain people instead of maybe all African Americans.

Person A: Okay. Could you give me some context about your friend? Like is her family a direct descendant of slavery? Or does she have African immigrant parents?

Person B: So she's mixed now. She's mixed, but her dad and his whole family, they're from Arkansas and they moved out to California two generations ago.

Person A: Okay. For me, I guess my context [is] I have immigrant parents from West Africa. So I guess that's some context about myself. I supported it just due to the fact that other ethnic groups that have been mistreated, raped, kidnapped, killed, the list goes on and on about historically what has occurred to different ethnic groups. And if the U.S. has offered reparations for other ethnic groups, then why not Black people? What makes them not deserving of reparations if historically other people have received it? So I just feel like it's a no-brainer obviously. If negative things have happened to a population, the country should respectively do what's right and try to make amends. However, none of that has been done efficiently. So that was my first point.

Person B: So I have a quick question. What people groups are you talking about specifically in the U.S. that have been compensated? Maybe I'm not familiar.

Person A: I know for the most part that historically, Native Americans received compensation. Also different Asian American groups did receive compensation for mistreatment historically. So for example, like Japanese internment camps, their people received reparations.

Person B: Got it. Yeah.

Person A: Yeah. So that’s just a few examples of historically how it has been done. So I don't see what the hesitation is to do it for another ethnic group that has suffered and is still currently suffering. My second point was that Black Americans are still enslaved in the U.S. through various forms. I'm not sure if you know that much about American history, but after the 13th Amendment that necessarily freed slaves, a different -- I forgot what the --

Person B: Sharecropping?

Person A: Yeah, there was a form of sharecropping. And basically the 13th Amendment says you're free unless you're a criminal. So they basically criminalize Black Americans and basically re-enslave them. So [they] just put them in various prisons and made them do the same work they were doing before they obtained their freedom. So there was technically no freedom of Black people.

Person B: And a lot of the families moved to the inner cities, I realize, about that. Which led to the mass incarceration issues.

Person A: Yeah. So that's mass incarceration, which is a current form of enslavement just with a different name. There is also redlining, gentrification, continued police brutalities, structural racism, voters' rights, poverty due to being pushed out of cities and literally having to live in an inner city with bad schools around, with gun violence. The list literally goes on and on about how basically Black Americans are enslaved through different names.

Person B: For sure. And that's why I somewhat oppose it because I think making an umbrella statement definitely makes room for free riders. And I don't necessarily think that everyone identifies with those issues, although maybe a large majority do.

Person A: Identify with what exactly?

Person B: Like all the issues that you listed and that actually goes on.

Person A: Yeah. I feel for the most part, regardless of -- historically in the States, race still overpowers class for the most part. So even if you may not financially be struggling, there are still other instances of how race can shackle you in the States, if that makes sense.

Person B: Mm-hmm. I was watching a documentary, but kind of informal because -- I forget who was interviewing people. But one African American man said, he really believed this, that the United States government should buy every -- I can't remember if it was every African American household or African American individual -- like they should receive a house. How do you feel about that?

Person A: I personally don't think that's valid because buying someone a house doesn't solve any of the issues I've stated. So I think reparations should be done. But I feel like the government should decide how they want to go about it in order to offer reparations that hit every bullet point that I have addressed that affects the Black community. But I don't think buying a house is sufficient, if that makes sense.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: Got it.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Thank you.

Person A: Yeah, no problem.

# Pair 256, Support P548, Oppose P541, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0

Person A: Okay. So yeah, what do you think?

Person B: I think -- you support it, right?

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: I think we should start with the agreement side. So why do you support the extremely controversial speakers?

Person A: Mm-hmm. So I think that free speech should be protected. And when I say “free speech,” that's separate from, I think, hate speech. And I think that line is really hard to find. And so I don't think we should be quick to assume that it's hate speech. And I feel like everyone has a right to their opinion. And we all have the right to disagree with what they say. So just because we're letting them speak doesn't mean we agree with them at all.

Person B: Okay.

Person A: Yeah, so I think that sums it up. What about you?

Person B: I think -- I know there's this argument that they should have a right to free speech or free opinion, blah, blah, blah. But I think not letting them on campus doesn't mean they don't have that voice. It's just the fact that students, especially those that are marginalized, don't want them on campus. But that really does not mean that they are being silenced. Obviously, these are extremely controversial speakers because they had that platform already to reach out and voice their opinion. And they're set on what they believe in, and then blah, blah, blah. So I really do not see a problem with not letting these extremely controversial, hateful or conservative whatever speakers -- because they're not being silenced. They are already given the right to think a belief. It’s just the fact that there are so many protests and so much social anxiety, anger in our campus. Just that fact that many students, and predominantly those marginalized, feel such discomfort. That just signifies that their presence on campus obviously affects the psychological, mental stability. So I feel every student, above any other person, especially in a school or educational institution, should feel secure and should not feel intimidated or threatened by people and their views. And I feel like that should just be a right as a student. They already have a major platform. Obviously, they're controversial for a reason. So they should look outside of the public schools or institutions and just search for a platform somewhere else. They do not have to come to schools and especially where students of color or those that are marginalized or minority.

Person A: Mm-hmm. So I totally agree with that. All students have the right to feel safe. And so if they feel that their safety is threatened then obviously that's not okay. But -- wait, can you hear me?

Person B: Yeah. Yeah.

Person A: Oh, okay. But I think that – you know how you mentioned that they already have a platform to talk. So then they don't need to come to public schools. And so I feel like limiting the place where they can talk is also kind of a limit on free speech. Because you're giving them a restriction on where they're allowed to express their free speech. And that's kind of not free speech. So then, you know, how you mentioned protests and things like that? So I think that stuff should also be protected. So then if controversial speakers were to come, then students should have the right to be able to protest in ideally peaceful ways and things like that. And I feel that if people who have these flawed or morally unsound arguments do come to campus, then giving them a chance to express that and then countering them with the correct reasoning or explaining why they're wrong is a more powerful way of -- I feel like that sends a more powerful message. Because for example, when Milo [Yiannopoulos] -- you know how he was really controversial and he wasn't able to come to campus due to safety reasons? I feel like a lot of people criticize that because they are saying that's a lack of free speech. And I feel like if he had come and people had protested peacefully, then the general opinion would have been with the students and against Milo rather than if he hadn't been allowed to speak at all. I don't know if that makes sense.

Person B: Yeah, yeah. I understand what you're saying. I feel like this school definitely supports protest, supports students voicing out their opinions and stuff. And it is a form of empowerment. I understand that. But just the fact that students continue to believe that their presence in this school is a threat and it's not a form of empowerment. I feel like there are the outside people who believe that, “Oh, these students, they’re voicing their opinions. They're doing this, they're doing that.” And I know that's, to them, is like, “Oh my God, that's something to be proud of.” But for a student in that situation, that's not what they're thinking. They're not like, “Oh yeah, yeah, we're going against it for empowerment.” They're doing it because they actually feel threatened.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: And that -- oh wait, what did she say?

Person A: I actually didn't hear. Oh, okay. Bye.

Person B: It was nice speaking to you. Bye.

# Pair 259, Support P552, Oppose P550, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0

Person B: Do you want to start with your viewpoint?

Person A: No, I think you should start because you’re -- oh, I'm supporting it so I should start.

Person B: Yeah. You start.

Person A: So I think that it's really important for government to give reparations for slavery because slavery has been going on for such a really long time and it's kind of the way for the government to say sorry to the people who actually faced it. And the thing is that it’s still really prevalent in society right now because -- indirectly, in like small, small ways and that kind of -- the entire idea of being equal and equality in the country and all is lost because if you have slavery, and you have inequality and discrimination, then you obviously can't be equal. So if you -- if the government makes reparations to the people and brings them to a higher level and makes them equal to the other people, only then will the society actually be equal.

Person B: Okay. So -- okay. So in my opinion, I agree with the fact that slavery is still -- there's implicit slavery, for example, a Black man doesn't earn as much as a White man would. But do I agree with the government giving reparations? No, I don't because I don't think that's the best way to address this issue. First of all, it's unfair to other minorities who also -- for example, let's say Hispanics or Latinos, they are also [a] minority and they're also proven to not be as financially stable just like you know, people who've gone through slavery. And so I think it'd be unfair for people -- if we only gave reparations to people who've gone through slavery just because this would be everyone as a whole collectively giving money towards them. And some other people need this money. First of all, and then second of all, I think it's more about the ethical aspect than giving money. I think slavery is -- it's just unethical, you know. It's something that's been going on in our country for ages and yeah, I definitely agree that there is implicit slavery, but I don't think that providing -- giving money to people like descendants of slaves is going to solve anything. I personally feel like that's just going to make the problem worse because that's like literally stating that, “Oh, you're inferior and that's why we need to give you money in order for you to be able to do anything.” And I think that'll give the White man privilege or whatever. I feel like that'll enhance that because first of all, upper-class White males, they're going to be like, “Oh yeah, we need to help them out. We need to give them money.” In the sense that -- I think that they'll look upon them as inferior if we do that because they're giving them money rather than talking things out and I don't know, just approaching it in more of an ethical manner than, “Oh, we need to give them money.” Does that make sense? That’s kind of all over the place.

Person A: Yeah. So I agree with what you said because then it kind of may just increase the divide between the Whites and everyone else. But the thing is -- what I don't agree with is that the other minorities should not really be in a position to revolt against this because they weren't the ones who were actually tortured. They weren't made to suffer like slaves were. The entire point of giving reparation to slaves is because they were made to torture and there were crimes committed against them, which is really unethical, and this is kind of asking them for forgiveness. And at that time when they were made slaves, the most important thing probably was human rights which was taken away from them. And right now, if money is kind of the most important thing to help you survive, you have to compensate for one thing that's taken away by something that's equal. And if you are taking away human rights, which was something so important back then and it still is right now, you have to reparate them or whatever, by giving them money, which is also so important right now. And similarly for minorities, they are a minority by choice and not because they were forced into being a minority in this country.

Person B: Wait. Okay, I don't agree with the last sentence that, “Oh, they're minorities because they were -- by choice, not because they were forced to be in this country.” Like people from -- like immigrants, they're all minorities. It's not like -- we're not minorities by choice, but if we're coming to America, you kind of -- you're put in the minority group because obviously it’s --

Person A: But why? But you chose to come to America, right? The difference is, even slightly, is that you chose to come to America and you wanted the opportunity to come here and to do something here. But on the other hand, slaves were forced to come here and do stuff against their will. So that does make a difference.

Person B: Okay. So I understand that, but I think what I mean is -- I think the bigger point when I say it's unfair to other minorities is that I don't think -- definitely slavery is a horrible thing and it's completely unethical. But I think the racism that's prevalent today is not just prevalent towards African Americans. I think it's prevalent towards other groups too. Racism in America is a real problem and I feel like it's prevalent towards almost all groups besides Whites. So I think if we are giving reparations to slaves, yes, they’ve suffered a lot and I definitely agree that they suffered a lot and they didn't deserve anything that came upon them. But I think it'll be -- it'll kind of become -- I think other minorities will revolt. And I think it will be unfair to other minorities who are also going through similar things in terms of racism. Yeah, there's a lot of facts that -- there's a lot of implicit racism towards African Americans, but if you go into the implicit racism towards, let's say same group, Hispanics, there's a lot of implicit racism towards them too. And I think it's unfair if we just try to address one group that's encountering racism and we don't address other groups that are also going through the same issue.

Person A: Yeah, I agree with you, but I don't think that means that the government should not compensate to the slaves or for slavery. Like one, just because you don’t want to give it to one doesn’t mean--

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: Wait, wait, wait. One second, one second. What did she say? I don't know. She was saying something. Okay, continue.

Person A: I think it's done. I don't know.

Person B: Oh, is it? Oh okay. That's what happened, okay.

# Pair 258, Support P549, Oppose P546, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0

Person A: Hi.

Person B: Hi. Nice to meet you.

Person A: Nice to meet you too. Okay. Well, I'm [name redacted], first of all.

Person B: Oh, [name redacted]. Okay. Nice to meet you. My name's [name redacted].

Person A: Oh okay, that's cool.

Person B: Yeah. So did you want to start, or?

Person A: Yeah. Let's go ahead and do this.

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: Okay. So I said that I support government reparations for slavery. And you said the opposite, right?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Okay. So I took an ethnic studies course last year and basically just went over the whole political situation in different ethnic groups in America. Essentially, I learned a lot about how crappy the government has been in the past to certain groups, including African Americans and Native Americans in particular. To me this question means more than just slavery. And reparations is defined as the addressal of such issues in education, through monuments, through museums, it can be monetary, but it's any form of addressal and apology for what's happened, which typically does include some sort of money that has to go into those things.

Person B: Mm-hmm. Well -- sorry, do you mind if I step in, or?

Person A: Yeah, go ahead.

Person B: Okay. So I think affirmative action is different than reparations for slavery. So my thing with that is, number one, there are logistical problems of how do you identify descendants of slaves and stuff like that. And also, I think it kind of [is] like reverse racism. You're pointing out differences between Black and White, when neither of these groups have anything to do with what happened in the past. Just because you're White doesn't mean you'd support slavery and should have to pay for it and just because you're Black doesn't -- or [you’re], I guess, the descendant of a slave, obviously you're put at some disadvantage, but that's why we have affirmative action and other programs, to kind of account for that or try to -- so that the government can kind of try to make up for that in a way.

Person A: Are you familiar with what Germany does for Holocaust families?

Person B: No, I'm not.

Person A: So Germany actually is super cool because they have super in-depth reparations. So Germany goes and they have reparations, so they pay families of survivors from the Holocaust. They actually -- I know someone who lives in America and gets reparations. Or I know someone who knows someone. So essentially, it's not about pinning people against each other. It's more about the fact that there needs to be some addressal. In Germany, on their streets, they have tons of Holocaust things saying facts, like how many people died in the street or how many people were killed in total. Like remembrance, remembrance of the wrongdoings that have been done. It's not reverse racism. It's addressing the fact that African Americans were enslaved by Americans lawfully for periods of time, that after that they were subjected to intense discrimination which led to lynching -- and they just made a monument for lynching in Alabama And essentially addressing those things, showing that, “Yes, America did this”, “Yes, it was wrong” and, “Yes, we are addressing the systematic oppression that still exists within America” is an important part of moving on. Because if you have an issue with someone you can't move on unless you address it.

Person B: Mm-hmm. Well I guess my response to that is -- for me, I don't know, the Holocaust seems a little different because it was something that a previous government was directly doing. So a new government stepping in obviously has to kind of clean up after a previous government’s mess. And in this case it was more, I don't know, it was more about personal -- not everyone -- I guess the government sanctioned slavery, but it wasn't universal. And my thing is why should people who are as against slavery as anyone else have to pay extra in taxes or why is there money going to stuff that they had nothing to do with.

Person A: I mean the same question could be asked is, why is like 80 percent of taxes going to the military now if we don't support the wars that happen in America?

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: I'm sure the people in Germany don't support the Holocaust and there was a civil war in America because of slavery.

Person B: And I think -- okay, well sorry. I also think the Holocaust is far more recent. Well, mm, that's tough because -- okay, I see your point.

Person A: Yeah. Segregation just didn’t end that long ago.

Person B: Yeah, yeah. Mm-hmm. The thing is, this is like bringing back segregation in a way. I don't know. Because why are you trying to further separate these groups, if the goal is to eliminate racism? Why are you still continuing to separate Black and White? It --

Person A: It's not just Black and White. It's not the separation of Black and White people. It's the recognition of what's happened to African Americans in America.

Person B: And well my thing is I think it gets recognized in other ways. Oh wait.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Okay. Bye.

Person B: Bye. Nice to meet you.

Person A: Nice to meet you too.

Person B: Good talk.

# Pair 207, Support P441, Oppose P442, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0

Person A: All right. So I’m [name redacted].

Person B: It’s nice to meet you, [name redacted]. My name is [name redacted].

Person A: All right, nice to meet you, [name redacted]. You want to go first? I assume you’re opposed to reparations?

Person B: Oh, yeah. Yeah, I’m opposed to reparations.

Person A: All right, you want to start?

Person B: You can start if you’d like. I don’t really have all that many points to spread with.

Person A: All right, all right. Me neither. I'll give you what I got. It's just in my opinion that there is an obligation of the U.S. government to pay reparations back to Black Americans for all the slights that they've received from the government in the past, like slavery, Jim Crow laws, withholding the vote from Black Americans until very recently. And Black Americans are still dealing with things like police brutality and being denied loans [and] houses on the base of discrimination. And I think reparations would be equitable with something like affirmative action. Do you agree with affirmative action?

Person B: In some ways. I don’t know. I'm less opposed to affirmative action than I am to reparations.

Person A: Right. Because affirmative action is definitely less radical than paying reparations.

Person B: Yes, absolutely. Should I offer some counter arguments?

Person A: Oh yeah, go ahead.

Person B: Okay. So I absolutely -- I hear what you're saying, and I definitely agree that African Americans have been mistreated in the past and the American government has had a long history of systematically oppressing African Americans. As you said with Jim Crow, that only ended like, what, 50 years ago? A couple of decades ago.

Person A: Yeah, there are still Americans alive who went through Jim Crow laws.

Person B: Oh yeah.

Person A: It is very recent.

Person B: Oh, it's just horrible. But the problem in my mind is that, while the American government, and I suppose the American people as a whole, may have oppressed African Americans in the past, the way that the American government would pay for such a program would be through taxpayers' dollars, right? Through you and me. I'm sure you hold no negative sentiment towards African Americans, and you've never been involved in the oppression of African Americans. And I wouldn't say I have either. While our ancestors might have, generally speaking, debt doesn't carry over generations. Think about it like this. If your deadbeat father was an alcoholic [and] he racked up a whole load of debt, I don't think you should have to pay his reparations. That just seems unfair, right? You shouldn't have to pay for all his credit card debt. And I think that the same thing should apply to the American nation as a whole. Past generations of Americans may have oppressed a certain ethnic group, but I don't know if the debt should carry over. Look at all the diversity programs we're supporting and we had a Black president. We're clearly not the same people who oppressed African Americans in the past. So I don't know if we should be the ones who have to pay the reparations for such oppression. What do you think?

Person A: Right. And I agree with that. I agree that the biggest problem that I have with reparations is where the money's coming from because obviously the people who should be paying reparations are the people who oppressed African Americans. But just like most Black Americans who were oppressed back then, most of those same U.S. government officials and the American people in general are long dead. So it’s tricky, and this is why it's more controversial than something like affirmative action. Because the basis of affirmative action is that Black Americans are starting at a disadvantage because of systematic racism in the U.S., and so they get sort of a boost in the admissions process.

Person B: Right, right, right.

Person A: And so I would say that African Americans are still at an economic disadvantage in the U.S. with job prospects and being turned down simply based on their ethnicity and stuff like that.

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: So -- oh, is [the researcher] --

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: Okay well, it was nice meeting you, [name redacted].

Person A: Yeah, you too.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: For sure.

Person B: Glad I could have a civil debate with you.

Person A: Yeah, yeah. You brought up some good points, man.

Person B: Thank you. You too.

# Pair 163, Support P342, Oppose P338, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0

Person A: Okay. So how should we do this? Just bring up point by point, or what?

Person B: I’m not sure. You can start, I guess.

Person A: Okay. So I don’t really have that strong of a supporting position on this topic, but I do believe that this topic is about rehabilitation over punishment.

Person B: Oh.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: The question is wrong then.

Person A: No, no, like in terms of drugs.

Person B: Yeah, I’m not really sure in that area. I just put that I don’t think all drugs should be legalized, like cocaine and heroin.

Person A: Ah. Yeah, I think there are some things that you have to talk about in terms of legalizing drugs, but I think in terms of the American judicial system, we treat drug addiction as a choice instead of let's say a mental illness or the result of an impoverished or poor influenced background, you know?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: So, I actually read about the Portugal thing where I think they legalized most drugs and their rehabilitation rates of their drug addicts improved rather than just putting them in prison.

Person B: Okay.

Person A: I think that, instead of treating drugs as a choice and punishing people for that, you should treat drug addiction as [an] illness where you get help and doctors and therapists and all that stuff.

Person B: What if they combine both of them? Like rehabilitation and prison time?

Person A: Yeah that’d be -- I mean things like marijuana should be legal.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: But if it’s things like heroin or crack cocaine, maybe it depends on the case because I think most normal people wouldn’t choose to -- they grew up in an environment where they were taught to not fall under the influence of hard drugs.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: And really, I think, in my opinion, people who fall into hard drugs are people who had bad influences growing up or a poor background or were just around all those drugs. And really their drug addiction might be a result of their background or their childhood, and I think punishment for that might not really be the right case. I think treatment would be a better choice.

Person B: Okay.

Person A: What do you think?

Person B: I would have to look at the success rates that if more people are getting off [drugs by getting treatment] than [by going to] prison, I guess.

Person A: Yeah, yeah, yeah. Yeah.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: I think that’s the case. It was a long time ago when I read [about] Portugal, but I think that’s what happened. But the American prison system is based on punishment instead of rehabilitation, and I think if you just take loads of drug addicts and put them in prison, it’s not really going to help them. It’s just going to either make it worse or not do anything, and, when they get out maybe, they’ll just fall back into their old habits. So, prison -- punishing them for their drug addiction might not be the best choice, [to] maybe help them.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Yeah. Obviously, drug distribution should be definitely illegal. Drug dealers and gangs should be put in prison, but yeah.

Person B: Hmm.

Person A: What do you think?

Person B: Yeah, I agree.

Person A: Okay.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Yeah. I think drug use most of the time isn’t even restricted. People who do drugs don’t really care about the law. Even if it's illegal, they’re going to do it, you know?

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: So, that’s just what I think.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Yeah. The Nordic countries like Sweden and Finland, their prison systems are focused on rehabilitation rather than punishment, and I think they have better rates of past prisoners contributing back into society or going back into society and becoming a useful member, rather than just staying in prison or going back and then --

Person B: Hmm.

Person A: Stuff like that. So yeah.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: That’s just my opinion. Anything you want to add there?

Person B: No, I agree.

Person A: Okay, yeah.

Person B: Mm.

Person A: Whether you legalize all drugs or some drugs, I think it just really depends. And the degree of legalization, I think that just depends as well.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Yeah. Any more of your points? Any points that you wrote down?

Person B: No. It was completely different -- like legalization of drugs, not that area.

Person A: The question is do you oppose or support legalizing drugs in the U.S., but I kind of interpreted it as either just putting them in prison and letting them rot or trying to help them and making it like a mental issue instead of a crime, you know?

Person B: Yeah.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Okay. Nice talking to you.

Person B: Alright. Nice talking to you too.

Person A: Bye.

# Pair 181, Support P392, Oppose P389, Condition 3 (Short Audio), Agreement 0

Person B: Hello?

Person A: Hi. Yeah.

Person B: Okay. If you'd like, you can start.

Person A: Oh yeah, go ahead.

Person B: You can start.

Person A: Okay. So I put that I agreed to have the controversial speakers -- or not “controversial” in a sense but have the speakers of an opposing view- come to school and be allowed to speak because all speech is free speech. Should I go through all of the points or just one point at a time?

Person B: You can go through all of them. That’s fine.

Person A: Okay. This is just on the fly. And I said that we have no idea if the speaker will speak and incite violence. We need to let the opposing side have a chance to speak. And by not letting the opposing side have a chance to speak, the Democrats mostly -- the Liberals are being hypocritical to say people have free speech when others are trying to take that right away from the minority beliefs from talking. So, in [the UC Berkeley examples], the Republicans were the controversial speakers. And then, we can't predict if their speech will be hate speech or it will just be a regular speech since they are coming to an institution that is prestigious. And everyone needs to have a chance to be heard, and once they're heard, we can argue and conclude if the speech was full of hate and not invite them next time and establish a strong stance against them.

Person B: Oh, okay. Those are really good points.

Person A: Thank you.

Person B: Do you mind if I ask you questions about your points?

Person A: Yeah, go ahead.

Person B: Okay. So you said that we can't predict if it’ll be hate speech or regular speech. I guess to you, what exactly would define hate speech?

Person A: I mean hate speech would of course be, “punch that person,” “arrest that person,” “that person's a terrorist.” Or calling names and just starting an environment full of anger and hate. I think that would be hate speech. Anything that's not rational.

Person B: Oh, okay.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Okay. Yeah, that makes sense.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Should I say my points?

Person A: Yeah, go ahead.

Person B: Okay. So I honestly said that it's -- I guess it's kind of like your last point -- that we don't know what kind of speech they're going to give. So, I said that it should be based on a case to case basis because there are some speakers who are too extreme and there are others who just have opinions like everyone else and just want to give people their insight.

Person A: Mm-hmm. Yeah, I agree.

Person B: So, I definitely think it's on a case to case basis.

Person A: Definitely.

Person B: And then I said if these speakers are known to cause problems or to invoke violence, then maybe it should be reconsidered because we don't want to endanger the students and staff. Because it wouldn't be worth it because we’d just be bringing violence to campus for no reason.

Person A: Yeah. Yeah.

Person B: And then, I just put a point here that I do think there is such a thing as hate speech, so we wouldn't want speakers on campus who promote hate speech and endanger the students.

Person A: Yeah. I agree. I agree. I definitely agree that if someone has a history of being violent, that that person should be reconsidered to see if they can come to campus. For an example, I'd say Trump.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: He's known to incite violence and hate speech. He makes fun of people who are disabled. He’s convinced people to fight each other, and he's kicked people who were Black or Mexican out of his rallies. So, I definitely wouldn't want him to come to campus and incite violence through his hate speech because he might inspire those who have not been inspired to do such things that they haven't before. So that's one person I wouldn't want to come on campus, but Ann Coulter, she's a political commentator. I don't really know what she has to say, but, suppose she doesn't have a track record of saying hate speech but a speech that is in opposition to what we believe in here at Cal, then I think she should have a chance to speak her mind to those who do relate to her.

Person B: Mm-hmm.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Yeah, I definitely agree with the whole Trump thing. He's a perfect example. So, if there were other speakers who have gone to other campuses and we've seen that they've been name-calling and invoking violence, promoting fights and such stuff, I definitely think that's a no.

Person A: Yeah, exactly.

Person B: We don't have to think about it.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: But, yeah, honestly I feel [that] I'm not so, “Oh no, if they’re Republicans, they can't do it.” No.

Person A: Yeah, exactly. I wrote a paper on this.

Person B: Oh.

Person A: Yes.

Person B: Girl, you’re prepared.

Person A: Yes. So that's why I was instantly -- I felt like I knew what this was going to be about, and I knew that was going to be a question. And so I felt prepared because I do feel [that] the Republicans don't have a chance to voice their opinions, especially in the environment that we come to school in.

Person B: Cal.

Person A: Yeah. And I feel really bad. Though I don't agree with what the Republicans have to say, they should have a chance to speak their mind and not be reprimanded for speaking their mind, which is how it usually [is] here in Berkeley. If you're a Republican and you say, “I voted for Trump,” or, “I agree with this,” then you're just bashed on.

Person B: Yeah. Or simply the fact of saying, “I'm a Republican.”

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: That's just it.

Person A: Yeah. That just ticks everyone off.

Person B: Yeah, I definitely agree with that.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Oh, okay so are we done?

Person B: I guess this is it. Yeah.

Person A: Okay.

Person B: Okay.

Person A: Okay. Nice speaking to you. Bye.

Person B: Nice meeting you.

Person A: Bye.
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Person A: Okay. So our question is, “Do you oppose or support required reparations for slavery?” So I think I answered [that] I support reparations for slavery. Did you say oppose?

Person B: Yeah, I did because I thought that we should put our money in -- have government sponsored things to repair school districts and stuff. I thought that just giving reparations to families doesn't do much, so personally, I opposed it.

Person A: Uh-huh. Uh-huh. Okay. Yeah, I was thinking of reparations in terms of affirmative action and stuff like that and those kinds of reparations imposed by the government. Yeah. I wasn't thinking so much of a cash sum or a check or something.

Person B: Oh, well then, I misunderstood it then.

Person A: No, I think both are valid ways of interpreting it. The question doesn’t give any details. But yeah, I think I agree with you on [how] just giving money as a reparation wouldn’t actually do anything because I think it's the systemic and institutional biases that are already in place.

Person B: Exactly.

Person A: So, no amount of money in the world is going to change that, unfortunately.

Person B: Yeah, it’s just changing the entire system.

Person A: Yeah, [take] Serena Williams. She's got more money than pretty much anyone, but she still has to face bias from the -- whatever you call them -- the linesmen and stuff. There's been a history of questionable calls and stuff.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: And what she can wear. I think the other week, she wasn't allowed to wear her one-piece tennis thing when a White player, the day before, had worn the exact same one.

Person B: My God, that’s so dumb.

Person A: Yeah stuff like that. And there's been a history of really bad calls, and it's kind of -- but anyway, we are meant to be disagreeing. So.

Person B: Yeah, but I feel like we both interpret it differently.

Person A: Right.

Person B: So both of our stances though -- I feel like we're on the same page.

Person A: Yeah. Yeah. I think -- yeah.

Person B: Yeah, which is kind of funny.

Person A: What do you feel about the affirmative action?

Person B: Oh, I think that at this stage of where we're at in our current societal climate, [affirmative action is] good, but as soon as the whole education system is on equal terms -- because you know how certain districts don't have access to better teachers or better resources? So once they are on equal terms, then I don't think affirmative action should be a thing, you know?

Person A: Right.

Person B: But at this point, there are obviously districts that are -- I don’t know, there's a lot of inequity. So, I think it's a good thing right now.

Person A: Yeah, definitely. The way I see it, the system in the U.S. is you go to the school that’s in your zip code, unless you can afford private school, but that's different from --

Person B: Exactly.

Person A: So you go to the school in your zip code. So if you live in a poor area, you're going to a bad school. And it just happens that in the U.S. it’s disproportionately Black people in the poor areas.

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: So they go to the bad schools and of course don’t get an education [and] don’t get excited about learning or going to the university.

Person B: Yeah, exactly. And even just now, talking to people who are coming from big schools, fancy private schools, or charter schools, they have a quota. Fifty people from their school get in just because they're a top school.

Person A: Right.

Person B: And who goes to those top schools? It's not poor people. So.

Person A: Right, right. Yeah. Maybe there should be a quota for the worst schools. You know?

Person B: Yeah, exactly.

Person A: But yeah, I guess if you were in charge of UC Berkeley admissions or whatever, it would be tough for you to say, “Yeah, I'm going to let this kid in that has pretty bad grades and reject this person that has perfect grades.”

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: From a, “What's that going to do for your school's prestige?” [point of view], you know?

Person B: That’s true.

Person A: So, I think that's what's kind of stopping affirmative action [from] actually functioning and serving the purposes it was designed for.

Person B: Yeah, people are just upset about it, I guess.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: I don't know. When did we ban it? Like 1996 in the UC system?

Person A: Yeah. I don't know. Yeah, that's interesting if that's when it was. That's a long time ago.

Person B: I know, and I'm pretty surprised that it hasn't been put back into place because --

Person A: Yeah. Cal is like -- I think it's three percent Black --

Person B: I know. It's insane.

Person A: -- which is ridiculous, because, I think in my view it should be at least proportional to the population.

Person B: Of California.

Person A: So if it’s a state school -- Yeah, I don’t know. I think California is probably -- I don’t know actually. I don't have my phone on me.

Person B: I think it's six percent or something.

Person A: It’s only six percent? Oh wow.

Person B: It’s pretty low.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: But Hispanics even. We don't have a lot at Cal, and that’s like 50 percent of the population.

Person A: Right, right. Yeah. Definitely, definitely. Yeah, no, for sure.

Person B: I'm looking up California demographics.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: Yeah, okay. 6.4 percent Black.

Person A: Really? Okay. Yeah, I guess. But then we -- I would want to know --

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Okay, we are meant to finish.

Person B: Okay.

Person A: Okay.

Person B: Yeah. All right. It was nice talking to you.

Person A: Okay, nice talking to you. Bye
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Person A: Okay, so what are your thoughts?

Person B: I guess I'll just list [them] out. So obviously I'm on the opposed side, and it's not really because I'm denying that slavery has caused generational issues and caused the great divide between African Americans and White Americans. But I just think that there's a better way to support the African American community. Instead of providing reparations based off of color, I would rather see something based off of income so as to not -- for the people who are doing well and getting reparations, I just feel that's not fair.

Person A: Mm-hmm.

Person B:And yeah, do you have a comment on that one or I can --

Person A: No, I think that that’s a really interesting way to think about it because that’s something that never occurred to me because my attitude was [that] their position in society -- I mean obviously not everyone but African Americans in society have been basically set up to fail based on laws made by the government. And therefore, since the government put them in that position, I feel like they should also have a role in improving it. And there's no set way on how that would necessarily look in terms of reparations. So that's why I was unsure about --

Person B: Yeah.

Person A: Yeah.

Person B: That’s actually a really good point because I was thinking of [this] more from a fiscal perspective. I'm thinking taxes and not so much how the government has had these laws or just society in general has treated African Americans [like they are] of a lesser status. So yeah, I think definitely there is an issue here, and something needs to be addressed. It's just, yeah, I wasn't for the idea of government reparations. Especially since --

Person A: Like fiscally?

Person B: Yeah. And also, just the fact that anyone who was enslaved or was directly involved in slavery is no longer alive, so I just think it's kind of an unfair burden for the descendants. And also, just all the immigrants who have since come, who had absolutely no part in it, not even their ancestors. So it's just a fairness thing to me where I think that, “Okay, if this one group is getting reparations, how about any other group who has ever been wronged?”

Person A: Yeah. No, I feel that. And I think if you look through history, there have been reparations made when the government decided to put Japanese Americans in internment camps and stuff. But I was going somewhere with this, but I don't remember. The only reason why I was thinking about it in not necessarily a fiscal way -- I mean it could take shape in a fiscal way or it could take shape in improving situations for improving schools and stuff like that -- but the only reason why I know so much about this is I literally took a class on basically this. So.

Person B: Oh yeah, that's really interesting. And I think the Japanese internment was a good point that you brought up because they were actually giving reparations to the people who were actually in the camps. So I saw that as a big distinction where those people actually suffered a wrong. It wasn't like they were giving Japanese Americans today, who maybe their grandparent was in the camps, any money. And yeah, that's what I see as a clear distinction. And another thing is just subjectivity. So how much money is enough to fix this problem? Even if you dumped in billions of dollars, I feel there's a more efficient way to do it. If there are different programs or education that can be done to kind of close the gap, that's probably more directed than just saying, “Here's a check. Do what you want with it.”

Person A: Yeah, no, exactly. And I was going to go back to -- because you said that with the reparations, it was specifically for people who were interned -- but the reason why I'm for it for the African American and Black community in general is because you still, even now, see the effects that it has on not all but a big portion -- The government had a really big role in forming ghettos and stuff like that. And a lot of times these families can't escape these ghettos, and people fall victim to gang activity and stuff like that or the war on drugs. And that's just something that the government created through things like red-lining and then the war on drugs, which I'm not even going to talk about that because that's a whole other thing. But I just think that historically, if you look at it, even people who come here from Africa who were not victims of slavery, not like African Americans, you still see the racial treatment of them as negative. Maybe not necessarily here and we don't necessarily see those effects -- I mean even here a little bit. That prejudice is still there. So I don't know how we'd go about fixing that or, in terms of maybe leveling the playing field, maybe improving schools and lower-income areas that are primarily Black, or making it so that they have more opportunities. Because to me, equality is not giving everyone the same treatment. It's giving people the treatment so that they have equal opportunities. And sometimes schools in lower income areas don't even provide the classes needed to go to college and stuff like that. So I just think it's a system issue, and reparations can take any form.

Person B: Yeah. Yeah. And then, your whole argument too, it's suggesting a more targeted approach towards the communities that need it, so I think I could agree with that.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Okay. It was nice to meet you.

Person B: Yes.

Person A: Okay.

Person B: All right

Person A: Bye.

Person B: All right, bye.