# *Pair 196 P421 & P416 – Short Text - T1*

Person B: hey there

Person A: Hi

Person B: where do you stand on the whole campus speech thing  
On the provided scale

Person A: i think I marked a 2 [on the scale] on allowing controversial speakers to come on compas

Person B: Bold

Person A: and then that I dont stand very strongly for this opinion  
Wbu

Person B: I oppose it a little bit, and stand sorta strongly for that  
I just think if its going to be spoken about it should be in a kind of private setting or have some sort of contrasting viewpoint (like a debate rather than a speech) if it's going to be speech that pretty much targets students

Person A: i could see why a private setting would be better  
but if someone so controversial visits campus I bet the number of people wanting to see him or her would be high and that leaves not much room for there to be a smaller/more private group

Person B: I just worry that students could be either marginalized or at worst full on violently resentful if they just hear it in the background while going to class  
and clearly that is the case  
I mean, even zellerbach [hall] is private enough imo, I just dont want it to be like out in the open on campus

Person A: i dont know much about either of the speakers that were supposed to visit berkeley last year but if speakers from the opposing side were to visit, wouldn't there be the same risk of having some students feeling hurt or offended  
i think that would just be a smaller population that feels that way  
i think the main thing i believe is in allowing everyone have free speech  
no matter if they agree with the majority or not

Person B: I mean, the opposing side isn't arguing that other people are bad, just that the people the speakers before were trashing are not rapists and whatnot

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 195 P419 & P420 – Short Text - T1*

Person B: hello

Person A: Hi!  
so what are your thoughts on campus speakers that are "controversial"

Person B: i oppose it  
and i'm assuming you support?

Person A: i would say I support controversial speakers depending on the definition of controversial

Person B: oh yeah same  
like i get that we need to respect everyone's opinions and whatnot but there's definitely a limit  
i don't think we should have speakers that straight up use hate speech and that kind of stuff

Person A: yeah, my top most value would have to protecting everyone's safety

Person B: yeah exactly if we let super controversial speakers speak then that will cause protests

Person A: yeah, thats why i think there is a distinction between milo and ann coulter

Person B: and maybe even start persecuting cultures on campus  
which would be NOT GOOD

Person A: milo is certainly more on the category of hate speech, same with ann coulter since she is basically a firebrand  
i guess the only thing i am uncomfortable saying is that the school itself like UC Berkeley admin gets a say on who comes to campus

Person B: like i think we shouldn't allow people who make a large amount of people uncomfortable speak

Person A: it feels counter to the entire free speech movement

Person B: yeah i totally get free speech but i don't think it necessarily has to be public speakers  
like you can say what you want if it's just you  
but don't broadcast your opinions if it makes a ton of people uncomfortable

Person A: hmmm i understand that, but what if some ideals need to be challenged?  
or at least a lot of times  
I feel like i have no insight into  
how half if not more of the country thinks

Person B: i think there are other avenues besides public speakers for that

Person A: and if we don't bring public speakers of different ideologies, misconceptions will never get cleared up  
like what?

Person B: you can just talk to different people on campus since there are so many different viewpoints, read stuff online, etc  
like public speakers  
are so in your face  
i'm just not comfortable with the idea that  
you might want them there to explore different ideas  
but some other people in the audience might feel persecuted  
Yknow

Person A: interesting, i definitely see that, however, I do disagree that people will go out of their way to dicsover new viewpoints either through reading or talkign to people  
i think that most people stick to what they know

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: good talk byeeee

Person A: bye!!

# *Pair 194 P417 & P413 - Short Text - T1*

Person A: Hello

Person B: Hi

Person A: what is your position on allowing controversial speakers on campus  
?

Person B: Mmh I think that all sides of a political spectrum have the right to free speech but that some speakers go too far so they shouldn't all be allowed. But I don't know too much about what happened last year so I don't have like... a more concrete answer on how to deal with this

Person A: ya i agree. I think as long as the speaker doesn't promote harmful actions or cults or anything like that all sides of politics/culture have a right to be engaged especially at a university. A lot of the problem last year/two years ago was the issue of providing security for speakers and the money involved.

Person B: Right, 'cause we're at an educational institution and these are relevant issues that we are dealing with as adults. I agree with that. I think that debate does make sense. After all, if it's money paid by all the students, some students would probably not want their money to go to that. Do you know if that's how it is for any type of speaker? Maybe it's more like certain departments usually

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: lol that was fast

Person A: with berkeley republicans they funded enough for speakers I think but the extra security needed after the riots proved to be an extra barrier that a lot of students (namely democrats) used as fuel to shut them down

# *Pair 171 P352 & P350 – Short Text - T1*

Person B: Hi!

Person A: Hi

Person B: I hope you are having a great day. Would you like to start the debate or should I?

Person A: Thanks, you too. I guess I will start. I am a proponent of free speech on campus. I am guessing you are an opponent.

Person B: I am, but I am definitely open to hearing your thoughts. I know it is not a clear-cut type of debate.

Person A: One of the main reasons I am a proponent of free speech is that it has started many positive social reforms throughout our history, from civil rights to womens' rights to vote. I like the fact that people can say what they feel as long as it is not threatening

Person B: I would not say I am "opposed to free speech on campus." I am opposed to the idea of allowing controversial speakers (which in the case of Milo Y. and Ann Coulter count as threatening) from coming to campus. It is not an attack to the idea of allowing people to share their opinions, but rather making sure that those opinions are expressed in a way that does not incite violence

Person A: That is a good point. I personally havent seen either of them talk or know much about them. My second point would be that attendance for these speakers is optional. It might make an even greater point if nobody showed up to hear a controversial speaker talk.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Good ideas. It was nice talking with you.

Person B: Likewise!! Thank you for sharing your opinion

# *Pair 81 P173 & P172 - Short Text - T1*

Person B: Hi, so I somewhat oppose having controversial speakers here to speak

Person A: And why is that?

Person B: I understand that people have a right to speak , but hate speech is harmful and often damaging to many listeners  
People feel personally attacked and hurt

Person A: I personally don't mind having them come speak although I usually disagree with their views

Person B: I also feel like there is a major security and danger issue for the speakers who are visiting  
It seems like a bad choice for the speakers to come when they know it could be dangerous  
And problems always seem to arise  
But honestly I don't think prohibiting them from coming is the answer

Person A: I agree with you that there is a difference between having different views and speeches that are actually hurtful, however based solely on them just speaking (and not the uncontrollable aspects) I do think that they have the right to come and speak. We pride ourselves on being the face of free speech and to completely disregard others because we disagree is kind of hypocritical  
If you want to protest or not be exposed to possibly hateful things then it is better to just remove yourself from the situation and not go to their talks

Person B: But by not protesting their hateful ideas, then we are perpetuating the problems

Person A: or even if you disagree completely, go to he talk and listen to what they have to say and actually challenge that as I know most of those people as audience for questions and input  
ask the audience\*  
I do completely agree that it can be unsafe because people outside of the university come in and make it unsafe

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 98 P214 & P217 – Short Text - T1*

Person A: Hi

Person B: Hi!

Person A: My name is [name redacted]

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

Person A: Nice to meet you, [name redacted]!

Person B: Cool. So what was your thought on the topic?

Person A: I think that the administration should play barely any role if any toward who is allowed to speak on campus.  
I think it comes down to issues of free speech, and that if a speaker has an audience they should be allowed to speak on campus to that audience. So long as the speaker does not call for violence or blatant bigotry, white supremacy for example

Person B: Right. So I think a lot of this obviously depends on the level of extremity we are talking about  
But assuming we are talking about very extremely opinionated speakers, I think that there should be some oversight by administrators to make sure we aren't supporting totally one-sided viewpoints

Person A: But opinionated speakers are one-sided by nature. The administration wouldn't be supporting their viewpoints, but rather they would be supporting their free speech.  
I don't think it is the university's responsibility to prevent students from hearing one-sided opinions

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: Yikes, sorry I can't type my response to that quickly enough…

Person A: No worries it was too quick!  
Nice chatting with you

Person B: Yes, nice chatting!

# *Pair 99 P211 & P215 – Short Text - T1*

Person A: Hello

Person B: Hi

Person A: whats your viewpoint on the topic

Person B: I oppose controversial speakers on campus

Person A: whats the main reason you say that

Person B: Last year when the speakers were planning their tour thing it was pretty much just a massive inconvenience to students and the campus. I walked past the SWAT team and road c losures and evryting for like a week  
And then Milo actually showed up and pretty much no one cared  
The only legitimate speaker was Shapiro and he's far less controversial in my opinion

Person A: But don't you think it's important to have all kinds of speakers give speeches on campus  
Shapiro is still pretty controversial

Person B: Yes. But I think the most important thing for our university to protect is our ability to access classes  
He is controversial. The way he came to campus was far more reasonable than Yiannopolis  
Milo just wanted to stir up a shit show

Person A: I think the fact that Berkeley has always been the pioneer and advocate of free speech means that a part of their responsibilities is also to expose students to controversial views that push you to expand your horizons and rethink your values and views  
Yeah thats true

Person B: He came to campus and talked on Sproul steps and didn't even talk about anything. He had no structured event or speech. The main argument in favor is to learn opposing views, I think, but he couldn't even deliver that  
I think Shapiro was fine honestly. I didn't go but he was respectful of campus and followed all our steps by actually getting a venue and everything

Person A: Okay I get what you're saying

Person B: I definitely agree that Berkeley should be an

Person A: But I think on the large scale, if you're not looking at specific speakers, it's good to have controversial speakers around

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 167 P365 & P353 - Short Text - T1*

Person A: Hello

Person B: Hi

Person A: So I have the position that campus speakers should be allowed to speak on campus despite extreme beliefs

Person B: Ok. I disagree somewhat, or at least I think that there should be more strict guidelines about letting speakers on campus

Person A: I believe they should be able to because it is a given right in the First Amendment of the Constitution, because "hate" speech is still protected speech unless it implies harm upon others or puts someone in danger

Person B: I think that when a speaker is known to be very controversial the school ends up spending a ridiculous amount of money on security, which takes away from things like student financial aid

Person A: And that it is important to give another perspective to students, allowing them to see topics from different viewpoints and to be accepting of others' opinions  
So is your main argument that it is an unnecessary financial burden on the school?

Person B: That's part of it, yes. I agree that students should be able to see a new perspective, but in this day and age you can watch these people on the news or on youtube and learn these perspectives that way, without the school having to pay hundreds of thousands of dollars. Also, historically controversial speakers have caused protests that become violent and unsafe for students at times

Person A: I see what you mean, but I think that the financial aspect may be worth the lessons and views given to the student

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 103 P222 & P210 – Short Text - T1*

Person A: Hello  
How's your day going?

Person B: Hey  
It's going good

Person A: That's great to hear! This is quite an interesting survey  
How do you feel about the topic of "allowing extremely controversial speakers to speak on campus?"

Person B: It is, I have some mixed views about our topic and I can certainly see merits to both sides of the argument  
I think that all drugs shouldn't be legalized here in the U.S.

Person A: I think that drugs should be legalized within the United States

Person B: Okay well what do you think about legalizing all drugs?  
I'm not for it because by introducing harmful and strongly addicting substances in the market and giving people easy access to these substances it leads to numerous issues  
First of all it can lead to permanent damage from both a health perspective and a fiscal perspective  
It's well documented that people that are prone to addiction or that are already addicted to substances will go out of their way to obtain them  
These substances are not only harmful to their health but they end up losing their income in the process  
Secondly, it also can lead to third party harm  
By being fiscally responsible or acting out in violent manners, which some people tend to do when addicted, it could severely harm their children or family members, putting multiple people in danger

Person A: That is true, and I can definitely see where the ramifications of allowing highly addictive substances can effect the socio-economic structure of communities and families.  
To your point of "It's well documented that people that are prone to addiction or that are already addicted to substances will go out of their way to obtain them" we can implement better treatment techniques to get these individuals off of their reliance of drugs.

Person B: Better treatment wouldn't be as effective in a situation when you're introducing a mass amount of the substance due to how easily accessible it becomes leading to a greater number of affected people which could potentially cause an overflow in addiction centers

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 123 P261 & P269 - Short Text - T1*

Person B: so i voted that i support allowing controversial speakers to come to campus

Person A: Wait I also support allowing them to come to campus

Person B: however i am against them speaking

Person A: ohhh i see okay  
What do you mean by that? Like they can come and hand out fliers but cannot give a speech?

Person B: no what i mean is i like for them to come to campus to incite protests and bring attention to their usually conservative intentions  
for example, ben shapiro is known for his racism, homophobia, and his disapproval of transgendered people  
so for him to attempt to come speak here, he started a conversation and brought attention to those issues  
but i am completely against the spreading of hate/negativity\

Person A: Yeah and I am totally opposed to Ben Shapiro's views on everything but I think the school should not be spending students' tuition money on hiring police officers to protect these speakers

Person B: exactly  
i completely agree\  
i think art the poimt whrn securityt wqas needed he shpoiuld niot havce come

Person A: I also think that for something like climate change speakers should be allowed to say if they think it isn't real because then you could easily disprove them and prove them wrong

Person B: same

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 125 P262 & P267 - Short Text - T1*

Person A: Hi

Person B: Hi

Person A: How are you?

Person B: good, you?

Person A: Great. Am I correct in assuming you think controversial speakers shouldn't speak on campu?

Person B: well i don't think that all controversial speakers should be completely prevented from speaking on campus  
but i'm thinking more about the excessively controversial ones that invite a lot of chaos and trouble like what we've been having over the past few years

Person A: I think that even if they cause trouble, free speech is really important for an open and effective democracy. But I also think that the way the university hosted those speakers was inappropriate

Person B: i totally agree  
yeah a lot of what i have problems with is how the university handled the whole situation

Person A: they blew it out of proportion by hosting in the middle of campus, disrupting everyone's school and activities, even when the audiences were small enough to fit in a smaller lecture hall on elsewhere on campus

Person B: exactly  
i think the events should be accessible to those who are interested  
but for those that aren't, i think it's unfair that the fallout has to affect the daily lives of everyone on campus  
everybody has classes to go to, assignments to turn in, activities to be a part of

Person A: so how would you feel if someone who espoused hate speech was invited to speak, but at a smaller venue with an attempt at less disruption?  
(though of course, still some disruption because of protests)

Person B: right  
i think in this situation, the student body should be aware of the kinds of things that will be discussed in speaker's event  
personally, i don't think hate speech should be given protection under free speech

Person A: but what gets classified as hate speech?

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 126 P266 & P268 – Short Text - T1*

Person A: Hello

Person B: Hi

Person A: so do we each want to state why we support our certain vie?  
\*view?

Person B: Yeah I think that's fine  
You can go first

Person A: ok, well i support allowing controversial speakers like ann and milo to speak on campus because I believe that it does not constitute as hate speech. While it may be offensive, everybody has the right to speak.  
I also believe that we should take it as an opportunity to try learn about and understand other opinions, giving us time for an open conversation  
Also, people can just not attend if they do not want to listen.

Person B: I do agree with that part about how they should have an opportunity to speak and that those who support them will attend  
I'm just not sure how I feel about it being on campus because I'd like to avoid any outside groups from engaging in violent riots  
I'd rather have them speak a place elsewhere to avoid any violence but I don't mind that they do share their opinions

Person A: i think it's important that people do not support attend as well, but it's everybody decision. for instance, i do not agree w/ milo, ann, or ben, etc, but I would go listen to see. i understand how you do not want any outside groups but that's always a possibility with any speech or event that can occur. while there may be a higher risk, i feel like people could avoid campus or uc berkeley could provide support for students? regardless, i think they should still be able to speak

Person B: Yeah, while I do agree that it's important that people be open minded and listen to what they have to say even if they disagree with their viewpoints, but in general I don't think the hassle of closing down sproul and having several police officers on campus directing foot traffic makes anyone comfortable

Person A: i think it can be approached differently  
but yes i understand your concern

Person B: From my experience being on campus and living near sproul, it was just a hassle to have it in an area

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 165 P364 & P363 - Short Text - T1*

Person B: Hi

Person A: hello  
would you like to begin?

Person B: Yea

Person A: have at it

Person B: i dont support extremely controversial speakers coming if their words directly encourage violence to those that arent necessarily involved  
thats how i defined controversial at least

Person A: I see  
I have a sense of acceptance, where it is important to have a reflection of both sides.  
People will conflict, and that's just human nature. But to understand each other requires us to be open and considerate before countering  
Maybe provide each speaker with a counter speaker, andthen let it to be to the comfort of the general public to accept what they think is right.

Person B: I agree with that. as long as both sides are respectful then it is important to hear opposing views  
I would prefer if these speakers used logic and facts to prove their points rather than being emotionally charged

Person A: Exactly. It can be a little lopheaded to have extremely controversial people, but that is what can help to show what is concerning about society

Person B: Yea totally agree with that  
It gives a chance for people to see how other things and form the right type of arguments to bring the opposing side to their side

Person A: But, I liked your point, having logic and facts that have been grounded/proven (by credible sources, which brings a whole other issue)

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Cool

Person B: looks like we are on the same page

Person A: Glad to hear. Have a good one.

# *Pair 77 P167 & P168 - Short Text - T1*

Person B: Hello. Our topic is speakers?

Person A: Yes. My position is that controversial speakers should absolutely be allowed to express their positions in a campus setting.

Person B: I was somewhat divided on the topic. While I think that people have their right to free speech, there are many things that can be considered hate speech and attack students as human beings.

Person A: That's certainly true. Let me suggest a few reasons why I think free speech on campus is critical. (1) Free speech is the basis of a free society. All individuals should be able to express their opinions and ideas freely.Moreover, in order to come to the truth, we need to be able to work out our ideas in the give and take of conversation. This means we must necessarily risk being wrong, insensitive, and even offensive,as we grope toward the truth.

Person B: I agree with that, but I do think that topics that question autonomy and agency of humans should not be something that is even being debated and questioned.

Person A: Can you explain what you mean? Or give an example?

Person B: For example, with abortion rights. There is a huge debate on whether they should be given and I believe that this is a serious violation of the rights of women and the choices they have over their bodies. Here, women's free speech and freedom to pursue their own actions are taken away through the debate in the first place. Not sure if that makes sense.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 164 P354 & P362 – Short Text - T1*

Person B: Hi! 

Person A: Hello! 

Person B: How should we do this? Shall we both type out our points and send it over? 

Person A: Sounds good!  
Do you want to start? 

Person B: OK sure!  
I oppose allowing extremely controversial speakers to speak on campus because:  
- It can promote violence: Having controversial speakers usually means there will be people present to watch who both support and oppose the speaker and there is potential for clashes between them  
- Cost: UCPD [police department] spent a lot of money when Milo came to speak on campus for safety precautions and while safety is so important, that money could be going elsewhere  
- Hate speech: Controversial speakers can promote hate speech instead of constructive understandings. I think at a certain point things can not be free speech anymore but become hate speech  
- There are other ways to promote free speech besides inviting controversial speakers to campus

Person A: You have some good points but I think there are still benefits to having controversial speakers on campus. For one, hearing others' opinions other than your own even if they are controversial can help you expand your views and opinions. Always hearing things that you support and deem the norm, I believe traps you in your own bubble. When you listen to controversial speakers, you can expose yourself to their ideas that you do not have to agree with.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 268 P567 & P568 - Short Text - T1*

Person B: Hi! I oppose allowing extremely controversial speakers to speak on campus. What about you?

Person A: Hi! I support allowing extremely controversial speakers peak on campus, but to some extent only. Are you completely against it?

Person B: I see. I think I put like -2 (instead of -3) on [the scale] because I do understand the importance of free speech and how it can start going down a slippery slope if we limit free speech for some and not others, but my reasoning is that in the end, the safety of the students is the most important. And that means that sometimes allowing freedom of speech for certain individuals can impede on the freedom of safety for others.

Person A: I put 1 and it relates to your reasoning. I understand that when controversial speakers come to speak they may attack certain groups of people, but I feel that sometimes people don't let them come simply because they don't support views contrary to theirs.  
But I agree with your reasoning.  
\*contrary to their own

Person B: That's a good point. I see why you said to some extent only. I do think that at a campus like Berkeley, certain voices tend to be shut down before they're even given a chance to speak. So I think you're right that they should be given a chance to speak. I opposed it also because the prompt said "extremely controversial" speakers and I was thinking of one case at my old school where Milo Y was allowed to come, and a gun was fired at the event and a student had to go to the hospital  
Yes, that makes sense

Person A: A gun was fired at the event in response to what the speaker said?

Person B: No, there was a lot of build-up and tension because people knew he was coming. And certain right-wing students were there to support him and there were left-wing students there protesting and one of them got shot  
He didn't die but he had to go to the hospital

Person A: I see what you're saying and that makes sense. If it's a safety hazard then for sure extremely controversial speakers shouldn't be allowed to come to schools.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 280 P593 & P595 - Short Text - T1*

Person B: I think this particular controversy is a bit of a grey area. I do understand and believe in the importance of free speech as a human right. With that being said, I think it is unacceptable for a (public) university such as UC Berkeley to host and fund a speaker that is overwhelmingly hurtful to significant populations of students on campus, not to mention even more people outside of the student body. Furthermore, a lot of the speakers who were possibly going to speak on UC Berkeley's campus directly targeted groups of students who are already marginalized and oppressed as it is. By allowing such speakers to speak on these topics, we only perpetuate and maintain the societal hardships these people face.  
  
Person A: hi! so i believe that there should be allowed speakers who are seen as controversial, mostly because it gives people a chance to actually hear their side of the argument and how it lacks of credibility. My main idea is that having them come speak is an opportunity for students to understand the ideas of logical fallacy, and the fact that these speakers are wrong for a reason. I don't believe inviting them is agreeing with them. I think that inviting them gives students like us a chance to challenge their statements in person and confront them about their controvesial beliefs. I heard a podcast about a young black man at a certain college who invited scholars who were known for being racist. Many people were upset with him, but he said he did it so students could actually be exposed to this kind of rhetoric and hear its upsetting message for themselves. I think that starting riots, like what happened when Ann Coulter came last year, only fuels the fire of their fan base and does not actually accomplish much. I believe that all sides in an argument must be heard, even the ugly ones. I believe that these are teaching moments for students about recognizing logical falacies and being able to identify incorrect or hurtful speech when it presents itself.previously I would have agreed with you 100%, but listening to that student from this podcast really opened my eyes to the purpose of actually inviting speakers to campus and how to turn the current rhetoric on its head.  
  
Person B: I completely agree with you on the riots, and I do think you offer an interesting point. However, I would counter your unique argument by saying that I am not opposed to creating platforms for which students can hear and engage with these topics and beliefs (even, as you call them, the ugly ones). However, I think a debate or some other kind of event would have been a better option

**[Experimenter says time is up]**  
  
Person A: it was nice talking to you though for this 6 minutes   
  
Person B:  
Haha likewise!

# *Pair 168 P351 & P360 - Short Text - T3*

Person B: Hey!

Person A: Hello! 

Person B: So, you're against legalizing drugs?

Person A:I am for legalizing drugs  
Are you for or against? 

Person B: I'm against!  
Sorry  
So what are your arguments  
I believe that we shouldn't legalize drugs because I'm taking this drugs and the brain class, and I was reading this article, and they spoke about how people are creating synthetic drugs, which are just a combination of already existing drugs.  
Because the rate at which these drugs are being produced, doctors don't have any treatments. So, when patients who use these drugs and overdose, doctors can't treat them.  
As a result, chances of death are higher.  
Therefore, I think, in this case, legalizing drugs will only make it easier for people to create synthetic drugs. 

Person A: Okay my first point is that people will do drugs regardless of if they are illegal or not. I am skeptical that outlawing drugs deters usage because either you are interested in using them or not. If you are interested (because they are so accessible) you are going to take them. I don't believe fear of the law will stop people. Also, I would be interested to see how many people have not done certain drugs JUST because they are illegal rather than because they are wary of the effects. I believe the number is relatively low  
I am also taking drugs and the brain, what a coincidence! 

Person B: That's true! But I think banning all drugs except for medical purposes should be more effective.  
Because there is this whole notion of drug culture. It might be due to peer pressure or whatever, but there are a lot of people who do drugs illegally cause they think it's "cool". 

Person A: I would argue that legalizing drugs would minimize synthetic drugs because legal drugs can be more regulated and therefore it would be harder to convince people to take synthetic drugs. 

Person B: But if all drugs are banned, then their access to drugs will be cut off completely!  
Really what's your discussion time??  
Yes, but legalizing drugs can also mean that people can make synthetic drugs more easily. It doesn't solve the problem completely 

Person A: But those people would do them if they were legal or illegal. The people being affected by drugs being illegal are adults who are being incarcerated (mostly minorities)

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 170 P356 & P361 - Short Text - T3*

Person A: Hello!

Person B: Hi, what's your name?  
I'm [name redacted]

Person A: lol are we supposed to reveal our names

Person B:  
Oh maybe not idk

Person A: hahhaha its okay I'll be S  
Okay do you support or oppose legalization

Person B: Sure thing

Person A: I'm guessing they paired us opposites

Person B: Okay, number of things: I think it's a poorly worded question because support legalization of some drugs and not others

Person A: So I said that I supported legalization of drugs in a general sense  
What do you support and what don't you support?  
I said that I supported the legalization because I think certain drugs being illegal creates a stigma where people who may be in trouble are less likely to reach out for help  
because they know what they're doing is illegal

Person B: I think some drugs are more dangerous and addictive than others and I'm not sure it should be up to the average person to be able to use certain things. I'm fine with marijuana, alcohol, probably LSD 

Person A: And I've seen people around me get in trouble for the smallest things simply because they were illegal and I don't think the punishments in these cases are justified with the degree of the crime 

Person B: Okay, I see where you're coming from but I think there are two different problems here  
There's like getting getting arrested for marijuana possession, which I think is ridiculous 

Person A: I think you're assessing personal safety whereas I'm thinking about social and legal stigma 

Person B: And there's the heroin addiction crisis going on in large portions of the US that completely ruins quality of life for many people  
Okay. Let's talk about social aspects first?

Person A: I agree with you when it comes to watching out for the gen publics safety with laws  
okay!  
First did you also think the question was very leading

Person B: What do you mean?

Person A: like they cited a specific example where legalization produced positive results  
but not the other way around

Person B: Oh absolutely

Person A: so I feel like results might be skewed unless ppl came in w preexisting strong opinions  
okay social aspects through

Person B: That particular stat is not the whole story  
Sure

Person A: \*though  
Socially, I think that especially among teenagers it  
it's become a "cool thing to do," while other countries were it is legal might not have that attitude to the same degree  
does that make sense?

Person B: Definitely

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: yieks that was fast  
alright pleasure talking w u

Person B: I know didn't come close to finishing that  
You too

# *Pair 198 P418 & P414 - Short Text - T3*

Person B: Hi 

Person A: Hey  
Do you want to share your opinion first? 

Person B: Sure!  
for the specific topic on the legalization of drugs I am opposed it but am not too much to the side if that makes sense 

Person A: Okay yeah I get that 

Person B: So what's your opinion on the topic? 

Person A: I'm for the legalization of drugs for a few reasons  
mainly because there is just so much time and money put into the "war on drugs" that could be put to good use in other places  
Also like they said in the survey, Portugal, and other European countries, have legalized all drugs and have had less of a problem 

Person B: yeah I guess so but at the same time the reason why I'm against it because of the socioeconomic problems it cause and the effects on families

Person A: Yeah I agree there  
But at the end of the day, it's the person's choice whether or not to use drugs

Person B: I understand that it helped Portugal but I just think that it will bring more problems than solutions to the US at its current state

Person A: and medical care would be much more helpful than jail time  
I can agree there

Person B: I guess so but i think the person on drugs is less motivated to get treatment because there is no real consequence behind their usage except really a financial one

Person A: If they're having negative consequences regarding their families, they should be motivated  
I don't know how much jail time would improve that, considering many people go back to drugs after they have served their sentence

Person B: I guess but that hasn't really stopped people so far and there is a huge drug epidemic  
that is true  
they do

Person A: Yeah there is a huge drug epidemic, but just the resources used for it seem to be wasteful

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 269 P570 & P569 – Short Text - T3*

Person A: Hello!

Person B: Hi!

Person A: Are you Participant 569?

Person B: Yes

Person A: Cool I'm participant 570

Person B: Nice to meet you 570 lol

Person A: :) 

Person B: So you support legalizing drugs in the US?

Person A: Yes  
And I guess you oppose it?

Person B: Yes, mostly. Although I see some reasons why some would be for it

Person A: Ah I see. Tell me more about your stance!

Person B: What are some of your key points?  
Okay!  
Well I think if we legalize drugs, then the intake of drugs will overall increase. They will be easily accessed by children and young adults.  
Similar to alcohol now

Person A: I do see your point, and I guess my stance is that I would want the government to decriminalize drugs so that people don't get sent to jail for it, but I would want there to be some societal standard that doing drugs is not a good thing. For me, my opposition is mainly towards to criminalization and incarceration of drug users.

Person B: Another reason is for how drugs effect you. This could be lower levels of productivity at work and less involvement with family and loved ones, which can lead to divorce, and then depression

Person A: Yes, I absolutely agree

Person B: Yeah I agree with you. I don't think people should be sent to jail for a long time for minor drug related things  
And if it were legalized the government could tax it

Person A: Yup! People who get released after doing jail time have a harder time finding housing, education, employment etc, so it's more likely they relapse too  
Because of their "felon" status

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 271 P574 & P575 – Short Text - T3*

Person A: Cool. So hi, I may type slowly because i suck at typing

Person B: Haha that is okay. What is your stance on drugs

Person A: Mmkay, so I said yes we should legalize drugs

Person B: Why's that

Person A: it opens drugs to be studied pharmaceutically  
Like medical marijuana

Person B: True but that is medical not recreational drug use

Person A: But also the new clinical study that's focused on the beneficial side of LSD  
Well delegalizing drugs means scientists could work on it  
But also  
Legalizing drugs reduces the amount of people in prison  
We shouldn't be shovong people wo've committed minor drug offenses with people who have felonies

Person B: There are instances where yes medical drug use would be useful in life/death situations, however drugs used recreationally aren't controlled in any way. Therefore people can easily over dose because they aren't educated in the proper amounts they can take

Person A: Sure  
I agree  
but to do that  
You need to allow people to have the courage to come forward and ask questions  
If you make it illegal  
People are too scared to ask  
They're going to do it anyways  
But if you can regulate it  
At least if thier lives are in danger we know and we can help  
\*their

Person B: The smell of drugs is also terrible. Especially with the legalization of marijuana, you walk down the street and you have to cough or you see people plugging their noses or putting their faces in their shirts  
True they will probably do it anyway, but it isn't good for you because it alters your state of mine  
Mind

Person A: Um, I think I can deal with the smell if I know it's helping someone out  
With their medical problem  
Also just move to another area?

Person B: makes you do things that you wouldn't typically do, similarly to alcohol but to a different extent

Person A: Well see look  
That's the point  
Alcohol is regulated  
And drugs AREN"T  
Alcohol id drugs too  
But we regulate alcohol and that makes all the difference

Person B: People aren't going to want to move to another area if the place they have is affordable, accessible, and in a good location for them and their roommate/family

Person A: People are willing to get help with alcohol addiction

Person B: Same as people should be willing to get help with drug addictions  
but they aren't so it shouldn't be legalized until people are

Person A: Well then sure there can be buildings or places where marijiana use is allowed, like smokinh

Person B: very very few

Person A: But that's the point  
Poeple AREN"T getting help

Person B: i don't think its actually legal here to do that

Person A: That's why we have a public crisis going on

Person B: people aren't getting help which is why it shouldn't be legalized  
it will get out of control and more people will die or overdose or put them or their friends in danger

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 272 P571 & P573 - Short Text - T3*

Person A: Hello!

Person B: Hi~~  
So my stance on drugs is that we should legalize some drugs

Person A: When you say some drugs, what do you mean?

Person B: right so some drugs that have medical purposes. Because taboo against drugs and the risk of imprisonment,  
many people are unable to obtain drugs  
and research around the medical benefits of some drugs have been limited  
and is considered as fuzzy gray zone

Person A: I believe in the example it was referring to drugs like marijuana, alcohol, nictoine, etc. NOT hard drugs  
just so we are on the same page

Person B: yeahh

Person A: I think that long term effects on drug research is limited  
but in the short term, a lot have proven to be beneficial

Person B: right I agree

Person A: i think the grey zone should be approached with precaution

Person B: yeah

Person A: I believe legalizing drugs has a whole lot more benefits than just the medical one

Person B: okay like for example?  
I do think so too

Person A: Reduction of crime around drug trade, decriminalization (means poor/black people are less likely to go down for a petty crime), it would be more controlled

Person B: yeah totally

Person A: big economic gains

Person B: I am from Brazil where drug trafficking is a very serious problem  
yes  
there's so much violence from the police

Person A: I have lived in brazil for 4 years, so i know how the situation is

Person B: trying to root out drug trafficking  
oh wow  
I mean you know what happened in Phillipines

Person A: Yes the violence is overpowering, and a lot of that is from the taboo of what drugs do to you

Person B: yeah so I think that if we do a good job education people of the health risks

Person A: I think legalizing will open the eyes to a lot of people

Person B: and stuff  
I think legalizing drugs could be a good solution  
Yeah

Person A: As long as its controlled i think it should be legalized!

Person B: yes I agree

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 281 P599 & P596 - Short Text - T3*

Person A: Hi!

Person B: Hello

Person A: [Name redacted] here

Person B: What was your primary stance on this topic?

Person A: my stance was for the legalisation of drugs in the US

Person B: Would you like to start?

Person A: i presume yours was somewhere on the other end of the spectrum  
You can go first  
i'm still collecting my thoughts

Person B: Yes, I gave it a -2 [on the scale].  
Sure  
I listed that I opposed the legalization of drugs in the United States for the following reasons:First, I'd like to add that I weighed both the advantages and disadvantages to the legalization of drugs.First, it's mostly abused and used for recreational purposes.According to many statistical data, it shows that the disadvantages outweigh its benefits for medicinal uses.My second argument is that its overall harmful to one's health (considering both the physical and mental states). However, there are a limited number of cases in which it is exceptional.But, majority of these instances have negative side effects on the body.

Person A: I do agree with you that the abuse of drugs for purely recreational purposes is detrimental; i would also desire that this issue is tackled. my stance arises mostly from a tactical concern regarding the problem. I think legalising does not equate condoning, much less promoting. Instead, when coupled with a rigorous regulatory framework, I believe it might be able to better control the drug situation (based on what I understand of the US, there seems to be some drug epidemic of sorts - evidence that when people want to get their hands on something, they will).  
It's just that without legalisation and control, these desperate people will have to resort to underground means, which could be dangerous for them as well, and it is hard to regulate such supportFrom:  
they might also find it impossible to get help for their situation for the fear of prosecution

Person B: Before we end, I'd like to add that the third most important issue is addiction. Not only does this lead to a failure of making reasonable choices in our society but it also decreases our economical growth.

Person A: I do agree with you that it is dangerous! but i think thinking about what policy would be most EFFECTIVe is important

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 270 P565 & P566 - Short Text - T3*

Person A: Heya

Person B: hello  
Haha

Person A: ya right?  
okay, so I'm assuming you disagree with me

Person B: yeah hahaha I oppose leagalization of drugs

Person A: I support the legalization of most drugs (couple extreme exceptions), and I feel fairly strongly about it, but I understand the counterarguments  
what's your position on it, if I can ask?

Person B: well, I come from Singapore  
and there all forms of drugs are illegal

Person A: like, everything? alcohol and tobacco?

Person B: except alcohol and tabacco

Person A: ah

Person B: even e-cigarettes are illegal  
there's a heavy penalty for both consumption and possession of drugs

Person A: and you've seen that work properly?

Person B: the most severe being the death penalty for a few grams of heroin

Person A: ouch

Person B: I'd say it's worked  
Haha  
yeah ouch

Person A: hmmm  
See, I get that drugs are a problem, and they're bad for people and all that

Person B: our rationale stems mostly from deterrence

Person A: and I get that - high penalties are supposed to deter people from using

Person B: what's your view and rationale?

Person A: but I really don't think criminalization is the answer  
because America's penalties for drugs are VERY high (not death penalty, but still really high)  
and we have a drug epidemic  
see, legalizing drugs to me does a couple of things  
1.) It destroys the illegal drug trade. Drugs are way more expensive when they're being illegally made and smuggled, and that's where you get cartels (like in Prohibition)  
legalize drugs, and there's no market - a lot of organized crime around the world suddenly collapses  
2.) Criminalizing drugs misses the point, to me  
sorry I talked too much XD

Person B: haha no worries  
I see.

Person A: just...I don't think making drugs a crime is the answer - there are a lot of root causes that we're ignoring if we do  
economic desperation, psycholgical dependence, etc.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 144 P304 & P306 - Short Text - T3*

Person B: So I assume that you are against legalizing drugs?

Person A: Yeah  
Idk to me it just seems very arbitrary about what is legal and what is illegal

Person B: Fair enough, but I think we should be more clear on what legalizing drugs means (Like just because it is legal, it doesn't mean that it would be free for all access xD)  
Yeah, I agree, so what did u interpret as legal

Person A: I'm not saying 12 year olds should be allowed to do cocaine, but if an adult wants to try it I dont see why they shouldn't be allowed to

Person B: Yes, so it should be legalized?

Person A: I interpreted legal like the laws of alcohol/weed  
adults should be free to use whatever legally

Person B: Similar, so it's legalized but still heavily regulated

Person A: with it being legal the regulations required would clean up the drugs being used  
so in a way it would be safer for people already using

Person B: This would ensure that the consumption of it will be more safe as well  
I feel like we are agreeing that it should be legalized here  
O  
I'm kind of confused now lmapo  
Lmao8

Person A: wait I assumed you were against legalization. I am for it

Person B: I am for it as well  
Look back at the first question I asked

Person A: I wonder if one of us misclicked the survey? or are we supposed to be in agreement

Person B: Idk dude

Person A: easy debate

Person B: I could argue for the other side to spice things up  
Haha

Person A: why not

Person B: Dammit all my points are for rn  
Legalizing it would cause access to it more frequent despite the regulations  
Chances for children and minors to access the drug will become more common than if were illegal  
It would also encourage the consumption of drug recreationally as it is not longer illegal

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 124 P264 & P271 – Short Text - T3*

Person B: Hi

Person A: hello!  
so how are we feeling about this topic?

Person B: so i personally oppose legalizing drugs

Person A: do you feel really strongly about that or just meh?

Person B: i don't think i feel super strongly about it because I honestly haven't seen both sides of the argument super clearly and I don't know that much about the topic in general  
but my first reaction was to oppose it

Person A: oh thats interesting, I support legalizing drugs because we tried to make alcohol illegal during the prohibition and people still drank illegal, like the law didn't stop them at all, its just put more people in jail and costed a lot more for the government

Person B: hmmm that definitely makes sense

Person A: and also like it said when we were taking the survey, portugal legalized all drugs and now they have a much lower drug over dose rate and a lot less people in jail because of drug charges

Person B: i feel like the laws we have in place right now aren't that effective at stopping drug use  
but despite like the evidence from Portugal  
i still feel like completely legalizing drugs would just allow for it to spread more easily  
and people who might not have wanted to risk getting caught in the first place would be more inclined to try it

Person A: yeah I would support legalizing drugs if the governement spent the money they would use to jail people instead and used that money to put towards rehab centers  
but also higher jail penalties do not deter people from commiting the crime  
the governemnt already tried that with mandatory minimums on jail sentences and the rate of crime didn't go down

Person B: i definitely agree that putting money towards rehab centers is more effective

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: well it was nice talking to you!

Person B: you too!

# *Pair 142 P307 & P310 – Short Text - T3*

Person B: Hello!

Person A: Hi!

Person B: So...legalizing drugs?

Person A: I support that  
What do you think?

Person B: I'm opposed to legalization, I'd much rather prefer decriminalization. As legalization implies the legalizing of producing and selling drugs  
Which I do not see many benefits for, and many issues.

Person A: What do you mean by decriminalization?  
for all drugs?

Person B: Decriminalizing meaning rather than imposing jail sentences to those using drugs, they would instead be directed towards rehabilitative services.

Person A: Hmm.. I can see how that would help the current issue. This would help people who also have an addiction to these drugs. This goes along with what I think is a major issue, that people currently do not seek out medical attention when necessary because they are afraid that they will get caught for their illegal drugs. Legalizing it would allow people to them seek medical resources when in danger.

Person B: I agree with you, largely until the point of legalization. I wouldn't want to see the sale and usage of drugs become something that is institutional. Imagine if the doors were opened for companies to sell heroin using modern marketing techniques.  
People who use drugs should be helped, not punished.  
But those who sell shouldn't be helped

Person A: Thats very true. I don't think we should help and increase the sale of those drugs. But as we can see with the recent legalization of marijuana, there have been very strict laws put in place for both those who sell and those who buy. People are going to buy/use these drugs no matter if they are legal are not. I think it would just the governement if they could make money off these taxes?

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 145 P296 & P308 - Short Text - T3*

Person A: Hello!

Person B: hello! (:

Person A: how are you?

Person B: good good haha

Person A: easy way to make $13 huh

Person B: i know right

Person A:Hahah  
So

Person B: but in any case

Person A: about the topic

Person B: was your response like supporting?  
legalising drugs in US

Person A: yes, I put "somewhat supporting" and my opinion is "somewhat strong"  
i'm not as familiar with the statistics as I'd like to be to really, truly argue for it

Person B: oh okay, mine was like 2 [on the scale] which is like opposing, and yeah i think somewhat strong too.  
but so, why do you support anyway

Person A: but I think in the past, from what I've heard on numerous occasions, places that have legalized some of the harder drugs have seen significant decreases in deaths as result of overdoses  
addiction is in the DSM IV and is a medical condition and should be treated as such  
legalizing it would allow individuals to contact emergency help care more safely if they were not afraid of legal consequences  
Drugs could also get a hefty tax (I think MJ in California is taxed at like 25%) and that could go to benefit social programs or rehab programs

Person B: I do agree that it should be treated and more support should be given to drug abusers, but i feel like legalising it would only make things worse because they become more accessible. i think if a country has harsh laws against it (well, im from singapore and in singapore, drug trafficking is a criminal offence and would result in capital punishment), then it might see a drop in drug trafficking in general and drug abuse in total?

Person A: And this is not to say that I am, at all, encouraging consistent, recreational hard drug use, but I believe people should be able to do it if they want to, as long as they are not hurting other individuals in any way

Person B: and plus legalising it, yes maybe there's a decrease in deaths due to like lesser overdose, but i dont think that improves the social environment  
i think it is more critical to put in resources and tell people that it's okay to seek help for drug addiction

Person A: I don't think these people are better off dead though

Person B: just to clarify, the capital punishment is only for people who traffick drug  
meaning to say they import the drugs and distribute it to people for consumption.

Person A: as for accessibility, think about it now, anyone who wants drugs that bad can 100% get it here, especially in a city or through people.

Person B: so that's my background in thinking why it should be banned  
i would say it might be harder for US because of the big country so harder to enforce

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: haha nice talking to you though !

Person A: byyeeee!! good job

Person B: $$$  
HAHA

Person A: groceries for l8r

# *Pair 143 P301 & P299 - Short Text - T3*

Person B: Hi!

Person A: Hello, my name is [name redacted].  
I don't think you will find me very engaging in terms of debate, I really am not a debater. I am an anthro major and as such, I believe all opinions must be honored.

Person B: haha, i see. i'm a business major and not much a political person anyway  
I personally oppose legalizing drugs because I think that this increases the accessibility of drugs (and also means more advertising), which in turn results in more people interested to jump on the bandwagon. while it does help that legalizing drugs = people are unafraid to call for help when someone is overdosed; more people doing drugs = more people likely to get overdosed

Person A: I try to look at all opinions from as many sides as possible and that context and where and how a person has grown determines their political position. And I agree with you totally. I am not much of a political person myself.

Person B: And i think another effect would be: more involved in drugs = lower national productivity. and if it is true that more people are getting overdosed/abusing drugs, it also means that more money is spent (as a country) on healthcare/medical needs  
what about you? :)

Person A: I agree and do see your point. I think legalizing pot is ok, but I am not sure about other drugs such as LSD or cocaine. So even though we might not have agreed totally with the question to begin with, I do not think we are that far apart in our opinions.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 166 P357 & P359 - Short Text - T3*

Person A: Hello

Person B: Hi

Person A: Do you support or oppose?

Person B: Oppose, and I believe you support?

Person A: I support the legalization of drugs

Person B: Why?

Person A: yeah haha  
I wrote down 6 reasons, but first off I believe that there should be regulations as with all things such as minimum age, also more info should be available about side affects  
My first argument was that after weed was legalized, there wasn't a significant increase in the use  
Secondly, at least in CA we have a 3 strikes law, which means that after the 3rd crime, a person is sent to jail for life no matter the crime, and I do not believe drug use is a severe enough crime to be sent to jail for life  
That is not productive  
what are some of your positions?

Person B: I'll go ahead and type out some of my argument:  
First off there are some less dangerous drugs like weed that may not need to be illegal since they are very common and not as harmful.

There are a lot of dangerous side effect not only to people using them but others around them. It impairs logical and proper thinking and can expose people to issues they didn't know they had, skitzo etc because it impacts people's chemical compositions differently.  
With legalization, some drugs may be easier to access  
less barriers  
For people who really want to do drugs, they will find a way illegal or not, but at least for curious users who may not fully understand the consequences, it can prevent them from using it simply for fear of law

Person A: For sure, I also thought of how it affects others, but my position is that it really only harms the person taking them and if that person becomes a threat to others, the law will account for protecting other citizens and I bleieve also that if it is legalized, some laws can be formed in order to better give people help when they do have addictions  
I think that by making drug use illegal, it specifically targets some groups i.e. minorities

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: good talk!

Person A: Thanks for your arguments!  
I see where you're coming from

# *Pair 102 P218 & P212 - Short Text - T3*

Person A: Hi

Person B: Hi  
So, what's your opinion? I'm guessing you support the legalization of drugs?

Person A: Yes. My stance is supporting the legalization of drugs  
We see success in legalizing marijuana. Government can tax the sales of drugs and use this money for other social goods

Person B: I responded that I oppose a more widespread legalization of drugs, because although the survey talked about how legalizing them could make more people get help with their addictions, I don't think that would end drug abuse—after the Prohibition ended, people have continued to abuse alcohol, for instance, and still hide that without getting help

Person A: The legalization of drugs would make no difference to the urge of doing drugs of people who are already addicted or want to try drugs

Person B: But as I was coming up with points for this debate, I'm thinking that actually what bothers me more about legalizing them now is that since they've been illegal for so long, we don't have adequate knowledge about their effects, especially in the long-term. I think if they are to be legalized, they should have to go through the same sort of clinical studies (through the FDA/other organizations) as new pharmaceuticals  
But it would make them more accessible to people who might want to try them, making casual use (that could easily lead to addiction) much more common

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: Thanks for the debate

Person A: We need more time

Person B: same

# *Pair 101 P223 & P219 - Short Text - T3*

Person A: hello, what's your opinion on the drug question from the survey?  
i answered strongly support (legalization)  
or decriminalization, as it says in the prompt

Person B: Hi! I have conflicting ideas right now because there are pros and cons to both sides, however I am leaning towards supporting legalization

Person A: oh LOL okay we have similar views then  
i guess i'll state my ideas / side of it  
and let me know what you agree/disagree with  
i support decriminalization of scheduled substances with the philosophy that it is the governments job to provide opportunity and safety to its citizens, rather than be a moral body.  
1. this will reduce the amount of inmates in America's already crowded prisons, and allow them to receive proper mental health treatment  
2. this will provide an improved overall mental health culture in America, where treatment is viewed as the proper next step (rather than punishment or prison)  
3. risk of adulterated substances (things cut with other stuff) and overdosing is reduced since it is not taboo or illegal, therefore getting dosages / your drugs tested would be much easier

Person B: I opposed because I was thinking about the individual using the drugs to harm others and themselves so when there is less access, it becomes more difficult to inflict harm on others. However, I agreed with supporting legalization because then the people can be put into medical facilities to get the treatment that they need and so the money can instead be allocated towards medical care. Also, the usage declines when it is legalized because people feel less of a desire to do something when they have better access to. Like, when you're a little kid you want whatever your mom says no to.  
I totally agree w your number 3

Person A: i really agree with the last thing you mentioned about reducing use overall. this was heavily shaped by my experiences abroad (including but not exclusive to Portugal). the more lax culture around drugs + alcohol made it less of an 'extreme outlet" and more of just something you do if you want to.  
it's not like people really want to be addicted to drugs or mess up their lives

Person B: yeah exactly totally agree

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: wow nice we did it

Person B: yayyy  
lol

# *Pair 79 P162 & P161 - Short Text - T3*

Person A: Hello!

Person B: Hi

Person A: Do you oppose or support legalizing drugs in the US?

Person B: I guess I oppose legalization of drugs. It would depend on the specific drugs in question, but for most I oppose it  
You?

Person A: I'd say for the most part I support legalizing drugs in the US  
If drugs are legalized, the government can have oversight over what exactly is happening, as opposed to turning a blind eye to underground, "black market" type dealings  
the revenue that comes from drug sales can be taxed, and that money can go towards helping these people actually get help, instead of putting them in overcrowded prison systems  
It seems like we spend so much money putting people in prison and paying cops to send them there rather than helping people get the treatment they need. I think legalization would help with that

Person B: I understand the concern about underground drug dealings and the negative things that go along with that, but in general I believe that drugs are harmful to individuals. I'm not sure most people can be trusted to not use drugs and this ends up harming both themselves and society as a whole. There should be some incentive for them to not use them in the first place and making them illegal is one way to do that.  
I agree that there are definitely problems with the current way drugs are handled, but I don't think that legalizing them would solve these problems

Person A: The illegality of drugs doesn't serve as much of an incentive for people to not use them. If it did, we wouldn't have as big a problem as we have now

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: I'm glad I got to hear your opinion!

Person A: thanks, you too!

# *Pair 82 P170 & P171 - Short Text - T3*

Person A: Hi

Person B: hi

Person A: so i was pro drugs because i feel like there would be better regulation and awareness of drug use/abuse which would help address current drug issues

Person B: I think uneducated people might be misled by this proposal. Since people believe that legalizing process is somehow beneficial to their actions.

Person A: or pro legalizing drugs  
i think there's an understanding that drugs are illegal for the harmful effects it has on the body but growing public awareness and education is important in preventing drug abuse

Person B: I was like a little opposing to it because we dont know how to really solve these problems now  
So it might be too early to make it legalizing

Person A: people might be more inclined to want to try drugs because of the illegal and risky nature behind it but being able to talk about it without fear allows people to understand more

Person B: And drugs are harmful to people so they should not be recognized?

Person A: also for example, amsterdam or however it's spelled legalized a lot of drugs

Person B: Yeah

I think people who dont use drugs will be affected by those who use drugs, and legalization cannot turn this over?

Person A: but they don't have an issue because the culture has allowed people to better understand and be educated in the effect of it and the govt is able to profit and reinvest the money into addressing the topic  
people who use drugs will always exist  
it doesn't matter if it's legal or not  
but like alcohol or weed  
legalizing it gives the opportunity for a culture to shift and discuss an issue and provide economic opportunities as well

Person B: It could be, but for those like cocaine

Person A: cocaine is a hard drug but the issue now is that the making of it is unregulated and more dangerous that way

Person B: Really does harm for health mentally and physically

Person A: govt intervention can regulate the quality of the drug and somewhat curb illegal drug trade

Person B: Some people would not violate laws since its illegal but more poeple will try

Person A: alcohol and cigarettes have similar bad effects

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: Thank you

Person A: or not similar but lol

Person B: Nice to discuss with you hahah

# *Pair 83 P176 & P174 - Short Text - T3*

Person B: Hello there!

Person A: Hey!

Person B: Okay so one reason I think drugs (such as cocaine, meth, and etc.) shouldn't be legalized is that the legalization will lead to more people being tempted to try them. And as more people try these drugs, there will be a higher risk of people becoming addicted. As a result, a lot of peoples' lives will be ruined by such addictions.

Person A: So, to get started, I strongly support the efforts to legalize drugs in the US because I am convinced that it is the only way to stop the drug war that is causing violence and deaths in Central and Latin American countries.

Person B: I agree that there is SO much violence and death in Central and Latin American countries as a result of drug wars, but the legalization of drugs wouldn't just affect those areas, as it would affect the whole of the United States.  
In addition to the terrible results of addiction, legalizing drugs would also lead to an increase in drug-related accidents, such as car accidents and pregnancy issues (aka drug-addicted babies)

Person A: To reply to your first argument: Drugs will always be a temptation, the real question is how we handle the use and how to avoid abuse. While it is true that drugs might become more accessible to more people, having them delivered under clearly defined and safe conditions, only with proper education etc. in place, I think that the overall abuse rates would decrease. After all, for many people something is tempting because it's forbidden. By legalizing the drugs you would take away that part of the overall temptation.

Person B: I do agree the forbidden element of drugs is a point that makes them more tempting, but if they were legal, I think it would just open up the field of possible users.  
Also, in regard to the crime and death that drug wars bring about, I think legalizing it would still bring about crime. As more people start using the drugs, I think more and more people  
will have a need to use the drugs and therefore commit crimes to achieve it

Person A: Another important argument to take into account are the health issues that come with illegal use of drugs: Infections such as HIV would decrease if drugs were legalized

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 92 P198 & P197 – Short Text - T3*

Person A: Hello

Person B: Whats your position  
hello  
that's a lot of typing

Person A: My position is that drugs in general should be legalized. People should be free to choose in general what they want to do with their bodies. Additionally, legalization generally produces better outcomes. It makes drugs easier to regulate, shifts focus from drugs being a criminal justice issue to being a public health issue, and opens the opportunity for additional tax revenue. However, there are probably harder trugs (heroin comes to mind) where it might make more sense for it to be decriminalized rather than legalized  
Hence why I said drugs should be legal in general.

Person B: Yeah, fair points. I'm thinking here that drugs in this term encompasses anything that's not the already over the counter and legal things, like marijuana and addy (haha) but when it comes to say, cocaine and opium, i;m definitely against the idea because they're both more addictive and have the ability to create addictions and that then leads to a bunch of other issues

Person A: That makes sense.

Person B: though I also have to say, the weed industry is currently doing that now

Person A: For harder drugs, decriminalization would be better than full legallization

Person B: that still allows for easy access  
too easy of access

Person A: It possible for government to track and offer assistance for people using those drugs

Person B: But it makes it possible for government to track and offer assistance for people using those drugs

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 100 P220 & P221 - Short Text - T3*

Person B: Hi

Person A: Hi

Person B: I oppose legalizing of drugs  
because laws can deter people from selfish acts  
what about you

Person A: i support the legalization of drugs because it can help the government keep a tab on the citizens' consumption  
it also prevents the inflow of spurious drugs as the supply will be regulated and monitored  
additionally, in case someone is overdosed or under the adverse effects of the drug after usage, the government can support their medical care

Person B: I have a counterargument to your second sentence: when legalized, drugs could still be illegally imported

Person A: well, i agree but as of a situation where they are illegal, ALL of the import is unauthorized

Person B: Right

Person A: at least in a legalized state, the government will have an idea

Person B: My second argument: legalized drugs would direct a big part of economy to useless activ'ities  
especially the rich people

Person A: also, think of the people who sell drugs right now - they have an unreliable source of income. with a legalized substance, they would be able to earn a respectable living  
thats true, but isnt it happening even now?

Person B: counterargument to what you said: eg marijuana is legalized, but not things like cocaine, which still make borderline situations

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 141 P311 & P298 - Short Text - T2*

Person B: alright do you want to go first? or should I?

Person A: Hello, I believe in the principle of equity instead of equality, which means giving all people equal opportunities, as this is not the case still for people of color, and the reasons for that can be traced back to century long discrimination and slavery, I think that reparations are suitable.

Person B: that's fair  
I consider the inequality of the situation (and the idea of reparations) as a legitimately valid point, however, I think that implementing such a system well would be very difficult  
how would you go about doing it?

Person A: I see the drawback that such a policy would not help them to emancipate themselves, as they are still on the receiving end, and get the feeling of being dependent on governmental funding. Hence I suppose, that in order to be included in the decision making process, people of color themselves should participate in the board and help to decide where and how to spend the money.

Person B: That's a good point.

Person A: Well the question about how to do it would be raising more taxes from people with high incomes (that is more of a general question as I support social systems)

Person B: How much of a tax raise? Would you propose only taxing those "responsible" or those related to slaveholders, or those who have family in the country since times of slavery?

Person A: I would not think about it as such a direct form of redemption. I believe that this would be a governmental household decision to make money for reparations available. Where exactly this money stems from (potentially even rich families of color) would be of secondary importance. But I have also not thought about the details of this, to be honest.

Person B: I gotcha  
yeah same  
That's a fair point

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: thanks for talking

# *Pair 138 P300 & P305 - Short Text - T2*

Person B: Hi!

Person A: Hi!

Person B: Nice to meet ya  
Should we start?

Person A: You too! Yeah let's start, I'm assuming you oppose reparations?

Person B: Mmhm! And you are for?  
Cool so why do you support government reparations?

Person A: Yup  
A few reasons

Person B: Sure shoot

Person A: I think they are symbolically important as a way to make amends for the damage done to Black people in this country; clearly they wouldn't be a solution to the racial inequities or economic inequities caused by slavery, but symbolism has value  
And other countries like Germany and Spain have both paid reparations to Jewish people victimized by the Holocaust the Inquisition, as well as return citizenship to their ancestors

Person B: Okay, that's a really good point

Person A: it doesn't solve any of the emotional or physical damage, but it helps rebuild trust and diffuse resentment

Person B: Okay, I hear what you are saying

Person A: Shoot!

Person B: Okay!  
I am iffy towards government reparations as these reparations will be paid for not by the government (since they don't really have any money) but by ordinary citizens instead. I am afraid that this might breed animosity towards the people receiving these reparations, as is seen in the cases of negative attitudes towards people ongovernment welfare

Person A: That's a good point, something I thought about as well

Person B: Also, there have been so many mistreated peoples in U.S. history, from Chinese railroad workers South American slaves on sugar plantations...  
Thanks!  
Who determines who will receive what reparations? And what about those who were hurt but are not made amends to?  
I think simply having government reparations for slavery alone isn't enough to encompass all that has happened in the past several hundred years

Person A: True. I do think that the African slave trade has more of an ongoing cultural impact in a way in the country as a whole though, although I don't know as much about those two examples so I can't make a full opinion

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: Nice to chat with you!

Person B: Of course, I hear what you are saying. I like the symbolic aspect as well  
Nice to talk!

# *Pair 139 P309 & P303 – Short Text - T2*

Person B: Sup

Person A: Oh dang I thought we were going to video chat

Person B: Same  
why else woudl you use skype lol

Person A: Right haha

Person B: alright lets debate

Person A: So you oppose requiring government reparations for slavery?

Person B: Yes  
the current government has no obligation for something that happened two hundred years ago

Person A: Ah ok. Btw how are you interpreting "government reparations"

Person B: paying each black person in america money

Person A: Oh ok

Person B: Hbu  
bruv you type so slow

Person A: So yeah, I wouldn't say that I'm necessarily of the other side, like I don't really support requiring government reparations for slavery. But I think my problem is with the reparations part. Like what exactly does this mean? Because if it were purely financial and reparations were done in the form of simply giving people money, then yeah I think it would be useless  
LOL sorry haha

Person B: because if you provide reparations of some sort you go down a slippery slope  
do you provide reparations to Mexicans, Irish, Asians, and others who were all discriminated against?  
or just blacks

Person A: But yeah, what I mean to say is I think people often understate or don't really realize the huge impact an institutionalized economic system like America's slavery has on a nation, like I don't think you can just heal all damages in a couple generations (bc America is like, what, only 200-300 years old)?  
Also sorry i feel like i'm not even getting to your point  
freaking typing this out is so dumb

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: lol yeah  
ok later

Person A: alright haha

# *Pair 122 P265 & P258 – Short Text - T2*

Person B: heyyy how u feel about them reperations tho

Person A: I feel the government has an obligation to give back from exploited labor. The effects of slavery are still seen today.

Person B: i agree that the effects of slavery are systemicallly present in us society today but financial reparations are not the best way to solve or even mitigate the issues faces by black americans today  
from a completely practical standpoint, financial reparatins aren't a feasible solution  
how do you collect money? how much do you collect? from who? every year? once?  
lots of questions with subjective answers

Person A: What would you suggest would be a better alternative? You can create education grants and scholarships for descendants of slaves.

Person B: additionally, the implementation of financial reparations acts a a hush tool for the history of slavery, where people can say that now that the black community has been paid that the impacts of slavery are no longer existent. instead, i think a solution of investing money into black communities through better primary education, more access to healthy grocery stores, better government housing options, and cleaner safer parks is a step in the right direction that also provides a sense of agency and community

Person A: So you agree that the government should provide reparations, but not paychecks?

Person B: yeah!! education grants and scholarships, while a good idea, only help black kids with access to high quality education, why not target primary schools and make education accesible for everyone as a method of reparatins

Person A: Cool. I agree

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 80 P169 & P164 -Short Text - T2*

Person A: Hi

Person B: Hi

Person A: Id love to call since itd be easier that way but welp  
Tbh with you this is the topic that I least want to talk about haha

Person B: I feel that they should not be repatriated but given money incentives to improve themselves  
I come from Singapore and grew up in a meritocratic country where different race and ethnicity interact with one another and have equal opportunities to succeed

Person A: I can't recall but was giving incentives to them included in the opponents idea earlier?

Person B: Perhaps there is online platform and these marginalized individuals can use e-money to select online courses to better themselves

Person A: Oh I see. I think it's super hard to disregard race and ethnicity here and just simply say that everyone has an equal opportunity to succeed  
And that racial discrimination happens everyday here in America

Person B: I mean thats my background  
I have come to notice some of that during my stay here

Person A: Ye I understand where you came from and how that help establish your perspective  
Personally, I don't mind paying taxes to help other people in need

Person B: but I would caution against giving them money but constraint their selective use of money through online cources  
Courses  
or something similar

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 197 P415 & P422 – Short Text - T2*

Person B: Hello! [emoji]

Person A: Hello !  
Oh cool a smiley

Person B: [emoji]  
ew, too big

Person A: Haha

Person B: but yea! my opinion is that the gvt should offer reparations due to slavery  
a bulky topic but eh

Person A: Oh wait

Person B: ?

Person A: I also agree with you

Person B: oh what

Person A: The government should offer reparations due to the impacts of slavery that still persist in society today  
Manifesting as racial bias etc.

Person B: wait, is this supposed to be a vs debate or something?

Person A: I thought so too  
If i could ask,

Person B: ?

Person A: what number did you put on that topic [on the scale]?  
personally i picked the middle (forgot if it was 1 or -1)

Person B: i put 1 in agreement of  
and then i think a 3 for my stance

Person A: Ohh  
i also put a 1, but for how strong i did like a 2 i think  
i can't recall haha because i was so worried i'd have to passionately argue against someone else

Person B: i know omggggggggg  
i was getting low key stressed out with all of the formalities and questions lmao

Person A: oh yeah same!  
hm i guess we can just discuss the topic?

Person B: sure! that'd be cool

Person A: what kind of things did you brainstorm?

Person B: i wrote down that  
'the mistreatment from early on has essentially created a domino effect of mistreatment for many PoC in the US'  
:0

Person A: ah yes i agree

Person B: but yes! debate !

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 282 P597 & P594 - Short Text - T2*

Person A: Hello,

Person B: Hello

Person A: What is your stance on the subject matter?

Person B: I disagree with making slavery reparations

Person A: As do I  
I believe that financial checks do not address any of the societal issues that have arose from slavery

Person B: I feel that in making reparations, tensions would rise overall between communities

Person A: That is also true

Person B: I agree.  
monetary means wont fix what has happened with slavery and the injustices that resulted from it

Person A: If the government truly wanted to create some sort of amends, I think the best direction would be for them to better schooling, so that these individuals who they have deemed affected by slavery, have better opportunity to attain an education

Person B: Also I know it is different, but reparations from World War I were shown to make the situation worse between countries and it is in part what lead to World War II. I feel like a similar situation would arise by paying reparations now to descendants of slaves and it would only promote tension  
I agree that a schooling or education program would be a better approach than monetary means

Person A: In addition, I believe that the societal repercussions of slavery happen to be ideologies, such as racism and criminalization for which obviously cannot be fixed or pardoned with money. The best thing the government can do is better our education system to try educate these individuals as best as possible.  
But I see your point of view as well.  
We can always do our best to learn from history

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 283 P591 & P600 – Short Text - T2*

Person A: Hello

Person B: Hi there 

Person A: Do you want to start

Person B: Yes, for sure. I am ready

Person A: go for it

Person B: I strongly oppose requiring government reparations for slavery. First of all, If reparations are provided for slavery, I think most of the people who will be benefited from this policy will heavily rely on it, and they will not be serious about working to support their monthly expenses.

Person A: I am not completely convinced of my side, however i think that the point your making cant be used as there are so many people who do not have jobs or are losing their jobs to today. in addition i dont believe that the government giving extra funds would be enough

for someone to stop working  
Also one of the cases I would like to make is that the wealth that the US now enjoys stems part from the use of slaves. It's development wouldnt have been as fast, its GDP wouldnt be so high, it wouldnt have as much money. Some of it should be paid back. If links can be established to corporations, then those corporations should pay. Pointing to the fact that individuals alive today

Person B: Well, they will have an unhealthy mentality that this country and the society owe this to them.Hence, they think that they have should have this 'special privilege'. They will put the blame on others for causing them suffer from their current bad situation.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person A: sorry i didnt get to finish my point  
it was great chatting with you

Person B: It's really nice chatting with you too!

# *Pair 284 P598 & P592 – Short Text - T2*

Person A: Hello

Person B: Hi!

Person A: so what's your view on this topic?

Person B: I am against government reparations for slavery.  
Are you for?

Person A: i suppose we have conflicting views, which is why they put us together..  
hmm i think otherwise

Person B: Why do you think otherwise?

Person A: i feel that some support is necessary

Person B: I guess what are we defining as government reparations?

Person A: but not to the extend where they feel it's an entitlement

Person B: I also agree that some benefits are necessary but I dont think this is a sustainable solution

Person A: maybe say some educational scholarship  
to provide some assistance

Person B: those are already available though

Person A: Yeah..  
which is considered part of the reparations for slavery right?

Person B: I think that if we really wanted to address the issues of slavery and the current consequences we need to make changes that are centered around benefits or society  
sorry that arent

Person A: please elaborate?

Person B: although those are necessary stepping stones.

I think its more about addressing institutional injustices

Person A: Hmm..

Person B: that design our society to make it difficult for relatives of slaves to be successful  
how do you feel about that?

Person A: yeah there are institutional injustices  
removing them is necessary  
but what about people who are already affected by them  
some form of assistance is certainly necessary dont you think?

Person B: i think those people are definetely deserving of some benefits. like u mentioned. scholarships and things of that nature

Person A: yeah but the main concern  
how much to give  
for it to be sufficient  
and not excessive  
for it'll not be sustainable

Person B: Well I think that we should change our priorities because realistically there isnt a formula that can repair those damages with sufficient help

Person A: Fair

Person B: i also dont think we should focus on slavery

Person A: so you suggest?

Person B: because there are plenty of other unwritten or ignored histories of peoples that have been affected  
we cant prioritize one group

Person A: that's true

Person B: and validate their histories any more than others

Person A: but helping one group is better than helping none…

Person B: but we cant just offer a bandaid solution

Person A: Yeap  
so it must be coupled with some other policies  
that help to address the root of the problem

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 120 P259 & P274 – Short Text - T2*

Person B: Hi

Person A: Hey  
What's your stance on reparations?

Person B: to be honest i didn't really know what i wanted to put so i just entered whatever at the time  
could you explain your stance and arguments?  
i'll try debating from the other side as much as i can

Person A: Yeah sure  
Well I think in the US, especially in parts like the South and Midwest social mobility is really difficult  
that is, if you're born poor chances are you'll stay poor  
and lots of African Americans were born poor now, from the consequences of slavery  
in that it's always been really difficult for Americans of African descent to have the same liberties and freedoms of those who weren't born black  
But I don't think race by itself should warrant reparations  
If you're a black person born rich then it would be a waste of resources to provide reparations  
and if you're white and born poor you should also be given any assistance possible to help you move up  
I just think that the disproportionate amount of African American poverty can be linked to slavery so I think the government should provide reparations  
I'd love to hear your thoughts

Person B: i like the idea of trying to help people born into low income move upwards a lot  
but from where are we/the government getting the money to give them?

Person A: Taxes are the only way the government can provide this money

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: that wasn't enough time lol

Person A: But I think if social mobility goes up, more people can pay their taxes  
yeah lol

# *Pair 78 P160 & P166 – Short Text - T2*

Person A: Hello, so do you think that the government should pay for reparations for slavery?

Person B: No I don't. Do you?

Person A: Yeah, I think there are various reasons why like first of there is a traceable recording of wrongdoings and specific historical instances where reparations can be anchored, such as the homestead act, historical redlining, and other economic measures which we can tie to economic reparations  
I also think that that the continuation of oppression past slavery would be something to consider in reparations such as the skewed effects on black people when it comes to issues such as the war on drugs, and the fact that many of those people ended up in prison because of lack of economic resources stemming from decades of economic gains from unpaid labor

Person B: Yes, I completely understand your viewpoint on the horrible institutional and systemic oppression that has afflicted African-Americans and continues to afflict them to this present day. While I completely acknowledge the United States wrongdoings in the past, my issue with reparations is more of a feasibility argument than a moral one. Reparations would ultimately be paid for by the American taxpayers, and many of these taxpayers weren't even in the United States during the time of slavery and have done nothing to contribute to the oppression of African-Americans at an institutional level. For example, my family came to US from India in the 1970's and now we are all taxpaying citizens but it seems unfair that we would have to pay extra taxes for a problem that we did nothing to create or contribute to.

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 97 P213 & P216 – Short Text - T2*

Person A: So I believe that we as a country should have slavery reparations. I think that it is quite clear how a cycle of poverty and lack of opportunities could start in slavery and think that the only way to reverse this is to create programs (not necessarily money reparations) that enable people affected by slavery to break out. Although universal education, housing and other opportunities would be better, if we decide as a country that this is not feasible then at least those who we have hurt the most should be able to access them.

Person B: I oppose government reparations for slavery because people may have ancestors who contributed to slavery, but they themselves didn't so it's like punishing people who did no wrong, only because they are connected to those that did wrong. And it would be difficult to figure out who should get reparations like what if there's people whose families weren't here during the time of slavery, who came to the U.S. after.  
And in deciding who is going to pay, is it going to be everyone's tax dollars or only certain people? if it's just using everyone's tax dollars, it's unfair because there will be people who have no ties to slavery who will be paying for it

Person A: Yes it is unfair that people who had nothing to do with slavery should be hurt by it but it would benefit them as well by helping fix some societal problems, like lack of access to education, which would benefit all of society.  
Cut the military budget, no new taxes

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

# *Pair 121 P270 & P260 – Short Text - T2*

Person B: I oppose having the government paying reparations for slavery  
I just think that it is just too simple too simple of a question, that is

Person A: yeah  
I get that

Person B: Before I continue, I want to simply know what your stance is

Person A: oh sure  
I said I was for reparations however I do believe that the solution is too simple. Like there should be something done in order to counter balance the racism that has spammed the decades but the solution is not complex enough for the complex problem  
spanned

Person B: I see. Well, before we get into hypotheticals about actually using reparations, I just want to say a few things

Person A: Cause I feel like families that are discriminated against can be hindered economically and therefore deserve compensation but like that would be impossible to police  
and I feel like other groups should be included like native americans, women, LGBT and other minorities

Person B: Many, if not all, white members of the population today have to relation to, or have not engaged in, slavery. My family, from my father's side, arrived in 1910, more than 50 years after slavery was made illegal. Does that me his side of the family should pay for crimes he did not commit, or to help allieviate an economic situation that was not in his control?

Person A: I also agree with that  
Like I never owned slaves nor did my family in our history therefore why should I pay  
so we are basically in agreement then

Person B: Now, practically speaking, if we could even potentially find all the families that had owned slaves, should their descendants pay for the crimes of their ancestors?

**[Experimenter says time is up]**

Person B: I guess that's it then,

Person A: yeah  
it was nice talking to you :)

Person B: Just when things were getting interesting. I enjoyed this conversation too :)