

Mind the Gap: Toward Conflict-Resolving Conversational Agents with Theory of Mind

TAHIR ABBAS and YARA KHALUF*, Information Technology, Wageningen University, The Netherlands

Conflict resolution scenarios require sophisticated social reasoning and advanced cognitive abilities, which humans develop through Theory of Mind (ToM). However, despite advances in ToM-based modeling techniques, current dialogue agents fall short in managing complex, high-stakes interactions such as conflict resolution. These ToM-based models exhibit limitations mainly in three areas: (1) the inability to model and respond to emotional cues, which undermines rapport and empathy; (2) weak mechanisms for filtering and prioritizing user intents in dynamic and ambiguous contexts; and (3) a lack of strategic reasoning needed to maintain long-term goals and anticipate interlocutor behavior. Through a synthesis of recent approaches—including belief state tracking, personality modeling, and Bayesian policy inference—we advocate for a tightly integrated architecture that addresses these shortcomings. Our analysis outlines clear pathways toward socially intelligent agents that possess affective understanding, intention management, and adaptive, goal-directed dialogue, enabling them to mediate conflict resolution tasks effectively.

1 Introduction

Conflict is an intrinsic and often productive component of human communication. Conflicts often arise from differences in beliefs, goals, emotions, or intentions. To resolve these issues effectively, it is essential to understand others’ mental states. This understanding, known in cognitive science as Theory of Mind (ToM), is essential for resolving disputes. In artificial intelligence, ToM involves modeling others’ beliefs, desires, intentions, and emotions to generate socially and contextually appropriate responses.

While recent large language models (LLMs), such as GPT-4, demonstrate competence in passing classic false-belief tasks, their effectiveness in socially nuanced, interactive contexts remains under scrutiny. Benchmarks like NegotiationToM [Chan et al. 2024] and analyses by [Kwon et al. 2024] and [Yang et al. 2020] expose significant limitations in current ToM implementations, particularly in emotion modeling and strategic reasoning.

This paper critically examines three dimensions of computational ToM limitations:

- Emotion in Conflict Resolution
- Intent Filtering and Prioritization in Dynamic Dialogue
- Strategic Reasoning Deficiencies in LLMs

We conducted a structured search across five databases (Web of Science, Scopus, IEEE Xplore, ACM Digital Library, and arXiv) using a comprehensive query combining Theory of Mind, dialogue systems, and conflict-related terms. After retrieving 148 papers and applying strict inclusion criteria, we shortlisted eight studies that explicitly modeled ToM in

conversational agents for conflict or negotiation tasks. By synthesizing findings from these papers, we propose integrative approaches to enhance the capabilities of socially intelligent dialogue agents. The summary is provided in the Table 2.

Finally, we present a simple example to illustrate this approach in practice. In this example—deliberately simplified to ignore several technical complexities—we demonstrate that even a static application of this method can lead to improved performance.

2 Emotion in Conflict Resolution

Emotion plays an important role in resolving conflicts. Successful human mediators recognize and address emotional cues such as frustration, empathy, or betrayal to build rapport and de-escalate tension. However, most theory of mind models overlook these important factors, focusing instead on rational reasoning. As a result, they often have difficulty in emotionally charged situations. They provide factual answers but do not take into account the feelings involved.

A central challenge in negotiation for LLMs is evaluating subjective and emotional states, such as the satisfaction or frustration of a dialogue partner. [Kwon et al. 2024] found that LLMs perform poorly in assessing these nuanced aspects of interaction, highlighting a key limitation in emotional sensitivity. However, [Yongsatianchot et al. 2024] showed that state-of-the-art models like GPT-4 Turbo and Claude 3 Opus can adapt their negotiation behavior in response to structured emotional cues—particularly facial expressions, which demonstrates emergent capabilities in implicit ToM. These findings highlight the importance of emotion modeling as a necessary component of complex social reasoning and conflict resolution.

Yet, a major obstacle to robust emotion modeling lies in the inherently multimodal and often conflicting nature of emotional signals. Emotion is conveyed through not just facial expressions but also through tone of voice, body posture, gestures, and language pragmatics. [Ong et al. 2019] emphasizes this complexity by identifying “emotional cue integration” as a core mechanism of Theory of Mind. Here, agents must reconcile discrepancies—such as a calm tone paired with frustrated expressions—to construct a coherent emotional inference. In LLMs, incorporating such integrative reasoning mechanisms remains an open challenge, but doing so is essential to improving their capacity to interpret affect in nuanced, socially situated contexts.

Another difficulty in emotion-sensitive negotiation is that emotional signals are often implicit or indirectly conveyed. [Yang et al. 2020] tackled this problem by modeling opponent personality types as proxies for underlying affective

Authors’ Contact Information: Tahir Abbas, tahir.abbas@wur.nl; Yara Khaluf, yara.khaluf@wur.nl, Information Technology, Wageningen University, Wageningen, , The Netherlands.

tendencies in negotiation. Their method uses text utterances to infer whether the opponent is cooperative, competitive, or aggressive, thereby capturing emotional cues not represented in standard dialogue state transitions. As they note, this strategy “*utilizes text utterances to infer types of opponents, thereby capturing side information (e.g., emotion).*” Importantly, removing personality modeling led to a 20% drop in agreement rates—demonstrating that personality-aware dialogue strategies are effective in inferring emotion and improving negotiation outcomes.

3 Intent Filtering and Prioritization in Dynamic Dialogue

In high-stake conversational tasks, users often communicate multiple overlapping intentions, which may sometimes conflict with one another. For a dialogue agent to respond effectively, it must accurately identify the core concerns and distinguish them from secondary ones, prioritizing the most salient issues. However, most ToM agents cannot parse and rank complex communicative goals.

We argue that intent filtering and prioritization are crucial in Theory-of-Mind (ToM) dialogue systems, as they shape how agents interpret and respond to users’ inferred mental states. *Intent filtering* restricts the set of plausible user or agent intentions based on contextual, ontological, or belief-based constraints. For instance, MAIDS [Engelmann et al. 2023] employs structured ontologies and argumentation schemes to enforce domain-specific filters on allowable intents. Sun and Chen [Sun and Chen 2022] *implicitly* apply Bayesian policy reuse to restrict the agent’s response set to those policies that are optimal under the predicted strategies of opponents.

Intent prioritization, by contrast, enables an agent to rank competing intents based on factors such as utility or alignment with inferred beliefs. Qiu et al. [Qiu et al. 2024] implement filtering through belief state tracking by using discrepancies between first-order and second-order beliefs to eliminate belief misalignments. Importantly, they enhance simple filtering by introducing an explicit value table that assigns a priority level—low, medium, or high—to each belief discrepancy. This table formalizes the relative importance of different belief mismatches, enabling the system to prioritize which conflicts in mental state representations are most urgent to resolve.

Although some existing systems exhibit early signs of intent filtering and prioritization, these functions are often handled implicitly and lack generalizability. Future work should focus on developing more resilient models capable of distinguishing relevant from irrelevant intentions and beliefs. Such mechanisms are essential in conflict-prone scenarios, where resolving disagreements often depends on accurately identifying the core issues and minimizing distractions from peripheral signals.

4 Strategic Reasoning Deficiencies in LLMs

Strategic reasoning is foundational to effective negotiation and conflict resolution. It entails more than reacting turn-by-turn—it requires agents to maintain long-term goals, anticipate the evolving beliefs and actions of their counterparts, adapt dynamically as the dialogue unfolds, and generate contextually relevant responses tailored to interlocutors.

Large language models, such as GPT-4, generate fluent and coherent dialogue (appropriate responses given the conversational context) but often lack strategic depth. As noted by [Kwon et al. 2024; Li et al. 2023], these models frequently agree too quickly, miss important negotiation cues, or prioritize superficial politeness over goal achievement. *Such shortcomings can hinder effective conflict resolution, where strategic understanding and goal alignment are essential for managing disagreements.* Addressing this gap requires integrating explicit ToM mechanisms (belief state representations) and planning modules into LLMs, allowing them to balance surface fluency with task-aligned negotiation objectives. For example, [Sclar et al. 2023] proposed SYMBOLICTOM, a plug-and-play method that enables language models to track better what each character knows or believes in a story. It constructs simple *belief graphs* and utilizes them to inform the model’s responses, thereby enhancing ToM reasoning. Sclar et al. [Chen et al. 2025] summarize several recently proposed methods for enhancing the ToM capabilities of LLMs, including belief graphs, perception inference, temporal belief state chains, and semantic parsing, among others. Current LLM-based ToM models primarily depend on prompting strategies, which are inadequate on their own.

Moreover, most existing systems treat mental state inference and natural language generation (NLG) as loosely coupled modules. For example, agents may infer beliefs or intentions but then rely on retrieval-based or template-driven generators that do not adapt based on those inferences [Sun and Chen 2022; Yang et al. 2020]. The current separation limits the agent’s ability to generate persuasive, socially appropriate, and strategically coherent responses. Future systems should closely integrate belief modeling with generation modules, allowing responses to be dynamically influenced by the agent’s evolving understanding of the interlocutor’s mental state. This integration is essential for facilitating real-time, strategy-aligned communication, ultimately bringing large language models closer to the reasoning depth needed for effective negotiation and conflict resolution.

5 Concrete Example

In this section, we provide an example of how incorporating emotions and priority weights can enhance the generation of consensus statements that are more aligned with users’ mental states and values. Please note that this is a simplified example and does not consider the changing beliefs that may arise in realistic multi-turn conversations.

In this example, we refer to a realistic subreddit post from ChangeMyView discussing whether killing animals for food is morally right or wrong¹. This subreddit is dedicated to holding a thoughtful discussion around controversial or strongly held beliefs. In these discussions, the original poster shares a viewpoint and explicitly invites others to challenge it by providing reasoned, justifiable rebuttals. The main claim of the poster was (reworded): *“Eating meat for pleasure is unethical. If we can live well without harming animals, we shouldn’t harm them.”*. After reviewing comments, we decided to include the following comments (reworded for brevity):

- **User 1:** *“We should breed fewer animals and grow crops for humans. Less meat means better use of resources.”*,
- **User 2:** *“Who decides what’s good or bad? Morality is created by society. Killing happens in nature and isn’t always survival.”*,
- **User 3:** *“Then I’d see it differently because I don’t see humans as equivalent to other animals.”*

To ensure the example is as close to a real-world application as possible, we employed publicly available pre-trained models from the Hugging Face repository. To measure emotions, we employed a RoBERTa base model [Liu et al. 2019] that was specifically fine-tuned using the Go Emotions dataset derived from Reddit posts [Demszky et al. 2020]. We used the Flan-Alpaca-large model² to extract beliefs, desires, and intentions from the text [Chia et al. 2023]. These models have demonstrated superior performance on structured instruction tasks, which are critical for extracting mental states.

5.1 Main Task

The main task was to extract emotions, beliefs, desires, and intentions (BDI) from the above user replies using the aforementioned models. After obtaining scores, we then computed the priority weights for BDI by employing the Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument (TKI), which identifies five primary modes: Competing, Collaborating, Compromising, Avoiding, and Accommodating. We use emotion as a gateway to categorize the comments into TKI categories. For example, anger signals a Competing stance, sadness reflects Avoiding, curiosity aligns with Collaborating, neutrality suggests Compromising, and admiration indicates an Accommodating style.

We initially set BDI scores to 33% each and then updated them based on the inferred conflict style. In this example, we applied a straightforward approach by predefining the weights (see Table 1) and mapping each conflict style directly to these weights. However, more dynamic and rigorous approaches could be employed in practice. One alternative approach is to detect speech/dialogue acts (e.g., propose, agree) and dynamically assign weights to them. For instance, when encountering

a declarative assertion, we can increase the belief scores. Conversely, when dealing with a question, we can enhance the levels of desire and intention.

After computing emotions, conflict styles, BDI, and their respective weights, we employed LLM to generate a group statement that captures mental states to generate an acceptable group statement. We used two queries for comparison: one with all the mental states (emotions, BDI, and their weights, conflict styles) and another with just BDI to see if our approach results in better overall representative statements.

5.1.1 Evaluation. We prompted GPT-4 with all extracted mental states and BDI weights, asking it to judge which consensus statement – only the BDI-based version or the version incorporating emotions, conflict styles, BDI, and weights – best matched participants’ values and conflict styles. The model returned a ranked preference and rationale to estimate likely acceptance.

The following are the prompts we used for consensus statements generation and their evaluation:

Prompt 1 (Full Context):

Given the following participants’ beliefs, desires, intentions, their priority weights, and their conflict styles, generate a concise consensus statement acceptable to the group.

Prompt 2 (BDI Only):

Given the following participants’ beliefs, desires, and intentions, generate a concise consensus statement acceptable to the group.

Prompt 3 (Acceptability Evaluation):

Given the following participants’ emotions, beliefs, desires, intentions, weights, and conflict styles, assess which of the two consensus statements is more likely to be perceived as acceptable and increase participant satisfaction. Provide a short explanation for your choice.

Table 1. Example BDI Priority Weights Assigned by Conflict Style

Conflict Style	Belief (%)	Desire (%)	Intention (%)
Competing	25	50	25
Collaborating	40	20	40
Compromising	33	33	33
Avoiding	40	30	30
Accommodating	30	30	40

5.2 Results

Participant 1. *“We should breed fewer animals and grow crops for humans. Less meat means better use of resources.”*

Top Emotions: Neutral (0.50), Approval (0.31), Optimism

¹https://www.reddit.com/r/changemyview/comments/gwavcs/cmv_killing_and_eating_animals_is_morally_wrong/

²<https://huggingface.co/declare-lab/flan-alpaca-large>

(0.10)

Conflict Style: Compromising**BDI:**

- **Intent:** Reduce meat production and conserve resources.
- **Desire:** Reduce meat consumption for better resource use.
- **Belief:** Less meat leads to more efficient resource management.

BDI Weights: Belief 33%, Desire 33%, Intention 33%.

Participant 2. “Who decides what’s good or bad? Morality is created by society. Killing happens in nature and isn’t always survival.”

Top Emotions: Confusion (0.50), Neutral (0.40), Curiosity (0.32)**Conflict Style:** Collaborating**BDI:**

- **Intent:** Highlight that morality is socially constructed and killing is not always necessary.
- **Desire:** Encourage individuals to define morality for themselves.
- **Belief:** Morality arises from society rather than absolute principles.

BDI Weights: Belief 40%, Desire 20%, Intention 40%.

Participant 3. “Then I’d see it differently because I don’t see humans as equivalent to other animals.”

Top Emotions: Neutral (0.51), Confusion (0.21), Realization (0.19)**Conflict Style:** Compromising**BDI:**

- **Intent:** Express a differing view about human-animal equivalence.
- **Desire:** Affirm that humans are distinct from other animals.
- **Belief:** Humans differ fundamentally from animals.

BDI Weights: Belief 33%, Desire 33%, Intention 33%.

Consensus Statement 1. “Our group’s consensus is that while individuals play an essential role in defining morality, we also strive to conserve resources by reducing meat production. This reflects our shared belief in personal choice, the uniqueness of humans compared to other animals, and the importance of responsible resource management.”

Consensus Statement 2 (BDI Only). “We agree to encourage reducing meat production, not solely as a moral imperative, but as a practical approach to conserve resources. We understand morality as a societal construct and affirm the freedom of individuals to determine what is good or bad, provided it does not infringe on others. We also acknowledge the distinct qualities that separate humans from other animals.”

Evaluation. Consensus Statement 1 is likely to be better accepted. While both statements reflect participants’ beliefs, desires, and intentions, Statement 1 more explicitly integrates

key elements of all three perspectives. Participant 1’s goal of reducing meat and conserving resources is included. Participant 2’s view of morality as socially constructed and individually defined is acknowledged through references to personal choice. For Participant 3, the recognition of human uniqueness is explicitly mentioned.

Given that Participants 1 and 3 exhibit a compromising conflict style, they are more inclined toward a statement incorporating a balanced perspective. Statement 1 demonstrates this integration more fully, suggesting it would be perceived as fairer and thus more satisfying to the group overall.

We also verified this approach by running it 10 times, randomly selecting 3 statements at a time from the pool of 11 statements. Our results show that in 8 out of 10 runs, the winning statement was the one that incorporated priority weights and emotions. The results are shared in the appendix A.

6 Conclusion

The current computational Theory of Mind models are insufficient for managing emotionally nuanced and strategically complex dialogues. Numerous studies confirm that these models struggle with emotional inference, intent prioritization, and maintaining long-term strategies.

To create truly socially intelligent systems, future architectures must transcend purely generative approaches. They should incorporate affective modeling, hierarchical intent filtering, and strategic planning grounded in ToM theory. This evolution is critical if AI is to become a reliable partner in conflict resolution and interpersonal negotiation.

References

- Chunkit Chan, Cheng Jiayang, Yauwai Yim, Zheyue Deng, Wei Fan, Haoran Li, Xin Liu, Hongming Zhang, Weiqi Wang, and Yangqiu Song. 2024. NegotiationToM: A benchmark for stress-testing machine theory of mind on negotiation surrounding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.13627* (2024).
- Ruirui Chen, Weifeng Jiang, Chengwei Qin, and Cheston Tan. 2025. Theory of Mind in Large Language Models: Assessment and Enhancement. *arXiv:2505.00026* [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.00026>
- Yew Ken Chia, Pengfei Hong, Lidong Bing, and Soujanya Poria. 2023. IN-STRUCTEVAL: Towards Holistic Evaluation of Instruction-Tuned Large Language Models. *arXiv:2306.04757* [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.04757>
- Dorothy Damszky, Dana Movshovitz-Attias, Jeongwoo Ko, Alan Cowen, Gaurav Nemade, and Sujith Ravi. 2020. GoEmotions: A Dataset of Fine-Grained Emotions. *arXiv:2005.00547* [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.00547>
- Déborah C. Engelmann, Alison R. Panisson, Renata Vieira, Jomi Fred Hübner, Viviana Mascardi, and Rafael H. Bordini. 2023. MAIDS - A Framework for the Development of Multi-Agent Intentional Dialogue Systems. In *Proceedings of the 2023 International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems* (London, United Kingdom) (AAMAS ’23). International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, Richland, SC, 1209–1217.
- Deukin Kwon, Emily Weiss, Tara Kulshrestha, Kushal Chawla, Gale M Lucas, and Jonathan Gratch. 2024. Are llms effective negotiators? systematic evaluation of the multifaceted capabilities of llms in negotiation dialogues. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13550* (2024).
- Huao Li, Yu Quan Chong, Simon Stepputtis, Joseph Campbell, Dana Hughes, Michael Lewis, and Katia Sycara. 2023. Theory of mind for multi-agent collaboration via large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.10701* (2023).
- Yinhan Liu, Mye Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. RoBERTa: A Robustly Optimized BERT Pretraining Approach. *arXiv:1907.11692* [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.11692>

Table 2. Comparison of ToM-Based Conversational Agents on Key Cognitive Dimensions

Paper	Modeling Technique	Emotion	Intent Filter	Intent Priority	Consensus & Mediation Strategy
Yang et al. (2020)	Bayesian ToM + Personality Inference	~✓	~✓	✗	Learns negotiation policies adapted to opponent personality; balances cooperation and competition
Kwon et al. (2024)	Prompt-based LLM	✗	✗	~✓	Relies on LLM to generate offers; lacks explicit belief or planning module
MAIDS (Engelmann, 2023)	Symbolic BDI + Argumentation Schemes	✗	✓	~✓	Structured subdialogues handle term and belief mismatches using rules and commitment updates
Chan et al. (2024)	Prompted ToM with Strategy Labels	~✓	~✓	✗	Uses labeled social strategies (e.g., fairness, coordination) to model BDI reasoning
Qiu et al. (2024)	Finetuned + Prompted Belief Tracker	✗	~✓	✓	Aligns first- and second-order beliefs; uses belief value table for generation
Sun and Chen (2022)	Bayesian Policy Reuse + Belief Tracker	✗	~✓	✗	Recursively reasons about opponent strategies; adapts policy using Bayesian updates
Li et al. (2023)	Prompting + Belief Logs in Multi-Agent Tasks	✗	~✓	~✓	Prompts agents to coordinate beliefs in decentralized tasks; emergent consensus
Zhang et al. (2024)	LLM with Macro-Intent Planning	✗	✓	✓	Uses mutual ToM to prioritize goals, reduce redundancy, and align actions in teamwork

- Desmond C. Ong, Jamil Zaki, and Noah D. Goodman. 2019. Computational Models of Emotion Inference in Theory of Mind: A Review and Roadmap. *Topics in Cognitive Science* 11, 2 (2019), 338–357. doi:10.1111/tops.12371 arXiv:https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/tops.12371
- Shuwen Qiu, Mingdian Liu, Hengli Li, Song-Chun Zhu, and Zilong Zheng. 2024. MindDial: Enhancing Conversational Agents with Theory-of-Mind for Common Ground Alignment and Negotiation. In *Proceedings of the 25th Annual Meeting of the Special Interest Group on Discourse and Dialogue*, Tatsuya Kawahara, Vera Demberg, Stefan Ultes, Koji Inoue, Shikib Mehri, David Howcroft, and Kazunori Komatani (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Kyoto, Japan, 746–759. doi:10.18653/v1/2024.sigdia-1.63
- Melanie Sclar, Sachin Kumar, Peter West, Alane Suhr, Yejin Choi, and Yulia Tsvetkov. 2023. Minding Language Models’ (Lack of) Theory of Mind: A Plug-and-Play Multi-Character Belief Tracker. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Toronto, Canada, 13960–13980. doi:10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.780
- Qisong Sun and Siqi Chen. 2022. An adaptive negotiation dialogue agent with efficient detection and optimal response. In *International Conference on Distributed Artificial Intelligence*. Springer, 88–102.
- Runzhe Yang, Jingxiao Chen, and Karthik Narasimhan. 2020. Improving dialog systems for negotiation with personality modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.09954* (2020).
- Nutchanon Yongsatanchot, Tobias Thejll-Madsen, and Stacy Marsella. 2024. Exploring Theory of Mind in Large Language Models through Multimodal Negotiation. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM International Conference on Intelligent Virtual Agents (GLASGOW, United Kingdom) (IVA ’24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 9, 9 pages. doi:10.1145/3652988.3673960

A Consensus Statements Evaluation

Consensus Statements Over 10 Iterations
<p>Iteration 1</p> <p><i>Consensus Statement 1:</i></p> <p>While there is a shared understanding that humans and animals are different, with humans being motivated by desires such as food, there is a respect for the belief that animals also possess feelings and intelligence. The group acknowledges the need for a new perspective on this issue for a more enlightened understanding. The consensus fosters the belief that it's important to understand not only human motivations but also the capacities of animals, promoting balance and equitability in our interactions with all sentient life forms.</p> <p><i>Consensus Statement 2:</i></p> <p>We acknowledge that perceptions concerning humans and animals may differ greatly, with some seeing them as unequal while others regard animals as sentient beings with emotions and intelligence. Furthermore, we agree that human desires, including those for food, can drive risk-taking behaviour. However, we aspire to broaden our views on these subjects, considering both the emotional intelligence of animals and the motivations behind human behaviour.</p> <p>Winner: Statement 1</p>
<p>Iteration 2</p> <p><i>Consensus Statement 1:</i></p> <p>We collectively acknowledge the ethical implications of harming animals for pleasure, recognizing it as an unacceptable act. Furthermore, we agree that the current process of overproducing animals as a food source showcases the need for a more sustainable and thoughtful approach to consumption. It is necessary to understand the gravity of taking life, emphasizing that an animal's life can have inherent value and happiness that should not be prematurely ended. We urge for humanity's collective responsibility in considering the consequences of our actions upon living creatures.</p> <p><i>Consensus Statement 2:</i></p> <p>Everyone in the group firmly believes that harming animals for pleasure or out of negligence is unethical and unacceptable. We also highlight the injustices within our current food system, emphasizing the need for a more sustainable and ethical method of consumption. We all recognize that taking a life results in real loss, emphasizing the potential for all beings, including animals, to lead fulfilling lives. In essence, we advocate for responsible and ethical treatment of all animals and a reassessment of our current practices that do not uphold these principles.</p> <p>Winner: Statement 1</p>
<p>Iteration 3</p> <p><i>Consensus Statement 1:</i></p> <p>Our group acknowledges the common agreement on reducing meat production as a way to conserve resources due to its potential impact on the environment. We further respect and consider each person's subjective opinions and viewpoints which adds to the diversity and richness of our discussions. We also emphasize the ethical considerations related to the treatment of animals and believe that it is essential to criminalize practices that harm them unnecessarily. The balance between our individual beliefs, desires, and intentions plays a critical role in reaching shared understanding on this topic.</p> <p><i>Consensus Statement 2:</i></p> <p>We collectively believe in reducing the amount of meat produced to better use and conserve resources. We emphasize the importance of individual opinions without being influenced by others and recognize the significance of ethical treatment to animals. We agree that it's crucial to avoid harming them unnecessarily.</p> <p>Winner: Statement 1</p>
<p>Iteration 4</p> <p><i>Consensus Statement 1:</i></p>
Continued on next page

Continued from previous page
<p>We acknowledge the reality of animal suffering and the role humans play in it, paralleling it to the loss that occurs when taking a life. We desire the reduction of suffering for all living things and respect for their potential for happiness. We agree on the importance of individual and societal responsibility in shaping our actions and morality towards all life forms. Our actions should be guided by these considerations for a more sustainable future.</p> <p><i>Consensus Statement 2:</i></p> <p>Our group acknowledges the significant impact human actions have on animals and expresses concern over ending their lives prematurely. We believe that all life, including animals and plants, should be respected and compassionately treated. We concur that killing is not always necessary for survival, and ethical decisions regarding life and death should be individual and influenced by societal norms. The aim is to promote sustainability and reduce suffering for all living beings.</p> <p>Winner: Statement 2</p>
<p>Iteration 5</p> <p><i>Consensus Statement 1:</i></p> <p>We acknowledge and respect the importance of individual expression and consider other's opinions as being subjective while remaining neutral. We agree that societal constructs play a crucial role in defining what is moral, with an emphasis on individual autonomy in determining personal values. We are unified in our belief that acts of harm, specifically towards animals, are fundamentally unethical and should be conscientiously avoided.</p> <p><i>Consensus Statement 2:</i></p> <p>We agree to respect each individual's right to express subjective opinions, acknowledging that personal views may differ. We also affirm that societal influence plays a significant role in determining morality, however, it should still be up to each person to define their concept of good and bad within this framework. We further concur that causing harm to animals is unethical and should be avoided. Despite our individual perspectives, we mutually appreciate the value of open-minded discussion on these matters.</p> <p>Winner: Statement 2</p>
<p>Iteration 6</p> <p><i>Consensus Statement 1:</i></p> <p>Our group consensus affirms that humans are primarily motivated by desire rather than necessity, leading them to take risks to obtain desired goods, particularly food which is a key source of essential proteins. This decision-making is individualistic, influenced by societal definitions of morality, acknowledging that actions such as killing for survival are not always necessary. Our shared perspective also emphasizes that animals, like humans, can suffer due to the consequences of their actions, warranting the need to equitably treat all living entities, including plants. With a common intention, we promote a more sustainable future striving for reduced suffering across all species and encourage individuals to make responsible and ethical choices based on their beliefs and desires.</p> <p><i>Consensus Statement 2:</i></p> <p>Human behavior is largely influenced by personal desires for food, which plays a significant role in the risks they're willing to take. Society's influence shapes our understanding of morality and individuality, leaving room for personal interpretation of what is considered good or bad. However, there should be a greater emphasis on reducing animal suffering and promoting a sustainable future, acknowledging that all life forms should be respected equally.</p> <p>Winner: Statement 1</p>
<p>Iteration 7</p> <p><i>Consensus Statement 1:</i></p> <p>Recognizing the shared belief that unnecessary harm to animals is morally unacceptable, we commit to advocating against the practice of killing animals for pleasure. We further recognize the need to conserve resources by reducing meat production and responsibly utilizing our resources. Emphasizing awareness, we intend to educate others about the emotional capacity and intelligence of animals, thereby fostering understanding and compassion.</p> <p><i>Consensus Statement 2:</i></p>
Continued on next page

Continued from previous page
<p>All participants agree that killing animals for pleasure is universally unjust, believing it is important to be mindful of animals' capacity for emotion and intelligence, and that mankind's usage of animal resources, in particular meat production, should be considerably decreased for resource conservation purposes.</p> <p>Winner: Statement 1</p>
<p>Iteration 8</p> <p><i>Consensus Statement 1:</i></p> <p>We collectively acknowledge that human motivation for food is rooted in desire, not just necessity, and entails taking risks. We all respect the subjectivity of opinions and the importance of being able to express those opinions independently, acknowledging the diversity in our perspectives. We unanimously emphasize the importance of ethical treatment of animals and agree that causing harm to them should be avoided. Each participant's input holds equal weight in reaching this consensus.</p> <p><i>Consensus Statement 2:</i></p> <p>All participants agree that humans have unique motivations and subjective opinions that guide their actions, emphasizing the importance of dietary choices that are nutritionally beneficial and ethically considerate, taking into account the inherent ethical issue of causing harm to animals.</p> <p>Winner: Statement 1</p>
<p>Iteration 9</p> <p><i>Consensus Statement 1:</i></p> <p>We concur that humans, driven by their desire for food, should become aware of and be responsible for the impacts of the current food systems. Constant motivation to obtain food, irrespective of the risks and consequences, plus the injustice in overproduction of animals highlight the urgent need for a more ethical, sustainable, and accountable way of consuming food. Moreover, it's fundamentally important to note that the act of killing animals solely for pleasure is inexcusable, and reflects a great deal of harm and mistreatment towards animals. Both our collective desires, and ethical considerations demand for a transformative change in our attitudes and actions toward food consumption and animal treatment.</p> <p><i>Consensus Statement 2:</i></p> <p>We concur that humans are largely motivated by their desires in regards to food consumption, often taking risks to satisfy these desires. We acknowledge the current food system's deficiencies and emphasize the need for more sustainable and ethical food consumption habits, understanding that humans should bear the responsibility of any negative consequences. We all agree that causing harm to animals for mere pleasure is unacceptable and urge for respect and ethical treatment towards all living beings.</p> <p>Winner: Statement 1</p>
<p>Iteration 10</p> <p><i>Consensus Statement 1:</i></p> <p>Recognizing our differing standpoints, we find common ground in agreeing that we perceive the world differently, and that both human and animal lives should be respected. The act of harming or killing animals, whether for pleasure or not, is unacceptable and unethical. No individual should derive pleasure from the detriment of others, and any such actions are viewed with disapproval by this group. Consequently, it is essential to understand and acknowledge the interconnectivity of all life, steering away from any bias or prejudice that might degrade its value.</p> <p><i>Consensus Statement 2:</i></p> <p>Recognizing various perspectives, all participants agree that harming animals, especially for pleasure, is wrong and unethical. While acknowledging differences in views on humans and animals' equitability, there is a shared desire to see the world from different angles and a collective stand against inflicting harm onto animals.</p> <p>Winner: Statement 1</p>