CELEBRATING 25 YEARS WITH THE SHORENSTEIN CENTER

EXPLORING: THE MEDIA AND POLITICS FRONTIER

UNEDITED TRANSCRIPT

Saturday
October 15, 2011

Nye Conference Center
Taubman Building, Fifth Floor
Harvard Kennedy School

(10:11 a.m.)

MR. JONES: Welcome back. We have had a great day yesterday. I think that all of you were here know that and I can assure you that we have more good stuff to come, a lot more very good stuff to come. Emily Bell, who is going to be leading the conversation and will introduce her partner here in just a moment, is someone who came to the Shorenstein Center a while back as a brown bag lunch person and I tried very hard to enlist her, but Nick Lemon at Columbia had beaten me to the punch, and she is now the Director of the Tow Center for Digital Journalism at Columbia.

She had been, before Columbia, the Director of Digital Content for *The Guardian*'s New Media and Editor Chief, *Guardian Unlimited*. She is one of the people who has been on the forefront of what has been happening in journalism and technology and is one of the people who is also not just knowledgeable but has sort of a penetrating mind that goes to the heart of things, and a sense of human as well, which I found is absolutely essential in these days. Emily just a moment ago paid this conference a great complement. I hope you won't mind if I say this, Emily.

MS. BELL: Go ahead.

MR. JONES: She said you had a great -- it was wonderful yesterday, it really was, and so forth and so on, and she said in fact I was just the teeniest bit envious. It was just a little too good.

(Laughter)

MR. JONES: So thank you, Emily. So I hope that you will now make it even better. Emily is going to be introducing our distinguished guest from MIT.

MS. BELL: Thanks very much indeed, Alex, yes. So if this is not quite as sparkling as the sessions yesterday it's because I'm deliberately sabotaging it, not because I'm hopelessly inept.

(Laughter)

MS. BELL: I'm utterly thrilled to be talking to -- in fact when Alex contacted me a long time ago and said who would you like to interview, I actually picked Joichi Ito who, at the time, had just been made Director of the MIT Media Lab. He is somebody whose work and thoughts and innovations as a journalist not only I've followed for a long time but also the things that he was responsible for and involved in like Creative Commons, Global Voices, Six Apart, Twitter, etcetera, were all technologies, platforms and ideas that at some point in my career I found myself using or using the thinking about.

So as I joined Columbia a year ago and then saw somebody that I greatly professionally admired joining another academic institution, I was going to say Ivory Towers, but I'm sure that whatever the MIT Media Lab is made out of, it can't be ivory and it's probably not a tower. So I'm thrilled that he is here today and I wanted to ask him why -- now, you are someone who has had a very geographically diverse career. You're an entrepreneur and investor, as well as somebody who has been an activist.

You've also been a club DJ. What I really want to ask you is what's on your set, but I won't do that until later. Why here? Why now?

MR. ITO: When I first heard about the opportunity, I had no -- I have a

brother-in-law who graduated from there and I have a lot of friends from the Media Lab, but I had no idea. But I'm one of those people who would never say no without learning a little bit more about it, so I actually came to the Media Lab and it was an incredible like speed dating thing where every 15 minutes I was meeting another faculty member or group of students. And after two days of just one person after another asking me all these questions, I realized that this was exactly where I wanted to be and I think that they felt it was a mutual thing.

And I think the reason, so I don't think I would fit in any other institution like this anywhere and the reason is my main problem, which I've been trying to wrangle into a strength, is I'm interested in everything and I'm very bad at focusing. And the way that I've sort of designed my life is to focus on the value I bring by connecting things that typically don't connect to each other and to try to turn this inability to focus into something that generates value.

It turns out at the Media Lab there is somebody more interested and better at every single thing that I'm interested in so far and it's the only place in the world that I can be interested in everything and have it actually be my job. And so, and then have people turn those interests into more then -- so as a venture capitalist you get to invest in a lot of companies and I tried various different jobs that allow you to do a bunch of things at the same time, but the Media Lab in a way creates impact in so many more ways so, to me, it's really the only place I can imagine right now. It's the best job in the world.

MS. BELL: Because you are not -- you haven't traditionally been a huge fan of formal education in the higher level, as is often said, and that you tried a couple of universities and of course it didn't quite fit, you are not a traditional academic. What do you think about how institutions like the Media Lab or possibly institutions like Columbia, Harvard, what can do or how can they change to participate in this world that you are describing now? Do they need to change? Is everything perfect and --.

MR. ITO: I assume I should be blunt.

(Laughter)

MS. BELL: The blunter, the better.

MR. ITO: The Media Lab is as untraditional and as informal as you can get probably, as a Masters in PhD program in an institution like MIT. The focus is really on learning and what I didn't really feel in the institutions that I went to, they were great institutions but a lot of the focus was on graduating and on the degree, and on the hours sitting in chairs and taking classes. And if you were a good long term planner, like my sister is a very good long term planner, so she has two PhD's, magna cum laude, Harvard, Stanford, all these.

So it's not that we -- it wasn't an environmental thing, clearly, but she was able to sit in the chair when she was in 1st Grade and say I'm going to be that person 30 years from now and in order to do this, I've got to do this, so she could plan her life. I just couldn't, I was too scattered to do that. So if it didn't really make sense for me for tomorrow, I couldn't do it. It turns out there are a lot of people probably that have this sort of disability, which is the interest-driven learning.

The Media Lab is all about how do you learn in an environment that is very unstructured when you have people who just want to build stuff and don't sit around thinking about what they want to be ten years from now? They sort of have a general trajectory but they learn through just tinkering and thinking and sort of -- so a serendipity oriented kind of view on life. And I think actually more people are probably better at that kind of learning than formal learning and so formal learning I think is great for people who can plan their life and put together this program but most kids, especially when they are small, can't do that.

So I think in a way the Media Lab and this informal learning that we do there, and some of my faculty will disagree because some of them are more academic than others, but I think we are designing a different way to learn and I

think there's a lot of variations in between strictly formal and completely informal and different institutions have those different shades of grey. But I think the Media Lab is probably the, I don't know, the most informal yet rigorous and so -- and it still has a lot of innovation that we can do.

So I'm trying to position the Media Lab as the future of learning in a certain category and so I'm hoping to -- if I went there, I would have graduated.

(Laughter)

MS. BELL: If you went there you would have graduated, that's a great endorsement. When you say sort of the future of learning in that kind of environment, one of the things that's been striking to me about the conversation over the past -- yesterday really was about something that sort of slightly obsessed me when I was a working journalist at *The Guardian*, was how difficult it was for the institutions of journalism, and maybe also we are talking about politics as well, the institutions of politics, to keep up with the kind of iterative thinking and behaviors that were going on in the software industry where you led things, which were really sort of transformative.

How do we change that? What's your kind of -- be the external insultant to us and how should we approach that?

MR. ITO: I think there are at least two things, the first one, which is the less insulting one, is that right now we have the ability to change our tools. And so if you look at the early blog software, they were all people who wanted to write, write text, and publish and express, but also knew how to write software. So there were these people who were kind of amateur journalist type people who knew how to write software. So instead of some big company creating a content management system for some big institution that hires a bunch of writers, this was a bunch of writers writing code, and so you came up with these very lightweight, very well designed platforms that became blogs.

The thing right now is that a lot of the technology that we use, your mobile

phone, your software, they are black boxes, so you assume that they can't be changed. If they are going to be changed, they are going to be changed by some company in Redmond and the only way you influence that behavior is by buying more or less of one thing or another. You can't tell them what to do and even if you could tell them what to do, and this is what we find at the Media Lab, you have to get the designer and the technology person working together and that's when the real innovation happens.

And as long as it's a black box being tossed over to you and your idea is being tossed back, that's never going to work, in terms of designing the tool. So the fundamental problem I find, whether it's -- and it's two pieces, it's the technology tool and it's also the institution business tool. The typical journalist doesn't have the skill to actually tinker with those two tools, so that's big problem number one. And then the other problem that we find I think, if you look at Silicon Valley, is that -- and there's a bunch of books around this too.

But it was very far away from large institutions and it was -- David Weinberger uses the phrase small pieces loosely joined, and it was really all of the great innovations around the internet are really teams of two or three people, whether it's Twitter or the web or the browser, everything. And you can't really innovate very quickly and iterate when you have a large institution and in fact even if you are a small institution, if you depend on a large institution for anything, you get held back.

And that's why we have had this difficulty on the West Coast is you are surrounded by these large institutions and you somehow think that you need to ask permission or that you care what they think, whereas on the West Coast you just do it, and so that part is the speed part. I do think that there is an opportunity because now you have all these citizen journalists creating tools and tinkering and doing all these things and then you can kind of look at those and see what your relationship to that is and maybe internalize some of this stuff.

We just had Wadah Khanfar, the former Director General of Al Jazeera, and if you talk to him, his relationship with citizen media is fascinating and they learn a lot from that. So I think that one of the solutions is to sort of give up on trying to do a lot of the innovation internally but to work with these outside folks.

MS. BELL: Well I was going to ask you about that because I was hoping that we would talk a little about networks, which is something which, again, this is really what we are talking about, in terms of how we see journalism, and also kind of politics, and how they relate developing. We can see it outside South Station and up in Zuccotti Park Park at the moment. When you join a network, do you automatically have to lose the kind of control that it seems to -- I mean having worked in a newsroom, the one thing is control.

This is something that obsessing journalists and we've gotten better at understanding how to give it up, but it doesn't feel like we are fully there yet.

MR. ITO: I think it's interesting because journalists always write about how control is overrated, in the fall of the Soviet Empire and all this stuff. I mean there is really very few cases now where it helps to have control in a complex environment and those who have the image that they have control are the ones who lost the most when it turns out that everything good and everything bad in the world was unpredicted and unplanned, and so I think planning is overrated.

I think that the minute you start planning, you start to think you know what's going on and then you lose sight of everything else going on around you. And so, again, I think of -- one of the words I use to describe the Media Lab is it's a serendipity engine and it's really trying to see what's around you, being agile and then, to use John Slee Brown's words, the power of pull, pulling the resources in as you need them and moving forward based on a trajectory or a compass, rather than a map.

And I think that the control people are the people who like maps and plans, but they don't work in the rest of the world, why would they work in journalism?

And, in the same way, I think that -- so I think control is overrated. I think when you come from the internet, building pieces of the internet, you realize that everything successful on the internet, whether it's the browsers, any part of anything was exciting mainly when it was used in a way that the original designers didn't anticipate.

MS. BELL: Right.

MR. ITO: Right, and so if you flip that around, again, it's about well if you were to control it. So YouTube, when it started, was a dating site with video. So if they were no, you are supposed to use it as a dating site for video, it would never have become the journalist tool that it is now. It was their ability to say well, no, you guys use it for -- okay, we'll pivot this, pivot. PayPal was a mobile app. And so all these things were only able to go because the designers and the people who ran this said well let's see what happens to it, and that's kind of the philosophy of the internet.

MS. BELL: So it's letting go of the idea that there's a canonical version, that nothing changes, that once it's done, it's perfect is something which--

MR. ITO: And it's not to say that you give up quality. So if you have a newsroom, you can still have a very rigorous newsroom but I think -- and maybe I'm misinterpreting your word control, but I think it's important to have high quality, but I think it's always important to be questioning yourself constantly. And journalists do this as a practice but I think when you institutionalize it, it starts to like oh, we want to find an expert. And this is kind of an interesting thing, I was talking to somebody from the CIA about this.

And so if you look at somebody, like the CIA, they can't actually go to people and ask somebody a question and say I'm from the CIA, can I ask you a question? So they tend to look for the one expert and they try to find the leading expert in the world and ask that one person, whereas the internet version of truth is you post it on UseNet or SlashDot and if it survives, it's probably true because

you have a million people who tried to tear that down and it survived. I mean it's the obvious wisdom of the crowds thing, but it's actually almost like a religious difference.

MS. BELL: Completely, and do the CIA accept now that they've been beaten by the internet or are they still sourcing their--

MR. ITO: I don't speak on behalf of the CIA.

(Laughter)

MS. BELL: Just on the sort of newsroom point, which you are absolutely right, which is that control and quality are sort of fitted together. It's almost like if we lose control, we lose quality, etcetera, and we heard a lot yesterday from people saying this is just simply not true, multi perspective or filtering the way that you kind of interact with a broader network actually increases quality, timeliness increases quality, all the things that you thought would degrade it.

If you were -- I know you are not a great one for planning but if you were planning a sort of a newsroom of the future, if I come to you and say look, everything we do, our systems are all organized around kind of structures of the past, let's throw those away, how would you organize the newsroom of the future?

MR. ITO: It would be very decentralized, it would be very --. I'm going to answer this in a slightly different way, which is if you look in Japan, every single disaster that's occurred where there was a planned -- there was a committee already, where there was a protocol, failed. So the Kobi earthquake, this recent disaster, because suddenly the rules kick in, they say okay, this is happening. The one that was really, really good was -- the response was good was the Peru hostage incident because it turns out they didn't have a plan.

So what the prime minister did is he said okay, who do I know? And they called their friends and they called their friends and they put together an ad hoc committee which turned out to be the best people in Japan on it, and they were

very quick at making decisions and they responded very well. And the more you plan it in Japan, it becomes political and institutional and then it just starts to -- and it ages but it doesn't change.

And so, for me, the newsroom of the future would be you only pull the things that you need, again back to John Slee Brown's thing, as you go. So I, when the earthquake happened, I wanted Geiger Counters and I had my friend here, Peter, who was a hardware hacker and he was trying to build Geiger Counters, and I asked my friend, John Vasconsellos, and he knew the guy who did the Three Mile Island instruments, and we got the father of the Japanese internet, and then Ray Ozzie said he was interested in the back end and within days we had all of the world's experts talking about who do we measure the data, how do we analyze the data, what do we think about the hardware.

And then like a few days later, actually I was at Alberto's place in Miami doing the night news thing and then I said hey, Alberto, you've got to fund this, and he funded it. But what was really amazing was that I had no expertise in this and within a day I knew more than all of the media. Within a week we were building Geiger Counters, deploying them and we had a citizens network. We now have 600,000 or 800,000 data points, it's the largest data set of radiation measurements now.

And I think some people that I told this to said oh, well, it's your political capital. That's not true, it was actually this competition of ideas and all the different groups that were on the internet that were working on this all kind of came together. They talked to us, they merged with us. There are a few who kind of want to do their own thing and most of them happen to be in academic institutions.

(Laughter)

MR. ITO: But what's interesting is all the sort of open people got together and so what's interesting is these bits of interest in news on the internet tend to

find each other, if you are open enough. And so the key is if you say okay, when this happens, this is the person I call all the time, then you are not really being open to new sources. And then one last thing I would say is the ability to vet sources is also -- you can use LinkedIn, you can ask your friends, you can post on Twitter.

So looking for new sources for a story is also I think a really important thing and I think that a lot of newsrooms, you kind of get used to using these traditional sources of information.

MS. BELL: Yes, and, again, that comes back to this idea well I trust my sources, they trust me. There's a kind of a process shift which needs to happen there to actually change it. Just on the sort of -- this idea, as you say, of highly decentralized news and listening for activity in the network and finding new sources and incorporating those into how you tell stories, one of the things that maybe sort of is worth pushing back a bit and I would really like to hear your thoughts on it because you were somebody who was in at a very early stage with Twitter, which I personally believe to be the greatest journalistic tool possibly since the printing press. Even maybe better than the printing press, who knows. I hope Bill Gehler is watching the livestream, though somehow I doubt it.

But as we decentralize journalism, we are actually giving an awful lot of our conversations a lot of breaking and valuable -- the first draft of history that journalism is very sort of notorious for compiling is being distributed onto platforms which are actually not -- they are open to us but they are not very open corporately. The more that we give to Facebook, the more that we distribute via Google or Twitter, or whatever, how do we think about that because it sounds great but you can, if you want to be skeptical about it, you can also say this is not actually an open system at all, this is a highly, as Clay Shirky put it yesterday, it's the corporate system which tolerates free speech journalism, etcetera.

MR. ITO: I think it's easier to do good design in closed systems and so just

about every kind of technology, you get the first version of it closed and then eventually open overruns closed. So whether it's AOL, email, even computer networks, modems, they all, the cool ones, started closed and then people realized oh, wait, we have to democratize it, let's open it up. And the open guys aren't necessarily as good at design because it's kind of like designing by committee doesn't work, but overthrow of governments work better when you have lots of people.

So I think that a lot of these closed systems will eventually be overrun by open. The time scale is tricky. I mean this is a funny side story. I was in Spain and we had a two hour conversation about this and somebody asked about Apple and I said yeah, Apple will eventually be overrun by open, and then the journalist who was there, the front page of El Pais said, Ito, Apple is dead.

(Laughter)

MR. ITO: And so that's mainstream media.

(Laughter)

MS. BELL: --newspaper front page is what we've been famous for.

MR. ITO: Sorry about that joke. But I just--

MS. BELL: Don't apologize.

MR. ITO: But to get back to the point, I do think that a lot of these things that we see right now in closed systems, it's occurred over and over on the internet and I think eventually they'll become open, it's just a matter of time. We are just testing a lot of new things in closed systems.

MS. BELL: I'm going to go around for questions in a minute so if people have questions, as we have the unusual American custom of lining up at the microphones. I still, a year from Britain, I still can't believe that we make you stand up to ask questions. But something I wanted to ask you specifically, a very sort of personal interest for me, which is that one of the things we are doing at Columbia now is we've introduced a dual degree in computer science and

journalism and there's this dialogue about well how much do journalists really need to know of the platforms and technologies that they are working and is this just an interim period?

I kind of think that all the things that we did really well at *The Guardian* we did because somebody who knew a huge amount more about technology than me had the really great idea for doing it. What do you think about the skill sets of journalists and how they might need to shift a bit in the future?

MR. ITO: So, going back to the tool thing, I think in many cases it may be easier to teach the technology people to become journalists, and maybe they don't become the best journalists but they learn journalism enough so that they can mess with the tools. And I started out my lift also as a journalist, even though I was more interested in technology, and I pivoted to technology once the technology became better, and I was never a great journalist but I knew enough about it so I could play with the tools.

But that, for the tool building part, you need somehow to either train the technology people to be journalists or the other way around. I think it's easier to train the technology people. But then at another level I think that if you think about the importance of data in reporting, we need people who understand data and programming in the newsroom somewhere and they have to know enough journalism to be able to do it because you have all these open government efforts but unless you can read the data, they are useless.

And then, conversely, I see all of these completely -- well more than, by the way, more than just computer science, journalists have to learn math. Statistics completely fail in almost all -- so there's a bunch of science, math and computers that have to be in the literacy of the newsroom and it's just like you have to learn how to type and use the word processor, this should just be something that everybody needs to be able to do.

MS. BELL: We had a morning at Columbia and J School last semester where

I sort of horridly gathered together lots of different data experts to talk about exactly this, about how do we introduce this, and we had a fantastic presentation from a really great woman at the architecture school, Laura Kurgan, who does brilliant visualizations, and one of my colleagues from the J School said this is great but we have, when people come to journalism school, they do it because they like to write and they like stories.

And she said when they come to architecture school, they like buildings and drawing but if they can't do the math, we don't let them in. And though I'm not sure if I could have actually done the math myself, I was thinking about having that made up as a kind of a banner. If you can't have --. Alex?

MR. JONES: I want to take a bit of a riff from what you just said about how you thought it was easier to teach journalism to people who really understood the technology. It seems to me that there is an increasingly smaller and smaller and smaller group of people in the world who really understand these things, this powerful tool of digital technology and how it can be applied, and that one of the public policy issues that doesn't get discussed and certainly doesn't get covered very well by the media for policy makers or for citizens is the policy dimensions of the kinds of decisions that engineers are making in places like perhaps the MIT Media Lab and other places far less transparent than that.

And I wondered if you had thoughts about how journalism or, in some fashion, inquiring minds can make comprehensible to people who are citizens of the world and legislators and so forth the policy implications of some of the technological and engineering decisions that are being made that don't necessarily on their face look like policy decisions but are profoundly policy decisions and are really outside the sphere or capability of what journalists, almost of any kind, can deal with?

MR. ITO: Lawrence Lessig wrote a book, I think his first really great book was called *Code*, and he talked about how software was like law and how the

architecture was politics. And he talks about how students, software engineers, came up to him after reading the book and said I don't want to be political, but his thing was well what you are doing is political because it effects policy. And I think that part of it is educating the people who are creating these things so they understand policy and this is again about being multi disciplinary.

I think the technology bit, there's another piece of it which is I think that unless you actually use the technology, it's very difficult to make policy decisions about it or even write about it. So, for instance, my friend, who is the head of Al Jazeera Online, he started out as an engineer at Accenture and started building the network for Al Jazeera, but it turns out that he had the right kind of personality to become the editor in chief, but he knew the software enough so that he could build his own system and could understand what was going on in the world.

And that's what I mean that technology people, some technology people can be great journalists because I think people who might have a journalistic type of mind or world view, a lot of them who are curious jump into the tools. I am very much this way, I was very much a media person, but I realized when I saw the tools that these would have a tremendous impact on media, so the first thing I did was that I -- it's kind of like if you're an artist and you start getting excited about paints when you were a child.

I think a lot of people who are interested in policy and interested in journalist jump into technology exactly because they realize now that this is a very political thing. Not all technologists are political, but I guess my point is a lot of the people are technologists exactly because they realize that that's where the policy battles are going to be fought. And that's why these programs I think are really important is to scan all the technology people and say who of you are doing what you are doing because you are interested in policy? If some, come here and let's talk.

In Japan and in the U.S. the biggest problem I find is that we have so many

elderly legislatures who are creating policies around things like copyright and computers without ever really having used one before and it's just kind of this intuitive understanding of what goes on. And, but I guess it's a long winded way of saying I think within the community of technology people, it's not a large percentage, but you will find -- our mutual friend, Ethan Zuckerman – Zuckerberg, he is the perfect example of that person who understands journalism, policy and technology. There aren't that many of them, but they exist.

FROM THE FLOOR: I'm Mitsy Worth and I'm with the Naval Post Graduate School but I actually work in Washington, D.C. And I'm like you, I never went to graduate school, I connect people and ideas. I've been told I'm an intellectual entrepreneur. One of the concerns I have with giving up print media, which seems to me has -- I mean I'm still angry at Warren Buffet when he talked Katie Graham into going public with *The Washington Post* because all of a sudden they had to write -- they had to make sure that they got a 20 percent profit and when the money comes in, all of a sudden that happens.

One can argue that doesn't happen on the internet, but my question is how do I know who to trust without spending endless days in front of a computer reading through a lot of stuff which doesn't have any value when I have a more than overloaded life? But I think, and this question of trust, which is so key, I mean you talked about how you had this trusted network. Were those all built over the internet or did you actually know them face to face?

MR. ITO: It's a combination. I think that great -- just not answer it directly, but I think they all augment each other. So if you look at the overthrow of the government in Egypt, and Mohamed Nanabhay, my friend, wrote -- he is doing a thesis on this, it's very interesting. You have the activists network, which are people trusting each other, you have Twitter and then you have Al Jazeera. And every time Mubarak attacked one of them, when he sent the thugs into the street to beat up the people, Al Jazeera and Twitter went crazy.

And so the highest ratings for Al Jazeera that day were when the thugs were beating people in the street and then when they shut down Al Jazeera, when they blocked it, Twitter went crazy and the activists went crazy and everybody started to repeat it. And then when they went after Twitter and started posting fake tweets, Al Jazeera started rebroadcasting the fakes and stuff like that, and it isn't in isolation of anything.

And so I think that mainstream media will always play a role, I don't know whether it's in print or whatever, but there will be trusted platforms. And I think that the relationship between Twitter and Al Jazeera was really essential because Al Jazeera presents the final amplification to the public but the people in the newsroom at Al Jazeera do spend the whole day sitting around trying to vet the sources, and you can kind of turn the dial as much as you want.

So I spent a lot of time during the Japan earthquake watching every single press release on my video, reading all the news streams, reading all of Twitter and whenever I saw *The Guardian* or the BBC or somebody get it wrong I would email them and say look, you've got this wrong, here's a clip from here, here are all the Twitter streams, and I was a citizen fact checker for these newspapers and I found several glaring mistakes that they made. But when I -- I just wrote an email to *The New York Times* this morning, a big, long email about why their article was wrong, and vetted all my sources and sent it all in, and they can check all these sources.

So I wouldn't say that the mainstream -- I don't think mainstream and professional media should go away and if you don't want to spend that time and you want to sit and read the press, that's a valid way of consuming news. But I think that more and more young people find diving in and spending the time to try to figure out their own view, that number is increasing.

MS. BELL: Which article was it in *The New York Times* that's in question?

MR. ITO: It was a very nuanced thing. So Hiroko Tabuchi wrote an article about some people taking some measurements in Tokyo and finding hot spots and

I was critical about it just because I am so focused on it right now. I think that the main story there was the way that the government wasn't publishing any of the data and that there were a lot of facts that she could have gotten. And this is exactly kind of the interesting thing about it is when you print something, she can't then go back--

MS. BELL: It's done.

MR. ITO: It's done, but I pointed to a bunch of different facts and a bunch of different data sources that could have added a lot more depth to the story. But I know that she was constrained in the time and constrained in the number of words she had, so it ended up being a lot less than it could be, considering it was in *The New York Times*, and that's what's frustrating to me.

FROM THE FLOOR: Hi. I'm Susan Crawford. So, Joi, a lot of optimism about open, overcoming closed, but also a concern about troglodyte antediluvian legislators and policy makers. So we are in an arms race, Clay says yesterday democracies are at great risk of closing down systems in order to -- there's a lot of fear out there, so what's your advice? How do we speed up the process of getting policy makers better informed? Is it just waiting for everybody to die off or is there something else that can happen?

(Laughter)

MR. ITO: Well I don't know. I think like attacking a policy maker's -- not attacking a policy maker, that sounds wrong. Attacking the problem of policy maker education is kind of doing it a little bit too frontal. I mean Larry is trying to do it with Change Congress and things like that. I spent a lot of time in Japan doing that, a decade on government committees and trying to change things from the inside. I think that this is the Silicon Valley way, you just build an alternative disruptive system and then it grows, and then you can't ignore it anymore, rather than trying to steer something big.

But I do think that one key element, and it gets back to your point, which is

that every single decision that we make is political and I think that Facebook forgets that we fought to keep each layer underneath them open and that they only exist because we fought these battles to keep things open. And then as the layers start going up to political free speech and copyright, we need to fight to make those open and I think if we can create an open internet that goes all the way up, all the way up to the sort of political discussion layer, then it becomes a pillar of openness in open society that then becomes something that the legislature just can't ignore.

So you've got these kids running around on the streets right now with this Occupy Boston stuff, it's just the tip of the iceberg. I mean once you get the ability to cause collective action very quickly, for better or for worse, you're just not going to be able to ignore it, and then suddenly the legislature is going to have to say how do we deal with this crazy thing that's going on, this flash activism, which is going to be -- I don't know if you've heard there's flash robberies apparently where everybody says let's rob the store, go, and then thousands of people show up and they can't stop them.

So there's definitely bad things that happen, but then it becomes a thing, so then what do we do about that thing? And so, to me, once you've got that happening on the outside, then you go up to the legislature, so, I know these guys, how can I help you? So it's a lot more convincing then the future is going to be like this. And, again, I wouldn't encourage bad behavior but I think like with the Arab Spring, it's a lot easier now to talk to the dictators left standing and say hey, you'd better change, now that the other stuff has happened.

FROM THE FLOOR: I'm Jim Snider, former Shorenstein fellow and currently a network fellow at the Safra Center where Larry Lessig is running the shop. My question relates to all the democratic reform organizations in the last half decade or so that are sort of copying the Media Lab. They are sort of democratic reform media labs and how are they doing? It's a follow your model or exploratory. So we

have, for example, the Sunlight Foundation has their Sunlight Labs for Democratic Reform. The Safra Center now has it's lab, democratic reform and media, Knight Foundation J Lab tries to do this stuff.

I have my gripes. One of the questions raised was the problem of having technologists that are policy informed. Most of these organizations take the policy framework actually as a given and try to match up existing data generated by the current system. From my perspective, crap in, crap out, and they've got all these fancy gadgets that I think the funders like but I don't think often have a really deep impact because they are not getting at the core public policies. They are generating very poor information and it's largely technology driven.

So I would be curious about -- I mean MIT Media Lab is real R&D and fundamentals and I actually don't think these democracy labs have been dealing with fundamental issues, to a large extent, I think it's quite largely gimmicky. What percentage, your overall view of these labs but, also, how successful should these projects that come out, if one out of ten is successful, is that -- what is your bench mark of success? If you are doing real R&D and this is supplied to be applied stuff, I think that the bench mark should probably be higher, but how would you evaluate these labs as to whether they are generating the goods that they really should because there's a lot of money now going into this and increasingly so?

MR. ITO: Well I think bench marking is very difficult, especially if you are thinking somewhat long term because the impact, there's so many different types of impact. And I also think that metrics are kind of a slippery slope too because if you can measure it, it means you already know the answer and a lot of what you are trying to do is figure out what the -- you are asking a question in which you don't know the answer, so it's kind of this loop that you get in.

I think that it's very important that -- well it really depends on what you are trying to do. If you are really trying to be --. So for the Media Lab a key part of

this is building but also being extremely interdisciplinary. So we have a Center for Civic Media, which is another thing that Alberto funds of ours, but I think that that works because it's a bunch of people who are interested in journalist and civic action who are surrounded by everything from a wet lab, working on molecular gene sequencing to people making robots.

And so they can pull on not just -- it's a very broad group of people and it turns out that a lot of these things can be used in a really interesting way and it also stimulates a lot of thinking. Now, how we would measure the impact of that is very tricky. And I'm also a venture capitalist, was my day job, I've stopped now but in venture capital the thing really is to bet on stuff that you really don't know. Like when we invested in Twitter, you can ask every single investor in the early round of Twitter whether they thought Twitter was going to be their big thing, I would bet you none of them did.

We just thought Ed was a cool guy, interesting thing, Blogger was okay, let's give it a try and every once -- it's like once, for a venture capitalist, if once in every ten years you get a Twitter or a Google, that's fine, and the average, like if you had invested $30,000 in Facebook, it would be worth about $200 million or $300 million today. And so the way that you measure the impact or the success of a fund is not by the average success over the portfolio, it's how many crazy wins do you get in every decade or every two decades.

And so if you are doing a lab, one of the things, and then it's also interesting, if you look at venture funds, the ones that very successful, the investors don't question the partners, they just let them go and swing for the fences. And the funds that are unsuccessful, the partners have their investors, limited partners breathing down their necks, and so they are afraid to take risks, so they take little bunts. And then getting two or three times your money on little investments doesn't work because you are paying these crazy people -- not crazy people, the VC's, $1 million, $2 million, $3 million a year to make little, tiny bets,

so then it turns out it doesn't pay.

And so what you want really is you want these guys to swing for the fences and not be measured on short term things. So that's sort of how I think about sort of massive innovation, scalable innovation, but it depends again on what you are trying to do. If you are trying to have a short term, reliable impact within the next few years, it's a little bit different from what we are doing at the Media Lab and what you would do at a venture fund.

So I don't ask the kids what is this going to do today because, just to give you another example, there was a -- YoYo Ma wanted a sensor on his boat, some new, weird instrument, so a student did that and then somebody that did a magic show, and this story I heard from Nicholas, so it wasn't me, but some magic show in Las Vegas wanted the sensor for the magic show, so apparently they sent students to Las Vegas, which was actually difficult to explain to MIT, to create this magic show.

And then an NEC engineer came and said that's exactly the sensor that we need to protect child seats from airbags, so now it's deployed in cars with airbags. And so this musical instrument turned into a magic show that turned into airbag safety, and so the thing that's really critical about this is you can't, from the beginning, say what is this going to do for me tomorrow, you kind of have to let the kids run around and do stuff that may or may not have returns.

The key though is to lower the cost of innovation because you need to place hundreds of bets, and so you want to lower the approval, you want to lower the cost. You want to make it kind of scrappy and you want to make each swing of the bat as low cost as possible, if possible free, and I think that's the only way you get -- that's my view. We may be talking about different things, I don't know.

MS. BELL: So I'll be going over here and then over there, then I think over there again and then over there.

FROM THE FLOOR: Hi. Alexis Gelber, former Shorenstein fellow, now

teaching at NYU. I wanted to go back to your very good point about journalists having to do math and, as Emily is very much involved in it, at Columbia there is now a joint degree program between the journalism school and the Columbia School of Engineering. And while most journalists may not necessarily be good at math, I think there's a general enthusiasm for technology and engineering, but I wonder from your perch at MIT whether you see that same level of interest among engineers in journalism?

MR. ITO: Absolutely, absolutely. I think that one of the really -- the things that convinced me that the Media Lab was where I wanted to be was that most of the things that these kids were interested in, these engineers, had nothing to do with engineering. They wanted to be social entrepreneurs, they wanted to be journalists, they wanted to be musicians. Some of them were professional musicians and they were there because they wanted the right to tinker with their tools and they wanted the freedom of having their own tools and, to me, that's a fundamental thing.

And so I think that's what I would say and so the reason why I say that it's harder to teach journalists and businesspeople to become technologists, that's not exactly precise. Journalists who go to J School and businesspeople who go to business school tend to be the ones who are trying to be those professions, assuming the tools they have right now are the tools they will be using. There's another category of slightly more disruptive, slightly less obedient journalists and businesspeople who feel like I can't do what I want to do with the existing tools, I want to mess with those and then do what I want to do, and that's the category of people that I think are at the Media Lab.

Now, some people, like me, I didn't have those opportunities in life and I may have been a different ways if I had been because most people don't know that the Media Lab exists and that you can be a journalist and join the Media Lab. So what I would like to do is take the DNA of the Media Lab and scale it so that we

can take this kind of tinkering DNA and put it into J schools and put it into other places because we don't have a monopoly on it and it would be great if more people did this.

But it really comes from this very kind of questioning authority, questioning the idea that you are not allowed to tinker with your tools and the sort of freedom to innovate, and I think that that hacking mentality is stifled because people try to pretend that software is in packages, that computers shouldn't be open, that if you open your phone it breaks the warranty. There's a bunch of stuff out there to protect the business models of those people who create the black boxes, and that's a very political thing, and it's about hacking.

We use the word hacking as a negative word but it's actually a very positive word. Hacking is about being allowed to break it open and modify the thing that you use and so --. So, I'm sorry, that's a long winded way of answering your question, but I think we have a lot of optimism.

MS. BELL: Just a quick personal note, if anybody knows disobedient journalists in the making in engineering schools, please send them to us at Columbia because that's what we are trying to do with the program.

FROM THE FLOOR: Hi. Seth Flaxman. I graduated from the Kennedy School this past May and now run a startup that I incubated here at the Shorenstein Center. And you said two things today that are pretty controversial around these parts, which is that planning is overrated and that we should try to answer questions that we can't necessarily measure impact for. And so the bulk of what I learned at the Kennedy School actually and the bulk of what the Kennedy School tries to teach is planning and measurement.

(Laughter)

FROM THE FLOOR: So I guess my question is what do you think the Kennedy School should try to teach?

(Laughter)

MR. ITO: So, by the way, my dean is the dean of architecture and planning, so I hope she is not watching this. I think maybe it's a terminology thing. I think traditional planning, structured planning where you assume you have all the variables probably doesn't work necessarily, now that we live in complex ecosystems that are high speed, complex and actually open systems when they look closed, and so there's a high level of complexity. I think there's a whole new art of -- and you can call it planning if you wanted to.

I mean I think you can stretch the word planning or you can come up with a new word, but the way that I think about it is you plan trajectories but you have to retain agility. So let me use a computer software development metaphor. So, in the old days or in old companies you plan what you want the thing to look like and then you spend a year or two developing the thing, and this is called waterfall, and then you test it for quality and then you maintain it. In agile what you do is you say okay, here are the rough things we want to do, here are the short term requirements, but every single week you review the requirements, change the course and you keep going.

And it's tricky because in a big company the CEO says well what is this thing going to look like when it's done and you say I don't know, but it will be better each week and it will be heading in the trajectory of what our customer and our company want it to do. And if you have the confidence, what you do is say that's fine, every single week it's going to head in a direction that generally meets my compass needle but if we find a little tree here, we'll go around it. If Twitter suddenly happens and it turns out that that's a much better path, we'll go that way.

And so that's planning, it's a process and a trajectory of where you want to go, but you don't have a map. And the problem is if you do a map and suddenly boom, a big mountain falls in front of you, like the internet, but you plan as if it weren't there, then you've got to tunnel through this thing. And so what is the

policy equivalent of that? I think there is a policy equivalent of that, which is what are our core values? What are we trying to achieve?

You set up the mission but you don't sit there and start drafting the specifications of the legislation or the policy based on every single problem that you can anticipate, you create a little version of it, you test it and then you modify it and you move and you modify it and you move. The Internet Engineering Task Force has rough consensus running code. Sometimes you get it wrong. We didn't anticipate spam, we didn't anticipate we would run out of IP addresses, but we kind of evolved our way through it as we got to those problems.

So I think there's a -- what I would say is focus more on process and a little less on trying to figure everything out before you try something and a little less on studying and, again, the historians are going to hate me for this, but studying cases and a little bit more on studying what's going on right now. I think it can't be either/or, but I find the cases tend to be the study of business, whereas entrepreneurship is the act of business, and there's a role for both of them. I'm not sure if I'm answering it, but focus more on process and a little less on study is what I would say.

MR. KALB: I'm Marvin Kalb. You spoke a moment ago about basic core values and that prompts my standing up to ask you this question. I worry about basic core values of journalism because they appear to be shifting today and people who have been at it for a long time are not quite sure any longer what a journalist is. And I feel, listening to you and other people like you, and I do that with great respect and with an awareness of my limitations, believe me.

But I feel like somebody on a lonely train station watching a rapid train leaving and I'm the journalist watching this technology in high flight while being pursued by a lot of very eager, bright people, more fascinated, and understandably so, by what it is that you are all doing, by the technology itself. By I'm mindful of a quote from Ed Murrow in a speech in Chicago in 1958 when he spoke about the

new technology of the moment, and that was television, and he said television is marvelous and in the hands of good people dedicated to good purpose it can educate, and he said even enlighten and illuminate. Otherwise, he said, it's just lights and wires in a box.

So my concern is how do you connect the new technology with all of the promise inherent in it with basic core values of journalism without which the technology may be wonderful for other things but in bad hands, again, it's just wires and lights in a box? How do you move forward without losing the core values of journalism?

MR. ITO: I think that the core values of journalism are very similar to values of a number of different communities on the internet that may not necessarily call themselves journalists. So, for instance, the Wikipedia community has this idea of a mutual point of view and they obsess about it to some almost an insane level. And so, in fact, if you go to the discussion page of any Wikipedia area where they are arguing about the validity of this source over the validity of that source and how many words should be used to describe this or that, you will find a value structure very similar to that you might find in a newsroom and, in fact, since they have almost infinite time, the conversations are much longer.

And so there are communities like that, the problem is whether those communities have -- how much influence those communities have. I would argue Wikipedia has a tremendous amount of influence right now and it's continuing, generally, to get better. And I would also argue that -- so the other thing is that I'm not being necessarily normative about this, I'm just pointing out what's happening, so I see the train leaving and all these other things.

I would also argue that this platform you are on is kind of sinking. So you are having companies buy newspapers and television channels who used to have primarily journalist values at heart, now being treated as content, having ratings at heart. And I would suggest that people who have core journalist values really

don't have anywhere to go or have fewer and fewer places where they can exercise those values, and journalists are being laid off in droves.

And so then the question for me is well where do we put these people, and where do they go and how do they exercise those values? So I personally adhere to the values of journalism, when I talk to -- and not just in journalism but just in my day to day life, whether it's fact checking, whether it's trying to be neutral, whether it's trying to be balanced and fair and all and whenever I try to write anything, I do that. So I guess my point is that I don't think newspapers and television and journalism schools have a monopoly on the values that you would call journalist values and that the trick is really to see how we could amplify those values in the communities of people on Twitter and other places.

And I would also argue that the damage created by those institutions that call themselves news agencies, that have lost those values, have a lot more damage because they have the authority of the name but they don't have the values anymore, whereas the people on the internet, even if they have those values, you are still going to read two or three sources and check them. And so the young kids today or at least the smart ones know that you are not supposed to believe everything you read on the internet and you are supposed to triangulate, and you yourself start to become a little bit more of a journalist, rather than just blindly, or maybe not blindly, but trusting these authorities.

And I think there's going to be a generation thing because I think the whole notion of authority is changing in the minds of young people and I think it's a kind of literacy. So a lot of people argue that Wikipedia, there could be factual errors, but any really smart kid who is trying to figure out something, they go to Wikipedia and they look at all the sources, and they read the discussion on the Wikipedia pages, and then they see all the sides of the argument and they come up with a much more sort of -- a much broader view of the argument than just the completed newspaper article about it. I don't know if I'm answering your

question.

I guess, just to reiterate, I think that even if you are just in chat rooms on the internet and you listen to the dialogue, if they are relatively sophisticated chat rooms, people will always be, I mean if you say something and it turns out to be wrong, you get pummeled, whether it's on a blog or whether it's in a chat room, and you won't do it again. You start to become very careful and, again, this rigor doesn't exist everywhere, but there's pockets of it and I think that that will grow.

MR. KALB: Okay, thank you.

FROM THE FLOOR: So I think I'm actually going to ask Marvin's question from a different perspective. My name is Nicco and I actually started my life writing code and teach technology here at the Shorenstein Center. And I heard you earlier saying something roughly akin to kind of ???? famous quote the arc of history is long but it tends towards openness, but I'm a little concerned that openness isn't justice. And the technologies we have, they are very profoundly about empowering individuals.

You said at the beginning that, if I'm going to kind of paraphrase, everything of consequence on the internet was started by two or three people. And I'm just wondering about the -- I think when Marvin talk about values, what he is concerned about is the role institutions have played in enforcing kind of important values of democracy. And even though I am a kind of very cold, serious technologist, I recognize that the values that the technology is designed on are not the same ones as democracy.

They are not about rule of law, they are not about holding power accountable, necessarily, and so I'm just wondering about that, that tension between the very nature of the technology which empowers individuals, I would argue, at the significant expense of institutions. At the same time, many of our institutions are corrupt and I kind of think deserve to die, to some extent, but I am worried about what gets lost in that equation and the kinds of values institutions

are good at carrying like, for example, justice.

MR. ITO: So, again, this may sound like a determinist statement but I think you can't really put the genie back in the bottle in some ways. So we have Wikileaks, it is, and we'll continue to have things like Wikileaks. So, just purely kind of from the trend is that institutions are going to be forced to be open, and I use the term transparency robustness. There are a lot of great institutions who cut corners inside because they never thought you would be able to --.

If you look at open source software, if you are a technology guy, you know if you are going to create an open source project, you've got to create it open source from the beginning, otherwise people put swear words as variables, they don't document, and it becomes spaghetti and it's so embarrassing you can't open it, even if it works. That's the state of most of our institutions today where you do things because you assume people aren't going to see it. And even the greatest institutions with great impact I don't think are robust under transparency.

And I'm not saying this is a good thing, this is a thing. This is going to happen and we are going to go through a tremendous amount of pain as we open up these institutions, I think, and then the new institutions, the lucky thing is if you are designing and institution from scratch today, you have to really kind in mind that --. I was with -- well I won't tell -- well I will tell the story. I was with John Markoff yesterday and he was interviewing me and I said well, John, can I tell you something off the record? Just remember everything you say may end up in *The New York Times*.

(Laughter)

MR. ITO: But I think you have to assume that everything you are doing is going to be opened. The thing is you can create institutions that way, if you design them from scratch. It's hard to transform them, so I think there's going to be a lot of real damage. But, to get back to openness, I think that fundamentally though, because technology, until recently, has really been focused on creating these

institutions that have power and protecting their secrecy, and then taking the individuals and destroying their privacy.

That's just been the way because the power does that and I think it's finally the inning of the internet, sort of people being a little bit more aware that technology is being used to do the reverse, which I think is important, that those in power should be forced to be transparent and individuals require privacy in order to be able to --. So I'm not addressing justice directly, but you need to be able to question authority without fear of retribution and you need to be able to dissent without being crushed immediately, otherwise you can't have democracy.

So one of my developers in Syria was just shot and all of his guys are being thrown in jail and beaten every day and in those societies, and what are they using? They are using Facebook, they are using -- they took his gmail password, they took his Facebook password, rounded up his friends. All this technology is being used primarily, in those sorts of places, to stifle dissent and you can't have democracy when you can't have a couple of people get together and say you know? I don't really like this president? Boom. That doesn't work, that's not a democracy.

So I think that privacy is essential in democracy and with the technology we have today, you no longer have privacy. And to put it a little bit more in a different level is that in the U.S. or in certain countries you may trust your institutions, but every policy decision around technology that we make in the U.S. affects the rest of the world, and I don't trust the regimes of the majority of the countries in the rest of the world. And so if you are thinking about free and open society from a global perspective, you really, really need to allow people to attack their institutions, whether verbally or otherwise, so I think that that's a fundamental architecture decision that we need to make. And for justice, so I'm not sure exactly what your definition of justice is and you might want to clarify it.

FROM THE FLOOR: Well actually I would just say you kind of touched on it

a little bit in the beginning of the answer when you were talking about well we just need to build some new institutions, and that actually makes a lot of sense to me, but trying to figure out, I guess I'm struggling in figuring out how and where and what kinds of thinking is required to take the values of the technology and bring them to the values of, you know --.

MR. ITO: And I think part of this will happen by it happening in other countries without those institutions. So I'm not sure whether it's going to happen in Egypt, but WADA yesterday was hopeful, but you have these countries now that are overthrowing their governments, lots of young people that are technology empowered. They may not get it completely right at the beginning, but they are testing a lot of things. I was just in Tunisia and listening to an argument around censorship and the level of the discussion, it felt like I was in the Berkman Center, not in a discussion in some --.

The quality of the discussion and the debate around censorship and the nuance because they were basically arguing that -- against the law. They were arguing against a law that was banning child pornography and it was very, very nuanced because these lawyers were saying no, if you start doing that, it breaks this whole idea of the power, of the role of the legislature versus the judiciary and the judiciary shouldn't be doing this and doing that. They were talking like constitutional law professors in trying to attack this law and they understood the technology.

So I could see, in some of these countries, seeing some model institutions develop in the oddest places and then that, just like the Arab Spring kind of spread, it might be interesting to see. And I think you'll find it in local governments because like in the U.S., you find a lot of really interesting innovation going on in local governments. So I think kind of piloting interesting, new transparent institutions and then having people say hey, why don't you guys do that, rather than trying to change the institution? I don't know, that's just an idea.

MS. BELL: Very much the last one.

FROM THE FLOOR: I bring you greetings from the West Coast and from the years of having debated some of these issues with the members of Asahi Shimbun and people like that where we were headquartered with the AP back in those days, and it was a tough argument then. I also want to clarify the fact that though I follow Marvin Kalb, we have experience going back a long time, from 1956 when we slept in the same bed in Jakarta, Indonesia, and with his brother, Bernie, we raced up the highway to interview Sarkano about his trip to Russia, and China and the United States.

The questions I have are based on the fact that I wonder whether or not the new media is concerned only with how to communicate, rather than what to communicate, and I think that one of the things that I found here in the last two days, I think it was a great conference and many of the people are very thoughtful and so on, but I didn't hear Afghanistan mentioned at all. I didn't hear the problems of colonialism, the problems that journalists work at all the time and can't come up with the real answers, we struggle with it.

I've had 56 years in journalism, came from the USC Annenberg School of Communication and Journalism, and many years in the Associated Press and then CBS News, and we don't have an answer for many of these things. And I just don't know how we are going to deal with these problems because one of the problems I think of the old media, my old media, is who is in control of it, who owns it, and it's largely corporate ownership, which really has no sense of what journalism should be doing and how it should serve the people and the country as a whole.

So I think that I leave today troubled by the fact that I haven't got an answer for this and I know that hearing you has been marvelous but, at the same time, I think we really -- we are struggling and it's a great struggling and I don't know how soon we can really resolve it. But we shouldn't lose track of the fact that there are young people coming into the schools of journalism who don't have

much sense or education about the problems out there in the rest of the world.

I went to Afghanistan in 1957 and interviewed, after having survived an attack in Pakistan at the Khyber Pass where I was invited to go by Abe Rosenthal, and I went to the American Embassy there and I met the political officer there and he said what can I do for you? And I said well I would like to know about Afghanistan, tell me, this is a kingdom, right? Yes. And how much aid does the United States give Afghanistan? He said owe, about $50 million year, in 1957 dollars. I said what's it for? He said nation building. Now, low and behold, where have we heard that most recently?

MR. JONES: We are going to have to have a question.

MS. BELL: So I think your question was the how do we answer this question, I mean just--

FROM THE FLOOR: Well the question is--

MS. BELL: --one thing I would say is that 40 percent of the people who now come to Columbia, and I'm sure the same is true of many, many J schools, actually do come from outside the U.S. and probably know a great deal more about their home markets which--

FROM THE FLOOR: Okay, well my only question really is how do you meld the skills of a journalist, which you've had, with the new media that's on the horizon and taking much more prominence?

MR. ITO: I would definitely suggest you look at Ethan Zuckerman's work at the Center for Civic Media because the reason he got into it was he was in Africa and realized that no one wrote or cared about Africa. And then I've talked to a number of professional journalists and asked them why aren't you writing more about this, why aren't you writing more about that and, to your point, it's a company now and if it doesn't sell newspapers, if it doesn't sell magazines, it can't write about it, so just reinforcing systemic biases.

In the old days, the journalists were looked to as people who would tell you

what you should be reading, not providing what you want to read, and there's a whole body of work in the technology field, and Ethan is working on this, I am working in this, is how do you prevent the reinforcement of systemic biases. I believe, so I am on the board of an organization called Global Voices and it's about getting people to blog and make content and teaching kids in the slums of Columbia to make videos about themselves because I -- I call it the caring problem.

If you don't care, it doesn't matter what you know, if you don't care and if you don't care, you don't read about it, and the way you get people to care is you connect them. And so one thing that's new is that the journalist is a proxy for what's going on. It turns out that if you have the person there, the kid in Columbia, and you see the video, you start to care. And when you connect citizens together, you start to care. So, to me, providing voice at the edges of our network actually starts to solve this caring problem.

So in the old says what you would do is you would have an authority system, you must care about Afghanistan, and then you would care. Now you can't do that, what you need to do is get the kid from Afghanistan to come to a conference here and say hey, care about me, read my blog, connect with me. And so, to me, it's empowering those voices and really silly things, like I have a World of Warcraft guild and we play video games together, and I have soldiers deployed in Afghanistan and I have these kids from the Middle East and we sit around and we talk.

And then finally I started seeing these kids caring and these kids are now flying all over the world to meet each other. So there's a bunch of different ways for these kids to connect with each other and once they care, I start sending links in our World of Warcraft forums to things going on in Syria, and is that where that kid lives, and they start to care. And so, to me, a lot of this is about connecting these communities and then you can feed that back into mainstream media

because if the kids start caring about what's going on in these countries, they'll start buying media about it. So, to me, it's a caring problem.

MR. JONES: Listen, this was terrific. Emily, Joi, thank you very, very much.

(Applause)

C E R T I F I C A T E

This is to certify that the preceding transcript is an

accurate record based on the recordings of the proceedings

taken before: Alex S. Jones

In the Matter of:

EXPLORING: THE MEDIA AND POLITICS FRONTIER

Date: October 15, 2011

Place: Cambridge, Massachusetts

11/1/2011

Allyson R. Farley Date

Advance Services