

Nancy Gibbs: Well, welcome, everyone. Thank you for joining us on what feels like a wintery November day. I am especially grateful to have this group of amazing women to talk about the challenges, truth, trust, and democracy. No small set of concerns. I'm Nancy Gibbs. I am a professor of practice here at the Kennedy School, and direct the Shorenstein Center on media politics and public policy, where we are looking across as many different levers as we can to address the serial crises around truth and how you define it, and trust and how you rebuild it, and democracy, all of which are directly relevant to the work that my panelists do. So starting, Martha Minow, who's the 300th Anniversary University Professor.

Martha Minow: Not 300 years old.

Nancy Gibbs: No, it's that title. At Harvard Law School, she's a former dean of the law school and an extraordinary voice and expert on human rights, on digital communication, on our information and environment. Her most recent book, I want to get this right, *Saving the News, Why the Constitution Calls for Government Action to Preserve Freedom of Speech*. Again, all the relevant topics for today, and she's currently on the board of GBH, chairs the board of the MacArthur Foundation, and was on the board of CBS News. So touches all of the legal and media and human rights aspects of these issues that we're addressing.

FCC chairwoman, Jessica Rosenworcel is particularly focused on the issue of accessibility to and affordability of our communications system. We talked about how you think of your jurisdiction as the channels, the pipes, the roads by which people are able to access information, and making that more equitable, more affordable. COVID, of course, was such a vivid reminder that we cannot take for granted that of course everyone can do everything they need to do on the internet, whether that's their shopping or their homework or their job, because there is still large swaths of the country where high speed internet is still not a reality.

You may recall the images we saw people camped outside of a Starbucks or a library or someplace where they could possibly pick up a free WiFi signal in order to get their homework or their work done. We have not closed that digital divide and that has been a major focus, but one among many of the challenges that we are facing. And Tracy Chou is an entrepreneur, a software engineer, and a leader in thinking about how to make tech more inclusive, more equitable, more I would say public interest oriented.

She's the founder and CEO of Block Party, which builds tools for online safety and anti-harassment, and the latest is privacy party, which makes it easier to find and address privacy risks on social platforms. She formally worked at Quora, at Pinterest and at the US Digital Service. So again, I love the mix of disciplines and this mix of experiences that you all bring to this.

Where I'd like to start, we were talking about the foundational values of the media world that I came out of, and the FCC had a very important role to play in

articulating and enforcing those values, whether around public television and decency and what Sesame Street was able to do because of the protection of public interest values in the decision of who gets broadcast licenses. And because you had control over the agency, had that control, the ability to exert real influence over the public interest aspect of our information environment was a very real thing.

Those values don't necessarily transfer very easily to an age when we are all internet all the time, and that broadcast spectrum is fading into our rear view along with much of what we think of as traditional legacy media. And so I'd be eager for you to talk about how you think about the application of public interest values now to your role and what tools you have to make sure that we create, we still have a public square and that people can not only access but can trust.

Jessica Rosenworcel: All right. Well, thank you for having me here today and starting somewhere deep in conversation about information and democracy. Not necessarily liked, but deep. I think you characterized the Federal Communications Commission well, and frankly there's a lot about the history of the Federal Communications Commission that aligns with the history of media and information in this country.

If you think about the phone system and the choices we made, let's make sure we reach everyone everywhere so we can share facts, so we can converse and do that not just in our community but across the country. Those were policy choices we made to support a network that reached all of us. When we had radio stations and later television stations, we decided that if we would give those licenses out, but we would expect something in return. You would have to serve your community. You'd have to make sure that candidates for public office had access to those airwaves.

You'd also have to make sure that you had some programming over time that's helped enrich young people who might sit before the screen for hours. And so we added this public framework to all of these technologies, and later when we developed cable systems, we had public educational and governmental channels. Some of the capacity was reserved for community so your town hall would have a place to broadcast its meaning.

This was important for community, for democracy, and it was a public interest value we applied to the next big set of communications. I think what strikes me most in the internet era is we've gone to a world that feels infinite but has fewer of these guardrails and values associated with that. I think that evidence of this right now is just in how much activity we're starting to see in our courts and in state legislatures and in legislation that gets introduced but not passed in Washington, because what you see across the board is a lot of dissatisfaction with the biggest companies, their influence on our lives, the ways that they can profit off of misinformation and disinformation, and the ways that our children

are changed by viewing these new services and spending so much time with them.

But we have not really wrapped our arms around what public interest values mean in the internet age. And I think all of that litigation from our state attorney's general and legislation and state courthouses and conversation in Washington is some evidence of that. So I just think it's valuable to think about what we've done as a country in our history, and ask ourselves, "What should we do right now?" Because I've got to believe that the environment we can exist in can be better than this, that it can be better and healthier, support information and democracy better than what we're doing right now.

Nancy Gibbs: So I think there's lots of evidence that suggests broad and popular agreement. Whose responsibility is that? I would love each of you on that, because I suspect you have different answers to that. Martha, why don't you ...

Martha Minow: Well, it's all of our responsibility. When we compare the United States and Europe though, United States has a philosophy that's so well captured by the platform companies and indeed the tech innovation spirit, which is move fast and break things. Europe has to overgeneralize a very different idea, which is a precautionary principle. Let's look at the risks before we unleash powers that we don't understand.

I think that probably we need to learn something from Europe. And at the same time, I do think that there are some great traditions in the United States, a public oriented tradition. Legally we have a problem about who's responsible here. In the United States, we're on one extreme end. Anything that gets close to speech, we're very nervous about the government regulating, the government having any say.

And the fact is we now have court decisions treating anything on the internet as speech, including code itself. If that position holds, then the highest level of deference to the private sector is accorded regardless of the decisions that are being made. I think that we've gone down the wrong road. I think it's not necessary under our constitution. And again, other countries have a different approach.

I think that inside of government we are confused because we have many different agencies with different pieces of this puzzle. One example I would just put on the table and then I'll subside is that the competition that could happen over the moderation of social media depends on treating the issue of antitrust as a serious one. Whose responsibility is that? Is that going to be the Department of Justice? Is that the Federal Trade Commission?

It's not high on their agenda, and yet the bundling together of the content moderation function with all the other stack layers of the stack of the internet means that we do not have choices as just ordinary users. We don't even see

what's going on, much less have any control over what's going on, which is why we need your work very much.

Nancy Gibbs: So Tracy, because you've worked both from inside and outside the government and it feels like with things like Block Party, you have been trying to empower consumers to have some protection, some control that absent any kind of responsibility from the platforms. How do you think about both whose responsibilities this are and where the levers are?

Tracy Chou: I think I bring two pretty relevant-

Nancy Gibbs: I want to make sure all the mics are ... Okay, it's mostly here.

Jessica Rosenworcel: [inaudible 00:11:43].

Nancy Gibbs: All right. Good?

Tracy Chou: So I have two perspectives here. One as an engineer, as somebody who wants to build things, and second as somebody in the private sector responding to all of the incentives of capitalism. I think there's a responsibility here for government and regulation to set up the infrastructure so that it's possible for people to build solutions, understand what's going on, build solutions and use the economic incentives of the private market to drive that innovation.

So one example, what I mean, APIs, application programming interfaces allow third party developers to build applications on top of other platforms. Twitter used to have APIs that were freely accessible and that made it possible for my company, Block Party, to build anti-harassment tools on top of the service that were really useful for people who were dealing with abuse and spam and harassment, and allowed people to stay on the platforms and exercise their choice. Elon Musk came in and decided he no longer wanted that, and so the APIs are gone.

Nancy Gibbs: And Reddit, same with Reddit.

Tracy Chou: Reddit also hiked up their prices so much that they're effectively unusable. And so now we can't build those solutions. As a technical workaround, we can still do things like browser extensions. It's just a lot hackier. So the engineers and developers, we're still going to try to do what we can. It would be a lot easier with standards, enforcement around there must be some level of openness. A lot of researchers are running into this problem now too. They want to understand what's actually happening on platforms, understand are there disinformation campaigns running? Are there other harms that are spreading through these networks that we don't even know because the big platforms don't want to see that control.

They'll often say, "Oh, it's too complicated, we just can't let anybody see this." It's not true. Their interest is to not give up that power. If there are APIs that are mandated for researcher access to understand what's happening, for people to be able to build solutions and interventions, then we'll be in a very different space where we can then just use the market incentives for people to build out these different consumer experiences and allow people to choose what they want.

Right now we're kind of stuck in this state where we're hoping for platforms to do the right thing and give people access. Even the research studies that you have seen, NYU did a study on the impact of Facebook on the 2020 elections, and the preface to that writeup in science is a big long thing about how it was great that this study worked, but this is not a model for future research where it's fully relying on Facebook's goodwill.

Nancy Gibbs: And I'm assuming that you don't believe the FCC in any way has the authority to mandate through directly/indirectly that kind of transparency.

Jessica Rosenworcel: Yeah, it does not fit neatly in the Communications Act of 1934.

Nancy Gibbs: So in the absence of that, and Martha, you've talked a lot about the how much, absent Congress taking any action on much of anything, certainly on this, if you feel that your rulemaking and your jurisdiction doesn't allow this, that leaves self-regulation. How optimistic should people be about that as a ...

Martha Minow: Well, does it work well to have the fox guarding the henhouse? Not really, but when the foxes actually own access to the hens, we really do need some other actors at the table. I think antitrust is a tool, a framework that was founded at the last gilded era, which was the public utility idea is one that I do think has some relevance here. If we all are so dependent on the internet to do anything, that starts to look an awful lot like the water supply and the electrical supply, and we came up with legal frameworks that justified regulation there, while keeping market opportunities so that people can actually get a return on investment and continue to invest in innovation and development.

I think that public utility is a really useful framework here. It's stretching it beyond what it has been in the past, but we also need some actors willing to try it. It could be the Federal Trade Commission might actually be some states. As we see the innovation right now in the United States around privacy, it's at the state level. Same thing with regulation of AI until this past week's announcement from the White House. It's been at the state level.

That shows something about the robustness of our constitutional system that when there's something not working at the federal system, there is another place to go. But if there's ever anything that requires at least a national, if not an international, a solution, it's regulation of the internet and internet companies, because nothing stops at the border of a state or a country.

Nancy Gibbs: So it feels as though, and this is what you're suggesting, is that we have the states on the one hand who may not be ideally suited for Montana to say no TikTok, and then you have Europe especially being much more proactive. I'm wondering how much of the European regulations do you think, beyond all of us accepting cookies, do you see being transferrable, translating having an influence here, or are we just always going to be the last country to be willing to be proactive around addressing some of these harms?

Jessica Rosenworcel: Well, I think it's very interesting for Washington right now because the Capital's being squeezed on these issues. On the one hand, you have states like California that have passed very aggressive privacy laws and laws to try to protect children online. And on the other side you've got Europe, which is minting new laws on digital services at a really fast pace. And so if you had asked me a while ago, I would've thought that those pressures for this service that is fundamentally interstate and international for a web that we all rely on every day, those pressures would make Washington more activist in order to preempt states from the excesses of their behavior, things that are not really optimized for state government to choose, and prevent other countries from dictating the terms of our access to websites.

And yet at this time, those pressures are out there, but we don't really have a consensus in Washington on where to go next. I keep on believing that there's going to be another Supreme Court case that comes soon that provides that incentive, because they are increasingly taking up cases that involve speech and the online world. I think that will wind up being an exogenous force and maybe the collection of those three forces, the Supreme Court, state activity and European activity will be enough. But I definitely think that there's a lot of pressure on Washington to try to figure out what a modern framework here looks like. A lot of consensus that the world should be better than it is right now, but inadequate consensus about what to do with it.

Nancy Gibbs: It's there. Tracy, can you help us understand the potential for third party content moderation to play a role here and how that would work? How would you grade some of the attempts so far?

Tracy Chou: Yeah, I actually want to first react to this idea that the government struggles with the regulation of speech and then overflow into some of my answers. I think for a long time we've thought that government regulation of speech online means the government is going to say this is okay, this is not okay, and be the arbiter. And for very understandable reasons, particularly in the US, we have shied away from that. But it's not just the option of the government decides what is okay or not okay, or the platforms decide what is okay or not okay. There is that option of third parties. Somebody else can be the one to decide. It could be the individual users, it could be individual users subscribing to a feed that's moderated by somebody else.

You could imagine Disney runs a feed and has their own algorithm with their own inputs for what is child-friendly and you can subscribe to the Disney feed.

So you no longer have to subscribe to what Facebook is pushing or Instagram is pushing. You can have a whole marketplace of other people who are creating their own experiences. What we were doing with Block Party is allowing people to choose what they wanted to see or not see. And it could be at the level of granularity of I don't want to see people with fewer than 100 followers in my mentions, or people who haven't set photos. They're probably spammers. I don't really care, I just don't want to see their content in my feed.

And that's not something you would say that the platforms should filter out. You shouldn't filter out all new users and the government should not be in this space of saying that somebody who's calling you ugly online should not be allowed to be there. But pushing more control to other parties gives us a lot more options. I still want to point out there is a responsibility for content moderation that lies with platforms.

There are some things that have to happen with the platforms themselves and the central authority. So there are sometimes the content that they are legally required to take down, like terrorist recruitment, child sexual abuse materials, and there's other stuff that they just want to take down like spam, because if spam overruns your site, then nobody wants to use it. For questions of disinformation or things that are very coordinated and can only be seen at the network level, there's also still more responsibility with the platforms.

However, there's a big gray area of other stuff that individual users or different communities may care about differently. So in a certain community, certain words may be okay to use and others may be not. There shouldn't be a single standard that's applied around the entire world or even an entire country. Different communities should be able to choose that, in my opinion, and that is much more feasible if there are third party developers that can actually build solutions on top of APIs.

Nancy Gibbs: Again, I mean there's so much I feel faith put in transparency, transparency, transparency, and I feel like that is often misplaced around that. It's about the algorithms as opposed to the APIs, and that what you're saying is not about it's anything the government is going to be doing. It's about these tools that would actually be very empowering for consumers.

Tracy Chou: I would say there's two pieces to this. There's the transparency and being able to observe what's happening. So when people talk about algorithmic transparency, I roll just a little bit because knowing what the coefficients are and what the variables that are getting plugged into your models is not actually that useful. Technically Twitter open source, it's feed algorithm, and what we figured out was that Elon's boosting his own tweets, but that doesn't actually tell us what people are seeing in their feeds, what sorts of content on the platform actually gets elevated.

So just having the algorithm is not enough without the data and what happens when these come together and people are actually using the service and

interacting with it. So that's one piece which is the transparency and observability, and we can't rely on the platforms to tell us all the bad things that are happening. We need researchers to be able to go in there and look at it. And then there's the other piece of building interventions and solutions, which requires those programmatic interfaces.

Martha Minow: And also if there was a requirement of opening up that moderating function, so middleware is a name that people have given to it, and competition. We could have Disney and the Boys and Girls Club and the Methodist Church and the LGBT advocacy community. They each could be moderating. For a country that says that we care so much about individual freedom, we're allowing a few companies to eliminate it without discussion. And I think that this is one reason that you see people from both sides of the aisle in Washington proposing so much legislation.

I mean it's into the dozens each year. Everybody thinks there's something wrong. Yes, they don't agree on what the solution is, but that's a pretty good thermometer about we need to do something, and I think it's going to be a public-private solution, and it's probably going to require some kind of limitation on the power of some very large companies to occupy the whole range of the stack. That has to be opened up so that there are more players, and the players that can include for-profit players that are smaller than could compete, but also nonprofits.

I personally think that we should be exploring the possibility of a public internet as a rival, the same way that public television elevated the standards, demonstrated that Sesame Street actually had a market. Sesame Street is now on commercial television, commercial media, just demonstrating, breaking through the assumption, the narrow perspective of the first movers, or the first successful movers. Well, that's a different kind of government action. It's not necessarily breaking up the big companies, but making a lane that's open for another kind of communication.

Nancy Gibbs: I'd love to come back to that idea, because of course public media as we traditionally think about it, was very much something that the FCC was a driver of. What prevents you from being a driver of the 21st century's necessary version of that? If it was traditional public media in the 20th century, it would be a public internet and surely in the 21st century.

Jessica Rosenworcel: Yeah, well we have a lot of history to share and a lot of models from that history, but what we don't have with this new era is the same legal and technical basis for action. Because when we had television stations that relied on public airwaves, that spectrum was a legal and technical hook for action. Spectrum's not infinite. We had to give out licenses. Those licenses were exclusive and there were conditions associated with it.

We can use that as a tool, but in this world of the digital age, we've gone from finite and knowable to infinite, and those same legal tools are not available, or

certainly aren't contemplated in the law today. I think that that is a big challenge, but we have to sit here and say, "Are we sacrificing all of our values at the altar of that?" Because when you look at the history of the development of technologies, this way we put a public frame on everything is really valuable.

We even continue to do it today. You don't see it, but we set aside Spectrum for commercial licenses so everyone's phones here work, but we also set aside airwaves for unlicensed access. So we have public access to the airwaves to make technologies and innovation work and to have free access to the internet. It's this continuous idea that as we develop new technology models, we try to bring some of these public spirited values along. It's less present in the world of the internet than any technology that preceded it.

Nancy Gibbs: Why did you decide to make that neutrality such a centerpiece?

Jessica Rosenworcel: All right, well that's [inaudible 00:27:57].

Nancy Gibbs: We were sort of done with net neutrality and then it's like of all these things we're talking about, and of all the places where you could put your energy, why did you decide that should be the priority?

Jessica Rosenworcel: Well, first things first, I support net neutrality because I think our broadband providers, who are our gateways to the internet, should not block websites, slow down services or censor content online. And many of us don't have a lot of choices of broadband providers. So making that table stakes is smart. But I ultimately think the conversation about net neutrality is narrow. The broader conversation to have is by virtue of bringing back net neutrality, what we are doing is saying that the Federal Communications Commission should have oversight over broadband.

And the reason that's important is we just got out of this pandemic where life moved online. Broadband is now essential. There's nobody here who would move to a house without electricity or broadband or plumbing. We all need internet access to thrive in the 21st century. The last administration chose to retreat and suggested that the FCC should have no role over broadband oversight, and with the effort to put back in place net neutrality, we are also making an effort to say that broadband oversight's essential because everybody needs it, the public deserves to have a cop on the beat, and that this technology also has extraordinary implications for our national security and public safety, and we need somebody who's mindful of that rather than just assuming that in every environment the market takes care of it on its own.

Nancy Gibbs: I guess that one reason I wonder is whether your assertion of that authority potentially opens a door for asserting other authority that would be relevant to some of the challenges we're talking about.

Jessica Rosenworcel: I guess that when I think about the Federal Communications Commission and the authorities we have, it's always based on the network. It's the facility that delivers the bits. It is the airwaves that transmit a conversation or data. It is not in fact usually the data that rise on top of it. So that would be an extension of our authority beyond what I think our statute would permit. But I still think that all of these gateways to the online world, we have to be smart and thoughtful about them and make sure we apply our values to them.

Nancy Gibbs: One of the things that we spend a lot of time thinking about at Shorenstein, and that Martha has been a real leader on when we talk about truth and trust and democracy, has to do with local information and local news. She knows Steve Waldman wrote the report for the FCC about critical information, and I think it's important to remember that news for many people is something of a luxury good. Only a quarter of people in this country have ever paid in any way for news. And now it may be down to like 16%. People don't think it's something they should have to pay for.

But critical information like how do I get a job? How do I get a COVID vaccine? What roads are closed? Is our water supply contaminated? Literally critical to health success in communities, it feels like something that the government really does have a responsibility to make available, and if it isn't then that is more than just a market failure. So I'm curious about how you think about in this environment when two newspapers are closing every week, how you think about the government's responsibility in making sure that critical information is available.

Jessica Rosenworcel: So we're looking at a landscape that has changed so dramatically in the last 15 years. I think Pan America, they did this study where they said something like 1800 newspapers had closed in the last decade and a half, reading news deserts. We are watching the destruction of the economic model that led to a lot of radio and television stations producing news. This is a crisis because local news, we all need it to make decisions about our lives, our communities, and our country. So we have to look at the resources we have and say, "What else can we do to help sustain news?"

And some of these things I think of as maybe within the FCC's purview. A lot are outside. One thing we've been looking at recently is how can we come up with a system to incentivize the production of local content. Without offending the First Amendment, how do we make sure that, for instance, we can accelerate the license renewal of any station that locally produces its own news, which is based on a model from the Children's Television Act. In other words, build incentives in our system so that we process and benefit those who produce local content.

There are also things we can do. Congress introduced a law, I think it was called the Local Journalism Sustainability Act, which was designed to say we should adjust tax policy to promote the hiring of journalists and the consumption of news. I mean, that's not radical. Our postage rates have historically benefited

news and periodicals. We do things like that from time to time in order to facilitate news production.

I also think we have to look more seriously at nonprofit models like what the Salt Lake City Tribune is doing, to see how viable those are for a community. So it's not as if it's something where there's a single solution, but I think all of us who care about the future of news and information and democracy have to be looking for each of these small incremental changes we can make to incentivize more news production and build a bigger market for local news in particular.

Nancy Gibbs: So Martha, you've thought about this so much.

Martha Minow: Well, you put very well why local news is so important. I just would add that there's only one private industry that's mentioned in the United States Constitution, and it is the press. It is one of the presuppositions of the United States Constitution that there will be a press, and that the rate we are going, we will not have a press. We certainly will not have local news. And Justice Frankfurter once said, "The Constitution is not a suicide pact."

If we have designed our rules in a way that we can't sustain the preconditions for our form of government, that's suicide. So I think it's a wake-up call. I do agree there's no magic bullet here. The Washington Post and the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal can succeed because they have a national market. Local markets, the whole ad supported news business has been blown out of the water with the combination of the internet, Craigslist, and also the migration of ads just generally to platform supported activities that are not really devoted to news at all.

And then you add to it the posting by users of content that was developed for a news enterprise without any payment back. And that's the disruption of the virtuous circle through which media operations in the past used to invest in news. I did serve on the board of CBS, and I learned that as much as I admire the news operations of CBS and its long history, it's a teeny, teeny item on the balance sheet compared to the NFL and the entertainment and all of that.

And it was really frankly a kind of prestige object to say we have the best news operations. It wasn't about the market. The same way that we have so many family-owned businesses, newspapers that have maintained kind of a standard, partly it's philanthropic. So one piece of the puzzle is philanthropic, and as you know because deeply involved, thank you very much, the MacArthur Foundation and 20 other funders have announced an initiative to a commitment of a half a billion dollars to invest in local news.

And the hope is that we will grow that to be even bigger. But what does it mean to invest? I think it means to, yes, support some great experiments, but also support something that can scale like back office collaboration, like demonstration of what kind of mix of fundraising and friend-raising and

subscription models can work in different kinds of communities, to actually help some of the print operations convert to digital first.

I think there's a lot to be done. I'm not giving up, but it is a crisis. It is absolutely a crisis. And you say, Nancy, and you're right, a lot of people don't think that news is something you would have to pay for, and yet it's about the price of a cup of coffee that people pay for if we actually just said to people, "You want to know what's going on in your local community?" The research is so persuasive to me that when a community loses local news, corruption in the public sector goes up, corruption in the private sector goes up and voting goes down.

I think it's in all of our interest to invest in the precaution against those kinds of results. And yes, it's going to take public investment, private investment, sharing of knowledge, and there's some opportunity here to diversify voices, which had always been a problem in the history of media in this country. But when the framers actually made a commitment to protect the freedom of the press, they also made a commitment for there to be a post office. The very first postal service act had the subsidy that the chair has described. They were inventive. We have to be inventive.

Nancy Gibbs: I'm going to throw this open to questions, and Kevin is going to walk around with a mic. So while you're thinking about what you want to ask, Tracy, you've been such a leader around the importance of bringing more voices, more perspectives into addressing these problems. Can you talk a little bit about where you see that opportunity and how that work is manifest in progress that we might not be as aware of as we should be?

Tracy Chou: Sure. Diversity in tech is a big topic. I'll try to be succinct in summarizing. Coincidentally, it's just been 10 years since I wrote a blog post called, Where are the Numbers? Calling on the Tech Industry to Release its Data on Diversity. At that time, 10 years ago, we had no idea what the tech workforce looked like because all the companies held the data internally. They did not want to confront this problem.

After my blog post unexpectedly went viral, all the tech companies did release their data so we could see how bad it was, and we could also start to measure progress. And what we have seen over the last 10 years is that there has been some progress, women's and underrepresented minorities' representation in the tech workforce. It's gotten a little better amongst startup founders. It's gotten a little better amongst investors, it's gotten a little bit better for boards. So we're seeing representation increase, which is good.

There's still a long way to go and we've seen with the layoffs over the last year and change that oftentimes it's the more diverse folks who are getting cut. But the way this translates into the technologies that we're building are tech builders bring these different perspectives into what they're working on. So one example I like to share from Pinterest is they now have skin tone, hair type search. They have AI models to detect body type, and so they can show diversity

of body type in search results as well. So there are ways to make the products themselves more inclusive and representative.

With increased funding of people from different backgrounds as startup founders, we can also address more of these problems that we ourselves feel. I feel very fortunate to be able to work on Block Party out of lived experience of dealing with online abuse and harassment, having to deal with stalkers. So I know why these protections are important, what types of things I need to keep private, and I can feed that directly into the products we're making. And this is true of many other founders as well who are solving their own pain points.

So the fact that we're starting to see more representation in the tech industry is very good. What I'm a little bit worried about still though is the acceleration of harms that have happened on social media platforms and with AI. Sometimes these things just move a lot faster than the human side of things. And so abuse, it's hard to know exactly, but I think it increased over the last 10 years. We saw Gamergate a couple of years after all the diversity reports started coming out.

During the pandemic, as everybody moved online, there was increased harassment towards women and minorities in online spaces, which were the only spaces we really had for a while, but the harassment towards women and minorities was getting worse. I'm concerned about generative AI feeding into distrust online and being weaponized, for example, in creating deep fake porn that's going to attack women.

So the harms are also moving very, very quickly. I'm not sure where all nets [inaudible 00:42:32]. I think I'm still slightly negative on our ability to address the harms right now because of the speed of technology moving. But that being said, we need to keep pushing for more diversity in these spaces. The chairwoman was speaking earlier about having a diverse leadership team at the FCC, and herself being a woman, and just seeing different problems and different ways to address problems that people who don't come from these different experiences are going to have.

Nancy Gibbs: That's the reason I ask is it feels like so many of the harms that we have been tracking over time disproportionately affect marginalized communities, affect women, affect communities of color, and yet they have in many cases the least opportunity to be part of driving the solution.

Tracy Chou: I think those are very much linked, because they're not in the tech workforce, so they're not there to solve the problems. I think the fact that Twitter's early employees were very homogenous and mostly white male meant that they were less likely to understand potential harms around abuse and harassment. Even if they knew that it might exist, they were less motivated to put in the safeguard and solve for those things because they didn't personally experience those problems. And so we need to solve these questions of diversity representation in the workforce and the harms that are happening on the platforms in lockstep.

Nancy Gibbs: Yes, Kevin,

Speaker 5: This is a question for Madam Chair. I fully appreciate you don't have jurisdiction over the internet or streaming companies, but as I look at the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 and the protection of airwaves and public interest programming the same way we're experiencing local news deserts, we're certainly seeing that the streamers are not buying content that is in the public interest, especially documentaries right now.

Public television is underfunded. It only represents 1% of streaming, so it hasn't made its digital way. And I don't know what kind of investments we can procure for that as one like Landing Pad, but one idea or one question I have is what's going to happen to those Spectrum licenses as linear television dies? And will those be safeguarded for whatever needs to be invented? In other words, is there a way to take the sale of those licenses and invest it in the future of local news or the right for independent voices to have access to producing content that could then compete in the marketplace? That's one question.

I have a second question about the taxation of streaming, and is there a way that by states taxing or the federal government taxing streaming companies, which I think have reached the point of choke capitalism, there's only five of these platforms, they have monopoly globally. Is there a way that those taxes could be set up as an innovation fund so that we can find other ways to compete and get more diverse and important public interest content? So first the Spectrum license and then the taxation. Those are my two revenue ideas.

Martha Minow: I'll say something about the taxation. I totally agree with you, and there's certainly no legal impediment, and I actually think there's no political impediment. And it could be set up very clearly as a tax that's key to the amount of product data that's collected, or to the market capitalization of the companies.

Speaker X: Exactly.

Martha Minow: So I think that's a really good idea and it could actually be a set aside fund not to pay off the debt of the country, but instead to support innovation and support local news. And I think that's a great idea. There's a Nobel Prize winning economist who supports the idea. This is out there. It seems to have bipartisan support. We just have to break the log jam in Congress.

Jessica Rosenworcel: Creative Spectrum policy. It's really important, so I appreciate that you just brought that up. The licenses that, for instance, our broadcasters use, are pretty valuable. It's largely 700 megahertz spectrum, which propagates very far. And the first generation of smartphones use some of those airwaves to help us all stay in touch. So there's a value proposition in those airwaves that's real.

I want to be careful though about not announcing the death of linear television before too early, because in a world where we've lost so many newspapers, that's actually become the epicenter of local news. And so I actually want to see if we can strengthen some of those stations in the near term, because I don't think if they walk off the stage, we have a lot else going on.

So I want to start from the proposition that we want them to be as strong as possible for as long as possible, and we should look for what tools we have to ensure that that continues to be true, particularly in some of those Nielsen markets that no longer have local newspapers. That being said, we are regularly in the business of repurposing airwaves where we over allocated a certain amount for weather monitoring or over allocated a certain amount for defense equipment.

And then when we can repurpose them, my agency can move those old uses out, take those airwaves, auction them off for commercial actors to use for wireless service, and we raise billions of dollars. To give you a sense of how much we've raised in the last 30 years, I think it's \$233 billion. Not a lot of government agencies raise money like that. So the question is, if we do have those opportunities going forward, to what extent can we put them to public interest use? Because we're using public airwaves. What's a public interest?

Now I definitely see a lot of opportunities there when you talk about journalism. And in fact, there's something similar that was done I think in the state of New Jersey where they chose to get rid of at least one public television station and use that revenue then for a journalism fund. But I would caution that there's not uniform consensus that that's a good way for the government to act. There are certain people who come in and say, "We're the government to create some funds like that." We have to be really careful because the government might dole it out in ways that it only goes to operators who favor the government or favor particular government actors.

So I think there's the kernel of something really interesting here, but we both want to make sure stations can thrive and offer local news before we get to that point. And if we do get to that point, we have to be really thoughtful about how to do it in a way that is reasonably protected from the First Amendment and some critics.

Martha Minow:

So one small thought, I mean even print journalism, even newspapers, there's a market for them. There's a reason that private equity companies are buying them up, because they get a return and then they strip mine them so that they die. But there is, even as the graying population is not going to be around for many more decades, it's still a few more decades, and that is the readership and that is the viewership of linear television. So I think it's a small window, but it's a window that the government has where there is a profitability. And the question is how to structure the guardrails so it doesn't get accelerated in its death.

Nancy Gibbs: You can take turns.

Speaker 6: Thank you for that wonderful talk. My question is for Tracy. You mentioned middleware and third party content moderation on platforms. I have two questions on that. First, technically how feasible it is and what would you have to make public? Would making public just the APIs be sufficient or would that vary across platforms? And second, what might be some sort of pushback against this idea of opening up third party content moderation, say intellectual property, or reducing the competitive edge that platforms might enjoy?

Tracy Chou: With regards to technical feasibility, I can say at least from my experience running Block Party, it is not that bad to pull the data for individual users. We were actually pulling quite a bit of data from Twitter. We're operating at consumer web scale, so people with millions of followers were screening through all of their mentions. So even as a small startup, we were able to ingest all of that data, do the processing, and do whatever we needed to ensure the experience for users.

So I think it's doable. There are different technical approaches. If platforms invest in this, they can also make it so that you don't need to extract the data from the platform, but you can run algorithms and run analysis on data within their servers that requires a bit more investment on their side, but that can also be better because you're not egressing all of this data, which then introduces other problems around privacy and also just there's copies of data everywhere.

On that point about privacy, I think the biggest pushback around pulling all this data out and doing the middleware approach is around data privacy, particularly in social networks where a lot of the data that you would want to look at that's relevant to you is actually posted by other people. And so do they have a right to that privacy on their data? I don't know. When I look at my feed, I'm seeing stuff from all these different people. When I look at my mentions, it's a lot of content posted by other people.

So there's this idea of contextual privacy, which is that if I can see it as a person viewing the platform, then the third parties that are acting on my behalf should be able to see the same data. We do have to be pretty careful about what the boundaries are and how that data is used. We've seen Cambridge Analytica. That was a big disaster, although I would say they were in violation of the terms of service and there was just not effective enforcement and auditing of what they were doing.

So I think there are ways to get around some of these questions if you're very thoughtful about what are the parameters by which you can pull data out from the APIs. So there has to be governance around these developer platforms. There has to be proactive and reactive auditing of how the data is actually being used. Is it in compliance? There have to be mechanisms to kick off the bad actors as well. But I think this is all very tractable, and the fact that we used to

be able to do all this stuff on Twitter and Reddit is a really good proof point that it's possible.

Speaker 7: My question was actually very much related to hers. So maybe just on top of that, if you could share a little bit more of your work with Privacy Party and how the tool works. And then, again, to her question, is the API enough for you to do this kind of work? And if not, what do you think is missing? And then if you have a specific use case of a specific platform that has enabled you to work with their data or API without extracting the data.

Tracy Chou: So Privacy Party is a browser extension that goes onto the different platforms, so Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, Venmo, and helps you to lock down your settings in an automated way. We have these recommendations say, "Don't share all your photos, don't share all of your transactions on Venmo." And what we can do then is go automate flipping all those settings, which people know but they're too lazy to, partly because the platforms design things in such a way that it's not very user friendly. They make it very easy to do other things, but not this.

The way that we've been able to do this is scripting over the browser because we don't have API access, so this is what we have to do when the platforms are not supportive of what we're trying to do for end users. We are doing what we can as close to the user in their browser. This means that we also don't have to ask for their credentials. We just run in their environment that already has everything set up. It is very challenging because we're looking literally at text in the pages to identify buttons and dropdown menus and select things, and it's very fragile.

Facebook is changing their UI all the time. They're running AB tests all the time. Things look different in different countries, so things break all the time. We have to be very thoughtful about how do we do graceful error handling, and we just have to be constantly monitoring for errors and updating our scripts. All of this would be much easier if there were APIs, but Facebook doesn't have much incentive to help us lock down people's privacy settings.

And in fact, it's much worse on other platforms where, for example, LinkedIn had a legal case against a startup that was trying to scrape some of the data. It was LinkedIn versus hiQ. And from that case they were ruling that if you say in your terms of service that you're not allowed to script, then any scrapers are actually in violation. So we are just trying to avoid detection at the moment. It's kind of a gray area about our operations, like we are acting on behalf of end users, but there's all sorts of core precedents. The Computer Fraud and Abuse Act, that makes it a bit difficult for us to operate.

So the technical workarounds are there. There's also legal questions. It would all be much easier with APIs is the short answer. I know that the new applied social media lab is curious about some of these questions as well about what are the

technical tools we can do to make it easier for people like Block Party to build solutions to the absence of first party support when you don't have APIs.

Are there things that we can do to advance the state of the browser technology? Can we do more headless browsers that run in the cloud to make it a bit easier to do these things in a privacy preserving way? So there's innovation we can push on the technical front, but again on the legal and policy side, it would be great to get some support.

Jordan:

Hi, my name is Jordan [inaudible 00:57:08]. I'm a student at the law school. My questions primarily for Professor Minow. Going back to the idea of treating the internet as a public utility. The Supreme Court this upcoming term was going to hear quite a few cases about social media platforms, and I think one predominant theme is can we see them by analogy as extensions of just the public square in terms of how they're governed?

And I'm just wondering, Professor Minow, maybe you can speak a bit about conceptually, do you see it as being consistent to treat the internet just very broadly as a public utility? And is that consistent with if the argument carries that social media platforms are just extensions of the public square, and so the way we regulate them, the way law enforcement can look at hate speech, violence speech, false speech, all those issues. [inaudible 00:58:04] write a whole thesis on this. But do you see those, just conceptually, are those consistent ideas to treat the internet as a public utility and then social media platforms as a form of public square?

Martha Minow:

So thanks, and I hope you do write that thesis. I think that to say public utility is not to say that it's public in the sense of government. So the public square is itself an ambiguous term. It's not a legal term. It's been used at times to refer to the physical square where people would go and stand on a soapbox and speak. Those were parks that actually were owned by the public. But sometimes when people say public square, particularly when they moved to the internet, they're talking about private spaces where people congregate.

So public utility is a private entity. It's a private entity that has private owners that get a private return. The regulatory framework of public utility says because it is so essential, there needs to be some guardrails around the ability of the owners to exclude people, and also some requirements about coverage and extension. Again, think electricity, think water supply.

So I don't know about the whole internet. I'm thinking internet provider companies as public utilities. I think a smaller bite might work, and what interests me is that you could actually develop a set of conditions and guardrails around individual ones, and that it would modify over time and be iterative. Is the Supreme Court the place to be working this out? Absolutely not. Absolutely not.

I can't get out of my mind the image, when they had the violent video game case, there was only one justice who'd ever seen a video game, and I think that there's now a younger group and they know a little bit about technology, but not very much. They do not operate the way that an agency would or a commission would or a legislature would, taking in viewpoints from a lot of different people, being interested in facts, coming up with frameworks that allow for sandbox as an experimentation. It's not what they do. They come up with yes/no answers, period at the end.

We had the arguments this week about whether individuals who have elected office can ban someone from their social media platform. The questions were somewhat intelligent from the bench. Do I have any confidence they're going to come up with a reasonable answer? No, I do not. And these are easier than the ones that are coming up later in the term. So I hope that they continue to say, "This is not for us," and just stay out of the matter and allow experimentation in other places.

Speaker 5: If that's the case, is it time that we actually decide whether to make these companies decide whether they're transformers or they're publishers? Because I think you could regulate or you could make decisions if you're the Supreme Court, if the platforms were being deemed as publishers, there would be laws that would adhere to publishing versus Section 230. I mean, where are we on the kind of transformer or superhighway versus platform versus publisher distinction? Or is that just mired in even more bureaucracy? I mean, getting clarity on either one of those or making them choose or making them subdivide portions of their business if they're publishing platforms. Does that help or?

Martha Minow: The process of reasoning by analogy that so dominates a judicial decision-making is the process that gets us a decision that treats a mobile home as falling between the two possibilities of a car versus a home with regard to expectations of privacy. I don't know if that's the best process to be thinking about things. It is true, you could shoehorn into Section 230 the role of a platform and say, "Well, they are doing some editing. Maybe it's like a publisher, but maybe it's more like a bookstore." There are a lot of people trying to do that, but rather than do the shoehorning, let's just go back to basics and say what are the goals? What are the risks? How should it be addressed?

Speaker 5: Thank you.

Speaker 9: A lot of the moderation that we've been discussing is moderation that happens after content is produced and it's often too late to take measures as a response. I'm wondering what kind of mitigative measures, and potentially some measures that could be implemented through design, can online platforms implement in order to respond to either harassment or different kinds of harms that usually fall into the trust and safety scope of their teams to respond to?

Tracy Chou: A bunch of different ideas on the product side. One is just generally reducing the speed at which things are disseminated. I know that platforms like to get

stuff out there very quickly, but to your point, if there's bad content that gets out there, we haven't been able to take it down automatically and it's not been flagged by humans yet. The fact that it can spread so quickly is quite dangerous.

We used to actually do something similar thematically to slow down content on Quora when I worked there. So I built some of our moderation tools to say if we don't trust this content as much because it's from new users, or it doesn't score well against some of these ML models, we don't remove the content, but we don't push it out, we don't give distribution to it until somebody has looked at it or we get more signal there's more people organically finding it up, uploading it, then we have more confidence it's good and we can spread it more.

The levers are not just is it there or not. It's also how much do we push this? How much do we recommend it? I think there's a tricky question of trying to preemptively get rid of the content. There's things like Twitter has these prompts of, "Are you sure you want to post that? That's not what nice people say on this platform." Or, "Have you read this article before you share it?"

So there's other things that you can try to put in some friction before people post bad things. So I think that helps a little bit. Trying to determine at the point that somebody's ready to post something based on automation, whether this is good or bad in blocking posting feels very dangerous to me because the machine learning models are just not that good. They have a lot of mistakes, and if we can't even see the model's decisions, audit them and figure out if there's any bias. It feels very dangerous that all these things are running silently in the background.

I feel like I have more ideas, but I'll stop there. There's a lot of things we can play with around the product side to mitigate the harms as well, even if these things are actually posted or screened. So one other example for Block Party, the original product we had on Twitter, we had a filtering mechanism so that things would go into a folder and hide them from your view on the platform. It didn't take the content down, but it was just less visible.

But because you can still go view it later, even if filtering made a mistake, you can still correct for that later. So the consequences, they're not so severe. So if we over filter something, you can go in and fish it out and say, oh, this is kind like when you go into your spam folder and see a legitimate email there, you can fish it out. So it's fine, it didn't get completely deleted. You can still rescue it on the cadence that you want, but if there's really bad stuff you can also go in and see, "This needs to be dealt with in a more severe manner than just hiding it from my feed. This may need to be reported or it might need to document and submit something to the platform." So we can also think about these ways of addressing the harms after things are posted.

Nancy Gibbs:

Martha?

Martha Minow: Well, just to add, this is a place where the tech side and the law could cooperate. There's no First Amendment barrier to slowing down distribution. There's no right, in other words, to have speedy distribution. There's a right to speech. And so there could be regulations that actually require either new users, so long as it doesn't get into content, or even require that you have to come back and renew it a day later, or require that there's no amplification until there has been some checking. There's no problem with that, that's neutral.

I think that those kinds of speed bumps are just what regulatory activity would be good for. Not to mention enforcing terms of service agreements, which exist and are not enforced. And so there's basic contract law, consumer protection law. This is a place that I think state governments go to town. There should be a lot of enforcement. And just a side comment, you think about the human beings who are given the task of looking at flagged content, and the trauma that they experience, that it's now viewed as a human rights risk to be in that line of work. Does that tell us that we have a problem? I think there's plenty of rationale to regulate here. This is a public health problem, and of course it's often on the shoulders of people in the most disadvantaged circumstances.

Nancy Gibbs: I will say with any editor who ever ran a newsroom will say it was the idea that a decision to amplify content is not a form of editorial decision just seems very strange. The minute a newsroom decides to publish something, you have a moral and legal responsibility for it. And so that distinction of, yes, I understand why Facebook can't be responsible for what, two billion people post every day, but once it is posted, what happens to it, they have enormous control over, and yet none of the externalities fall to them. I've always wondered why, what the barriers are to working in that space of that responsibility, but I just assume it's because I don't understand the architecture.

Jessica Rosenworcel: Where bigger liability law gets sued for damages.

Speaker 10: So we've been talking a lot about the value of actually of API access, and in our earlier conversation we talked about it's not ultimately the jurisdiction of the FCC. The FTC is not ultimately the jurisdiction there. Maybe Congress, the executive branch has a limited amount, or given the new executive order, there's a limited amount of power there. So then who can force these companies to provide API access? Because it's certainly not in their interest, at least now to do it. So what's the call to action? Who should be doing things?

Nancy Gibbs: I'd love all of you on ...

Tracy Chou: I am not an expert on the legal and policy and government side. I think the most practical way seems to be going through state legislatures. That's how the CCPA in California got through and now have better privacy protections because of that. So from a very practical perspective of we want to see this soon, it's probably through states. I do not think that answers the question of who should be responsible for this.

Martha Minow: I think that I can't answer this question either, but the who could, I actually think organizing users is an untapped resource.

Speaker 10: And who organizes the users?

Martha Minow: That's something that nonprofit organizations could do, academic organizations can do, and I think that there's an appetite for it. I would also add, I'd like to put self-regulation on the table, and I know that it has a terrible reputation. We talked about it briefly before, but if there were enough reputational benefits to be able to compete for having this certification, and let's start with something like API excess.

It sounds pretty good and neutral, and we are good players. So we provide API access and therefore we get this housekeeping seal of approval. And then next we have made a commitment to a set of shared standards around minimum age or other kind of child protection activity. We get another seal of approval. And you could imagine this can't be the government that does it, that sets what those standards are, but you could get the leaders in the relevant industry to identify as the motion picture industry that did in the past, as the alcohol beverage industry does, to say, "These are our standards."

And it's in our interest to be able to say, "We subscribe to these standards." And then you created this ecosystem if you have users, consumers who are able to vote with their feet, to make demands, even go into a shareholders meeting. Those are the levers that we have and they should be used.

Tracy Chou: I have a question to follow up on that, Martha. I think the challenge with a lot of the social media platforms is that they don't have competitors where you can easily move. So the voting with your feet thing is a lot harder. If all my friends are on Instagram, I can't go to another platform that looks like Instagram, and I'm actually experiencing this right now because Twitter is falling apart. So now I'm on four different platforms that try to be Twitter, but it's not the same. And that makes it a little bit harder to compel the platforms to move when there aren't real alternatives.

Martha Minow: Yeah, it's totally true. Mastodon I do not understand. No, you're absolutely right. But maybe there's a voting with your feet like, "We're not going to be on for a day, we're not going to be on for a week." Just different kinds of flex the muscle to show what happens.

Nancy Gibbs: That would be good for shared mental health apart from everything else.

Speaker X: That's true.

Jessica Rosenworcel: What do you think about the idea of data portability? I don't think in the near term it's wholly viable, but when you look at the Fediverse and the Mastodon model, or you think about Web 3.0, do you think that's viable? And I'll give you

an example why I'm most intrigued about it. It wasn't that long ago that if you changed your mobile phone, you couldn't take your number with you. You couldn't take it. It was not portable, it was impossible.

I got a whole bunch of people who tell me they couldn't make it ever happen, but every one of us can do it today. The FCC decided number portability was essential for competition in and among telecommunications providers. I feel like that tells me something, which is things are possible. We just may not be at the point that we can make that happen. But I'm wondering if you see a tipping point in the future where that could be more viable.

Tracy Chou: To directly answer the first question, data portability is important, yes. I think if we could get data portability on the platforms, that would be phenomenal. I think we have to be precise in defining what that means, because here it's not just, "Oh, I can carry my handle." It's that, "I want to be able to bring my followers with me." And where are the followers? So then do you need to have APIs that allow cross communication?

Jessica Rosenworcel: And do all those followers also based on that platform-

Tracy Chou: Yeah. So because of the network effects there, where are people spending the time? It gets a lot harder, but if I could bring my followers with me, then I would not feel stuck on Twitter. I feel stuck on Twitter because I have over 100,000 followers there. They will not follow me to Threads.

Nancy Gibbs: It's not just between Instagram and Threads. It's between ...

Tracy Chou: I have a different username on Threads. Now I can't port people over, so I'm still stuck on Twitter. So even though, hey there's a little-

Jessica Rosenworcel: But I feel like this friction that the lack of data portability adds to the universe also destroys competition-

Tracy Chou: Yes, absolutely.

Jessica Rosenworcel: ... between these different social media platforms and intentional.

Tracy Chou: That's why I think there's this increased appetite around the newsletters and products, platforms like Substack where part of the pitch to writers is you can bring your subscriber lists, you can always export it. So if you want to go somewhere else, you can actually have your subscriber list. That's [inaudible 01:15:50].

Jessica Rosenworcel: So that there's a platform culture that's growing that might treat those things differently?

Tracy Chou: Yeah, I mean it's just drawing more of the creators there and where creators go. If they're very powerful, then other people will follow. What's different about that approach is you have an email list and so you're still using email as a protocol to reach people. And it's quite different on the other platforms. But if there are a way to build connectivity between different platforms, and I think that's part of the pitch at Mastodon and the protocols like Threads is claiming it will get onto the APIs.

Jessica Rosenworcel: So let me give you another example. We deal all the time in standards bodies. I don't recommend it. It's a lot of engineers in rooms with fluorescent lighting and no windows. But as a result of working with companies and standards bodies, we figure out how to interconnect in a 5G world and rely on certain interfaces. We all agree exactly what it will look like. That means your network will meet with mine and that connection will be safe and reliable.

IEEE, 3GPP, I mean I've got all of these task forces we follow, and all of that happens somewhere below the surface and nobody sees it. But this is a form of self-regulation that has been wildly effective. I see it in telecommunication, so that equipment works, but I don't see it comparably when you talk about social media platforms. And I've always been intrigued about why this is so dominant in the world that I occupy, but so non-existent elsewhere.

I wonder if that's competition building, a moat protection, but the absence of it has enormous consequences for portability, competition, and us as consumers.

Martha Minow: It's such a great point because interoperability is possible because of standards. My few meetings in the IEE, there's a lot of people there who say there's a public dimension. We are committed to it. So I don't know if there's a data portability equivalent, but it seems to me there's a technical community that could go to town on that, could work on it. And standard setting bodies are private, but they can be recognized, they can be elevated by a public entity.

Jessica Rosenworcel: Yeah, and from time to time we take those standards and put them in our rules.

Martha Minow: Exactly. Exactly.

Jessica Rosenworcel: And we are better off, by the way, not making that standard up by ourselves.

Martha Minow: Totally.

Jessica Rosenworcel: We need that private sector community to help build it.

Martha Minow: Totally, totally. So I had a similar experience in setting disability access protocols by working with the disability communities rather than the government legislating, and having them work it out. And then the government said, "Okay, we're going to use your standard." I think it's a great method. I really do.

Nancy Gibbs:

I love the idea of ending on a note of optimism and sort of collaborative exploratory optimism. I think that there are a lot of reasons as we're a year out of a likely to be a very faithful election, that people are more than even before worried about the health of our information environment. And so it gives me hope that people like you or I are all thinking all the time about improving that health. And I really appreciate you sharing your perspectives with us today. So thank you.