



**SPEECH LIMITS IN PUBLIC LIFE:
AT THE INTERSECTION OF FREE SPEECH AND HATE**

SPONSORED BY The Institute for Humane Studies at George Mason University and the University of Delaware's Office of the President, Office of the Provost, Office of the Vice Provost for Diversity, the Class of '55 Ethics Endowment Fund, College of Arts & Sciences Dean's Office, and the Department of Communications.

CO-SPONSORED BY Heterodox Academy and the University of Delaware's Center for Political Communication

SESSION 6: Non-legal responses to hate speech on digital platforms

MODERATOR: Dr. Lindsay Hoffman, Associate Professor, University of Delaware; and director the National Agenda Speaker Series and associate director of the Center for Political Communication

PANELISTS

Brandi Collins-Dexter, Media, Democracy & Economic Justice Campaign Director at Color of Change

Carmen Scurato, Senior Policy Counsel, Free Press

Emma Llanso, Free Expression Project director at the Center for Democracy and Technology

Transcript of Event

Date: March 15, 2019 Place: Embassy Suites, Newark, Delaware



[Background noise.]

UNIDENTIFIED: And when did you get in?

DR. HOFFMAN: Good afternoon everyone. As we head into our last panel of the day do, ah, grab some snacks outside and please, ah, have a seat. Um, I think is going to be an exciting panel. Um, I'm Lindsay Hoffman. I'm an associate professor of communication here at the University of Delaware. I also am the director of our National Agenda Speaker Series and associate director of the Center for Political Communication. We have a great panel, um, that just changed slightly, ah, over the course of the day. Um, Trisha obviously went before, ah, and because, ah, Brittan is not here Emma is, is filling in. So, I'll give a, a brief background on our speakers and then I'll let them take over. So, Brandi Collins-Dexter, ah, serves as the Media Justice Director for ColorofChange.org, the country's largest online civil rights group. She comes to Color of Change from the Center for Media Justice, an organization fighting to media rights, access, representation for marginalized; and representation for marginalized communities. Carmen Scurato, ah, is the Senior Policy Counsel for Free Press. She works to protect the open internet, prevent media and telecom industry concentration, promote affordable internet access, and foster media diversity. And, lastly, we have Emma, who, ah, Llanso, who spoke earlier. She is at the Center for Democracy and Technology, the Director of the Free Expression Project which works to promote law and policy that supports user's free expression rights in the United States and around the world. So, this last session is all about non-legal



responses to hate speech on digital platforms. Um, so, ah, I'll go ahead and hand it over to our panelists and hopefully we'll have a good amount time for Q and A towards the end. Thank you.

MS. COLLINS-DEXTER: Hi everyone. My name is Brandi Collins-Dexter. Um, thank you for, um, sticking through the day. I know there was a lot of really interesting conversation in, in, um, that last panel. As I was preparing for today, I found myself going through all the speeches that I've had to do in the last few years in the aftermath of a tragedy. Um, I found the speech that I gave on the steps of the state capitol in South Carolina. I was there to deliver petitions calling for them to remove the confederate flag from the state grounds. I was there because a man just a week earlier had used that flag as a justification for walking into Emmanuel African American Methodist Church and murdering nine people. I remember I was shaking so hard on those steps as I told the story of my great-grandfather, a sharecropper from Clarksdale, Mississippi, who disappeared after getting into a disagreement with his employer who refused to pay him for his work; an employer who we later found out via a local newspaper was also a known Klansman. I said then that the same confederate flag that flew over my grandmother's head when she was forced to leave town at the age of nine was the same one waved around by a psychopath whose manifesto continues to fester online. I remember looking out at that moment and seeing neo-Nazis holding up that same flag and watching me with hatred in their eyes as I told that story. Um, it was one of the few times in my life that I genuinely feared for my life. Um, I didn't know then it wouldn't be the last time. I feel like in some ways I've almost become



desensitized to the number of threats I and my organization has received in part because I know they're a drop in the bucket compared to what so many people on the frontlines of doing this work have to face every day. Um, while I don't want to speak the name of the Emanuel Nine killer in this space, his family told the public what would become an increasingly familiar story, um, the story of someone pushed to extremes by overexposure to violent ideologies online. This was something I would test, put the test myself when I started using a device that was explicitly for my research on white nationalist communities. I found that when the computer began to read my data profile as a conservative white male it fundamentally changed my user experience. Hey, you follow Mike Cernovich Twitter would ask. But, have you tried following David Duke or David Horowitz? Amazon would see that I was looking up a plat, you know, a book about Lauren Southern and would make sure I could also buy Mein Kampf and a plethora of neo-Nazi paraphernalia that I could get shipped to me by the next day. I would be bombarded with articles on Yahoo and other places talking about the dangerous blacks in Chicago killing each other, eventually it would become content about the Clintons and their plot to destroy America. I found that my world was profoundly shaped by who the internet thought I was and once I was relegated to that bubble there seemed to be no way to get out, at least not on that computer. As we began to go deeper and deeper into the work, we began to realize that color change; that many of our colleagues were also ringing the alarm, um, in the U.S. and around the world, around what we were seeing online. Research by groups like SPLC and [indiscernible] Society showed both an alarming rise in hate groups and



the means by which they built power online for decades. We connected with experts from around the world seeking a deeper understanding of how we move out of the stance of waiting for the next tragedy and how we could put forth solutions to slow down if not stop the next tragedy. We researched a lot of the groups that we were fighting against and many of these groups had less obvious names than Ku Klux Klan and were actively organizing online, often through gateway content that increasingly pushed people towards more violent ideologies. By having, um, loose and often unenforced policies on various platforms, um, these groups were either were able to exploit loopholes and have a veneer of legitimacy that allowed them to operate increasingly on chats. They were able to push video and audio content on YouTube, sell paraphernalia and sell published books on Amazon, sell tickets to their events on Eventbrite, harass and seek to intimidate thought leaders, um, many disproportionately people of color and women on places like Twitter, and organize violent encounters on Facebook. And so, we saw all of this and as we learned more and more we began to realize, um, that we needed to draw a line in the sand for corporations, explicitly those who hold the most power in being able to rein in terrorism and deprive it of the digital oxygen it needed to thrive online. We had to make them choose and it was important for them to understand by staying neutral in these times they were in fact making a choice. Um, I found another speech that I gave. This time it was right after 11 were not, 11 people were massacred in the Tree of Life Synagogue in Pittsburgh late last year. Incidentally, that was the same week we released these principles. In the speech I gave at that time, um, I said that, um, I



couldn't imagine any word or phrase that I would find online that I thought I would choose to protect over a human life. And, I still feel that way. Today I give this speech after waking up to the news that 49 people were gunned down in New Zealand in the Muslim community of Christ Church. At this very moment the livestream video of their murders remains up on platforms like Reddit. I feel like we have to do our due diligence and we have to hold corporations accountable to making sure that everybody can feel safe in their churches, temples, mosques, and synagogues; they should feel safe in their schools; they should feel safe online. We in the Change the Terms coalition, we're tired of being told that there was nothing that could be done by tech companies to protect our communities. We were tired of being decentered from discussions about how best to deal with hate content online and it was so strikingly clear that current policies and enforcement mechanisms by big tech companies were not built with marginalized communities in mind even though we over index on those platforms and they, they need our business to exist. Change the terms is comprised of, um, I believe at this point 50 or maybe more than 50 civil and human rights organizations that believe tech companies need to do more to ensure that they are doing their part to help combat hate and conduct on their platforms. Their platforms must not be a place for extremists to grow their influence and spread their hateful ideas. Our organizations track the progress of major tech companies especially social media platforms and push them to adopt and implement model corporate policies which Carmen will talk a little more in-depth about. We're meeting with those companies and we're not just rejecting ideas but putting forth real



concrete solutions that we see as the way forward. Um, so with that, I will close and, and pass to Carmen to say more about the actual details of that. And thanks for having me.

AUDIENCE: [Applause.]

MS. SCURATO: I need to lower this. Okay, great. That's fine. [Laughter.] Oh, okay. That's better. Thank you, everyone. So, I am Carmen Scurato, I'm with Free Press. Um, and, I'm just going to – how do I adjust the arrows? Nope.

UNIDENTIFIED: [Indiscernible.]

MS. SCURATO: There we go. All right. So, I want to talk a little bit more detail about, um, Change the Terms. And, this is recommended corporate policies for internet companies to reduce hateful activities on their services. So, Change the Terms is really the shorthand, and you can read more about it on Changethetterms.org. Um, and I think this is great that we are actually the last panel because it touches on some of the questions that were raised at the very beginning and kind of throughout the day and in some statements that have been made. So, I took some notes and I'm just going to throw these questions out there so we can see how, um, these change the terms corporate policies answer those questions. So, and of the ones, um, very early this morning was, who do you trust more to regulate speech, the government or the tech pros in Silicon Valley? Another question that we had, or another question was, how can the historically disadvantaged use free speech to gain better equality? And some statements that we had is that hate speech isn't new, but the mechanisms of online speech are new and were



algorithms privilege, extreme or violent content. And, actually Emma raises on her panel that one of the things that we're grappling with is scale. Just the sheer amount of content that is being placed on these platforms every hour. Um, and over lunch, ah, we saw that tech platforms are actually being optimized for abuse. Um, and, some of the questions raised there were whose job is it to understand the historical context and whose job is it to, um, anticipate those unintended consequences? So, and, and something that Brandi just said, um, you know, something that we really, we realized as we were doing all of this research is that these platforms were not built with marginalized communities in mind. So, what does it look like when you center marginalized communities and then try to find solutions? And that's where we got to Change the Terms. So, one of the first things that we tried to do is define hateful activities and I'm going to go through this definition because we, we found this very important, um, and it's very central to, to the mission of Change the Terms which is activities that incite or engage in violence, intimidation, harassment, threats or defamation targeting an individual or group based on their actual or perceived race, color, religion, national origin, ethnicity, immigration status, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, or disability. And part of the reason we came to this definition is that these online platforms, they are not beholden to the First Amendment but if they were these things were also things that were illegal under the First Amendment. So, violence, intimidation, harassment, threats, defamation, um, and that's, that's why we came to this definition. So, we, we did think about it, um because we do believe in free speech principles as well. So, the other thing that we



wanted to define is internet companies. We talked a lot about Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, but this, these policies go beyond that because what we wanted to tackle was also this, um, this cycle that happens where you actually fund hate and, you know, hate is very profitable online. So how do you just tackle that? Like, how do you, um, as, as Brandi said, like how do you take away the digital oxygen and how do you take away the money incentive to spread hate online. So that's why internet companies is defined more broadly, again, than just the, the platforms that we were talking about today. So, its also companies that sell advertising online, facilitate financial transactions, provide public chat services, provide domain names, um, and build our host websites. So, it is a very broad definition, um, of internet companies. And so, here is the, the policy overviews and I'm going to go through each of them. Some of the slides you see moving forward are a little dense, um, but I'll, I'll go through them and this will be something that we'll, we'll make available and also, you'll have a full document if you'd like to read it on changethetterms.org. So, the, the overview is we did recommend terms of service, um, and acceptable use policies; enforcement was something that we wanted to tackle; right of appeal; transparency; evaluation and training; governance and authority; and state actors, bots and troll campaigns which was actually one of the questions that came up in one of the earlier panels. So, in terms of service and acceptable use policies, um, so here what we said is that users may not use these service (sic), these services to engage in hateful activities or use these services to facilitate hateful activities engaged in elsewhere whether online or offline. So, we're trying to tackle one of those, um, issues that I think



Brittan Heller actually brought up in an earlier panel is how the online hate leads to the offline violence. Um, and we wanted to make sure that we stop that, the online hate. Um, the terms of the service should also make clear that these are grounds for terminating a user's service. So that people are made aware at the very beginning that if they use the platform for this, um, you know, to incite hateful activities online or offline that they can be deplatformed. And enforcement. And this is something we were very careful when we talked about enforcement because there are a lot of companies out there that have great policies; where they fall short is in enforcing those policies. And enforcing them in such a way that I would say is equitable across the platform. And this is something actually that Color of Change did in, in their research, um, I believe it was with Black Lives Matter activists – you notice that their content was being taken down at a higher rate than the white nationalists, and the white supremacists. So, what does that mean? So, what it, so it's clearly an enforcement problem at that point. Um, so with our model corporate policy we said that the internet companies could provide a well-sourced enforcement mechanism that combines technological solutions with staffs responsible for reviewing that content. And the reason for this, and the reason we have this combination is that we don't think it should be the burden of that community to monitor content on Facebook, on Twitter, on YouTube. That is a heavy burden and that's something that's actually happening today after the events in New Zealand where we had some of our allies reach out to us and say, hey, can you please monitor YouTube, can you please monitor Twitter for us? If you see any of these videos, please flag them immediately. So, the burden is



falling on them and not the companies to use their technological solutions to get that content taken down or flagged before it spreads widely. Um, the other part about the enforcement is that we wanted to offer individuals and organizations not, not government actors, so this is going back to the beginning question about who do we trust in moderating content to flag the hateful activities, um, and we also want to trust the flagger program. So there are organizations that have been experts in this and they should have sort of a faster path, um, to get their content that they flag reviewed and then we also want to inform flaggers of the results because often times what's been happening is that people flag this content and they don't know what happens. And sometimes multiple people and there's just, you, there's really no, um, no transparency when it comes to that. And the other thing we thought was really important – and this is something that not every platform has but some are rolling out – is this right of appeal. So, if your content gets taken down you should know what that content was taken down and have a path to appeal it. Um, it seems like a very simple solution. It's surprising that it's taken this long to get some companies on board with this process but there's, there's a reason for that and that's because sometimes we are seeing, seeing this disparate impact and we want to have everyone a path to appeal and to not necessarily be deplatformed or have a strike against their account, um, because the historical context or just generally the context of their, um, you know, of what they've put online isn't being understood. So, this is where I'm going to gloss over a little bit of it, but transparency is important. And what, what the problem is right now is that we actually don't know what's happening



on these platforms. Um, we know anecdotally, we know when people tell us what's happening but overall because of the scale that Emma mentioned we just really, we really don't know and I think these companies need to understand that, um, and they're hiding behind this. So, we think that they, they need to open up when it comes, especially when it comes to hateful activities. How many, how many, um, how many things are being flagged on the platform as hateful? How many times is a particular post being flagged? Who was doing the flagging? Who is the, who is this content targeting? These are questions that I think are really important, um, and having a report and having this information gives us a better sense of what are the solutions that we can start asking for. So, I'm going to, that's one of two, there's more. Um, the other thing is, you know, who, again, who is doing the flagging and the type of victim that's being targeted. That's another thing we think is important. And, what we want with this transparency is the information to, to be published in a way that can be understood by a regular person, um, but also machine-readable formats so it can also be used by scholars. So, we want to have that ability. We want to be able to study this information and what's happening on the platforms. And the evaluation and training. Um, this is something actually again that Emma brought up is about Facebook and how the training materials were leaked and how it kind of showed that Facebook didn't quite get it. Um, [chuckle] to say the least. So, that's, this has to be part of the corporate policies. They need better training materials and they need to establish that with a team of experts. And there are experts out there. Um, and those experts should be, they are training the programmers as well as the, the



people who are actually enforcing the anti-hate policies. And, you know, with that being, the internet company should routinely text the technology that's being used to identify hateful activities. They should make those training materials available for the public to review, ah, because we saw how powerful that was when just the Facebook ones were leaked. Like, this is clearly wrong. Um, and then also locate assessment teams enforcing against hateful activities within those impacted communities. And that's, you know, again, a part of the historical context and just understanding that different communities have different needs and really, you know, centering them when it comes to these training materials. And so, this is, um, you know, governance and authority we were thinking that these companies needed to address hateful activities in the corporate structure as well. So, assign a board committee that's responsible for assessing the management and efforts of hateful activities on their services. Assign a senior manager. Um, and create a committee outside, of outside advisors with expertise in identifying and tracking hateful activities. So, this is something again structurally within the, the company that they can do to ensure that they have mechanisms in place to get better at this because it's not going to be something that happens over night but it's something that they can work on, um, and then through assessment or evaluation, through transparency it can get better. And, the last thing. Um, this is, again, this was a question that came up earlier about, you know, whether bots, um, should be considered people and you know, I think the, the way that we're thinking about this is that if a bot is being used to create or administer coordinated campaigns to engage in hateful activities that



should be prohibited from the service. So that's, that's where we stand on that. Um, and that's really the overview of Change the Terms. And I'm just going to kind of go through where we are today. Brandi kind of mentioned it. We launched this in October, on October 25th, 2018 at the Center for American Progress. We have been in discussion with internet companies. And one of the things that we're looking forward to late this year is some report cards that we're going to assess the companies' adoption and implementation of these recommendations, um, and just see where they are. And we have, ah, as Brandi said, close to 50 organizations that have signed on in support of these recommendations and I'm just going to put them up there so you guys can see that it is a lot. Um, ah, there, there is a lot of, um, different groups that support this. Thank you.

AUDIENCE: [Applause.]

MS. LLANSO: Great. Um, so I'll try to keep my remarks fairly brief, um, because I, I wanted to talk a little bit about what platforms can do and this will be a lot of what we've already heard from Carmen and, and Brandi about, um, what's in the, the Change the Terms documents. Ah, I think one way that's really helpful for think, for, for breaking down the problem of, you know, what, what are the non-legal responses and in particular what can, um, platforms and content hosts do is to think about kind of what are the different sorts of motivations for, for hate speech and hateful activity on platforms because different motives will lead to different kinds of solutions. So, there's people who have a financial motive because they realize that hateful content, um, can get a lot of views and can make them a lot of ad



revenue. And we're seeing a lot of platforms starting to look at, you know, different ways of responding to content, not just removing it or, or deactivating the account but especially when the adversary has kind of figured out how to really thread the needle of well I'm saying something really pretty horrifying but it doesn't technically violate your terms. We're seeing more companies start to say, okay, fine but we're not going to run ads against your, your content as a way to remove that incentive for, um, for putting, you know, really, ah, polarizing or polemic kind of, ah, posts out. Um, we're; sometimes the, ah, the incentive is political. Um, we saw this come up a lot in conversations around, um, disinformation especially in the U.S. in the 2016 election where there were all sorts of very clever strategies about using microtargeting systems, um, in, you know, different advertising networks that allow you to get a particular post in front of a very particular audience and make sure that it has, u, you know, exactly with the right message to sew divisions, sew discord. Ah, we also saw a lot of, um, what appeared to be Russian advert, ah, you know, political operatives impersonating, um, social justice activists and different kinds of genuine political actors in the U.S. and, and genuine political views that people held but using those for, um, you know, for purposes not to, you know, express a, a genuinely held political view. But, to, to target that content so that it was done in the most divisive way possible. So, if we're looking at those sorts of motives that really takes us into the kind of what are the solutions to disinformation sphere and what do you do when you have especially a nation-state actor trying to manipulate and abuse a platform for, for their particular ends. Um, you have things that are like what, a, Trisha on the last panel was



talking about, what I think of as the sort of the, the hate speech and the harassment that comes out of, of poorly designed communication experience, right? Whether its just people being able to post absolutely everything without, you know, that, that second of, I look for a metric of would your grandmother be proud of you for posting this? [Chuckle.] You know, [indiscernible] kind of interrupt, um, you know, potentially, ah, hateful or, um, or harassing kinds of experiences with just that extra bump or nudge to say think again or rephrase. Um, so things that really fall in the category of like site design and, and user experience. Um, and then that, there's probably lots of other motives but it also does leave that, that category of people who have a bad motive, who want, who have a, the hateful ideology and they want to express it in a way that hurts other people. And that's where I think, you know, especially the, um, the questions about what are the companies content policies, how are they enforcing them, how are they moderating that content, um, really come into play. Now one thing I'll say about all of these different approaches is, you know, from my sort of free expression and particularly like First Amendment lawyer perspective, my, my mind immediately goes to but what are the unintended consequences, right? How, what is the, um, the way that these same tools or responses or powers will be used for the opposite of the intended aim. Um, and we've seen and, as I think, um, Nadine was talking about earlier this morning, you know, we, we all are really familiar with the history of whether its law or policy on a platform being used, um, to silence and censor groups who are already, um, marginalized or already have less of an opportunity to participate in public debate or, or express themselves. Um,



and we've seen those kinds of outcomes come from a lot of the different things that platforms are, are trying to do, you know, in response to the enormous amount of advocacy pressure. Um, the groups like Color of Change and Free Press have, have been bringing about these issues. Um, you know, one of the, there's this, ah, ah, there has been a series of stories about sort of the advocacy groups in the U.S. who have sort of been smeared by association with Russian disinformation accounts, um, you know, who will set up a, um, a, a Russian account sets up a protest or like plans a protest but then three or four legitimate advocacy also say yes, we want to ,to protest about this issue. Um, and when the platform takes the, the response of, you know, shutting down the entire event or deleting all of the accounts and really kind of interrupting groups' ability to connect with their, um, constituencies and, and build on their networks, you know, that's also not a good outcome. It might be a, an understandable response if you're looking from how do we stop the spread of, you know, information from this particular source – a Russian, ah, disinformation campaign – um, but the, the impact and the burden is often felt by, um, by people who are, ah, you know, engaged in, in wholly legitimate activity. Um, it's also a reason why, you know, I have a little bit of concern about the, um, the part of Change the Terms that calls for companies other than content hosts to do, um, kind of content moderation, to, to take, to adopt policies and to actually, you know, not provide the main name services or not provide, um, web hosting services, or financial services, um, because in, in my work around, especially looking at, um, copyright regulation online the, the interest in sort of pushing content regulation deeper into the infrastructure of



the internet and, and moving it away from just the sort of, the top level content host into these other infrastructure providers, I have typically seen that used to silence and to, ah, you know, to, to censor not the, um, you know, kind of the unlawful activity or the hateful activity that we'd want to be the target, um, but just as, ah, infrastructure companies are not going to spend the time and energy into resources and money to have a, a well-balanced policy on hate speech that really targets bad actors and doesn't sort of sweep in a lot of other activity. I completely understand having it as a goal like thinking that, that they should and that should be something that they prioritize. Um, I guess I, I don't have a lot of faith that that's, um, that, that entities that are in the business of providing kind of more infrastructure sorts of services, um, and not kind of having that direct user interface will, will prioritize that. Um, but, I think all of the, these concerns about unintended consequences goes exactly to, um, to one of Carmen's points about the need for being able to measure and analyze what are the impacts of all of these different systems that, that platforms are using; um, what, how are their content moderation systems working; what are the real consequences and for all of these different interventions that are, are starting to be tried, what results are they having? You know, since the 2016 election in the U.S. there's been a big focus on disinformation but pressure from Europe over hate speech and terrorist propaganda has been going for even longer than that, you know, for probably the past five or six years that are really, ah, intense [indiscernible] and there have been all of these sort of parallel scientific experiments happening on all these platforms of what if we take down these networks, what if we, you know, change our ad policy this



way. And, and there's not that kind of evaluation that's shared with the public of exactly what are the impacts of any of these. And there's certainly not enough access by independent researchers to test out, well you know, what's the, if the, the company says it was very successful. Okay. [Chuckle.] I hope so but, but I'd like to verify that, um, through, you know, independent research. And we're starting to see a little bit more of that from some companies. Um, I was looking at Facebook's, ah, content, community guidelines enforcement report, um, which they just started putting out again after years of pressure from advocacy groups about, like, you need to have more transparency and, and real data about how these systems work. Um, and they actually have started to try to estimate the prevalence of different kinds of content on their platform. And they have estimates for terrorist propaganda, um, which they, I think, define in a fairly particular way or, um, content that includes nudity or sexuality. And with those kinds of material they, they provide a prevalence estimate – I think for nudity it was something like .1 percent of content on Facebook, ah, is, um, content that has nudity in it. So, it's like a very low percentage, um, but still something where that means they're taking down millions and millions of posts every quarter, um, that violate their policies. Ah, they don't offer an estimate for hate speech. Um, and I, I think it may, like, as [chuckle] I understand how you would measure this sort of thing I think that makes sense because the, the way that they are most likely measuring things like, um, images of nudity or, um, you know, videos or images that are terrorist propaganda are relating to finding matches of images that they've already identified. You know, so terrorist propaganda, um, finding particular videos,



ah, particular memes or images and then being able to say, um, through a technique called hashing – um, you know we've, we found this one instance of the image and we can find every other place its posted on the site. That gives you a way to actually kind of measure how much of this content is out there. Um, with something like hate speech I think they are at this point being up front about the fact that they don't know how to measure it. Right? They don't; there are ways and proxies that you could probably use to get at some of it but at this point I think it would be hard for any platform to claim that they really truly know the extent of hate speech on their platform and that makes it even harder to start assessing are they, are they doing anything to meaningfully address it? Um, so I think those are some of the, the challenges that, that we'll see going forward in, in this area but this, I think, for, for everybody to keep up this drumbeat of it, we can't just hear kind of assurances from platforms that they're trying to tackle these issues. Um, or that, you know, there aren't terrible unattended consequences for, for the, the techniques that they are pursuing. We need to see actual verifiable information, um, because what these different changes and techniques are doing is having a dramatic impact on our information ecosystem, um, and, and it's, I think, incumbent upon all of us to understand how those dynamics are, are really playing out.

AUDIENCE: [Applause.]

DR. HOFFMAN: All right. Yeah, I think we've got some time for questions but if you don't mind, I'm going to use my moderator's, ah, wand to ask a few questions first. Um, first of all I want to say, um, it's really delightful

to be on a panel of all women talking about technology, um, and it's been delightful to see so many women, ah, having their voices heard in the room today. So, um, I just wanted to point that out. Um, I wanted to talk a little bit about what, what happened today. I mean, it's, it's been hard to absorb the news of what happened today in New Zealand as we are kind of absorbing all of this interesting information. It's obviously very related. Its about spreading hate online and the consequences of spreading that hate. Um, but I think we'd be remiss if we didn't mention it and I think one thing that I wanted to ask about and I, I talked with Alex, ah, Amend a little bit about this before, is I had never heard of this concept before and pardon my language, ah, it's called shit posting, um, and apparently I'm not going to read the "great replacement" which is the manifesto that this shooter in New Zealand released before the shooting, but what some authors are, are stating who are following these things say that this manifesto is a trap itself laid for journalists searching for the meaning behind this horrific crime. There is truth in there and valuable clues to the shooter's radicalization but it's buried beneath a great deal of, for lack of a better word, shit posting, or basically throwing out huge amounts of content, most of it ironic, low quality trolling for the purpose of provoking an emotional reaction in less internet savvy viewers. So, my question is, how are we ever going to be able identify that content if it's constantly changing in a way to deceive people who are looking for that content? Um, that's one question. And the second question is, again I haven't been able to fully process what's happening but apparently some of the images and video are still available on Reddit, platforms like Reddit. So, it just, for, for anyone who would like to

respond, um, this idea of, of shit posting, how do we, how do we manage to monitor that content to look for potentially harmful content? And then, um, how do we keep that content from, prohibiting it from being circulated after it's been published?

MS. LLANSO: Um, well, oh, did you want this? Ah, so one, the, the, the challenge of identifying shit posting, right, and identifying when somebody is being intentionally ironic or intentionally provocative or both or genuine is, I, I don't think that's something that a tech platform is going to be able to do from the top down. I think it actually, it really points to, um, a shift that I, I think we should see, I hope we see, um, towards more of a sort of federation of how content moderation happens on a platform where you have the, you know, there are absolutely things that the, the – whatever platform it is, Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, Reddit, whoever – um, as the, the kind of central, the actual host of the content will need to take responsibility for it. They will need to respond to orders about unlawful content. They will need to, um, you know, respond to incitement to violence, to child pornography, you know, to kind of the, the most intense, the, the kinds of content where I think everybody would agree their resources should be prioritized. And that's not going to catch everything. Either it violates their terms of service or, or that makes for a bad user experience. But what we've seen in looking at a lot of different kinds of platforms online that the most functional online communities are ones where you have kind of moderators who are part of the community and who are kind of embedded in the day to day interactions. Um, and this is, I think a really interesting tension to talk about in the, the sort of, you know, as



I think, Carmen you were saying, the, the burden that it put, is put on groups when it's saying like no, you have to go and find all of the hate speech, you have to find the, the content that is targeting your community, and I think there's absolutely a key role for the platform to play there but thinking about finding something as hard to define as, as shit posting, as, you know, memes that have a, a sinister undertone. Um, that could be something that a community of users is much better able to identify. It would be like this isn't how, this isn't what this group is about, this isn't what we're, you know, we're for and too through different kinds of tools or techniques in doing moderation, um, you know, remove those kinds of posts or exclude users from, from certain circumstances. All of this goes back though to a lot of questions about how are sites designed, how does the platform imagine content moderation, and I think if you, if the framework is kind of top down its going to be one global policy applied to every single potential post out there, it's just not going to work very well.

MS. COLLINS-DEXTER: Yeah, I guess I would just add to that that I do think that, um, folks, yeah, um, so, I'm going to punt a little bit but I should say that there are definitely groups that are doing work like this. Um, I just right before the, this session, um, was talking to someone from Daedon Society (phonetic spelling) who for us personally has been like a really invaluable resource for this, like, because we Color of Change is like a really rapid response, um, organization, we've always, we sometimes got off on stuff where we didn't fully get it right. Like we remember one example, classic example of this is actually after the Parkland shooting there was immediately a lot of information saying

that the shooter was like a white nationalist and it was like intentional. Um, it was like an intentional campaign. Um, and we like went out on and campaign around this is why we have to do stuff around white nationalism, like oops, our bad. We were kind of, we were wrong this time but still we're still right, just not this time. Um, but I think like there are a lot of groups like that. Hope not Hate is another example that are like kind of doing this work that are like looking for how things are rapidly changing underground and like really sharing that information. And so, I think in addition to like building out these systems in this infrastructure I think it is really important. This is already happening in Europe that there is some collaboration with the like sort of research networks that are, um, kind of in those spaces. So, I would just add that.

MS. SCURATO: Yeah, and you know, one thing I would add, um, to answer your question a little bit more directly, you're talking about like, you know, these videos are on Reddit. If we know that, Reddit should know that too. Right? So that's why the burden shouldn't just be on us, it shouldn't be on just on our communities to flag this content, but they should really have solution, like technological solutions that are out there, and Emma mentioned the, the hashing, right, for terrorist content. Like that is something, why not apply it to these videos. And, why not use your algorithm that, you know, keeps on feeding people, ah, down this like rabbit hole of, of hateful stuff. Why don't you use that in reverse and find, you know, new content that's being posted on your website and you know to take it down before it spreads because one of the things that happens, um, is that once this, you know, once it goes viral it's all, its out there. It's been seen. And it's really hard for people



to unsee things.

MS. LLANSO: And, just to, like, double click on that too, on the YouTube at one point it was like they were flagging it as sensitive content so they could find the video and flag it as sensitive, but they couldn't actually remove it. So again, that just reinforces you can find it but like what steps are you taking to take it down.

DR. HOFFMAN: All right, well, um, I'd like to take at this point a moment just to remind everybody that you have a blue or several blue sheets on your table and in your, ah, folder. Um, as we're kind of wrapping up this discussion I know one thing that I put on here, what suggestions do you have, is I would have liked a little more time for a Q and A. So, I'm going to relinquish my role as the questioner, and we have about 20 plus minutes to really open this up to the audience. So, let's have some really kind of final good questions about the, about what we've experienced in the past day and a half. Do we have microphones, Jenny?

MS. LAMBE: Yeah. Here we go.

DR. HOFFMAN: All right. Thank you.

Q: Ah, thank you. This was a very interesting panel. Ah, ah, I, I would like to, to just to just ask a couple of questions about the, ah, Change the Terms idea, ah, and what, what drives my thinking is that I actually think that Change the Terms is the, ah, ah, name for the strategy against what you're doing as much as it is the strategy of what you are doing. Ah, what, what we see again and again, ah, that ah, all sorts of hateful groups, white supremacists, ah, particularly are very, very good at changing in the way they



talk about things to avoid content moderation and Emma alluded to this. Ah, and , and this goes all the way to taking, ah, what are, ah, mundane ideas like defending western civilization which is at least debatably good, ah, and, or, ah, simply true statements like all lives matter intoxicifying them and making them like ah sort of holders for, ah, the, the sort of hateful attitude. And I, I recently saw some great research coming out of Princeton, ah, showing just the depth to which, ah, anti-Semites and white supremacists will go to sort of mask what they're talking about and use complicated numerical, ah, patterns and, ah, anagrams, just anything to sort of talk within their community without necessarily talking outside of it. And, and it seems to me that when we start chasing after hateful speech, we end up following it down a rabbit hole, ah, and one interesting example of this that's outside of hateful speech is the way that dissidents work in China where they were on Chinese social media use near homophones for the words they're using to try to evade government censorship. But the censors it turns out, like you know, figure out which homophones are used and then they ban those and then it really degrades the, ah, ah, value of discourse overall because we have to ban more and more and more. And I'm, I'm just wondering is there a good, ah, way around this problem and as a, a secondary question is there a historical example of this ever working ah, being able to, ah, accurately, ah, police speech in such a way to keep people comfortable without using the real coercive power of the state to punish people either financially or corporally, ah, to make them stop. Being banned off of Twitter is really not enough to make people stop.

MS. COLLINS-DEXTER: [Indiscernible.]



MS. LLANSO: Um, you can –

MS. SCURATO: Yeah, I mean, in, in terms of, um, a historical context, I don't think we've ever seen this, right? And, and again what Emma was saying about scale. We've, we've never seen a Facebook, um, that connects people across the world. We've never seen a YouTube. So, I think this is a very unique problem, um, that we're dealing with. Um, also, in terms of, um, kind of what you were saying is like we're playing whack-a-mole a little bit and, and I completely understand that. And I think that's why we have to have this like, this transparency and start really learning what's happening on these platforms because we just, we are really in the dark. Um, and I, and, you know, to that research you were mentioning from Princeton, wouldn't that be great if Facebook started applying that to their platform and learning from that and see what their platform is being used for. And I think that's, that's part of Change the Terms it's not just literally changing, you know, the terms of service and the corporate policies but changing the way that we're thinking about this issue and the way that we're talking about it as well. Yeah.

MS. COLLINS-DEXTER: And I would just [indiscernible] I think, um, it's really tempting for us to be sort of chasing after what we think is like the magic wand that if we wave it magically like racism will go away, everything will be cool, we'll all love each other, right? And, there is no one solution to this and so for us at Color of Change and I think for all of the groups we work with like this is one, ah, proposal [indiscernible] policy interventions but it's nothing if not coupled with we know a disproportionate number of donations to Storm Front come from Palo Alto and there's a lot of people actually in Silicon Valley that



don't just have white supremacy mindset in a broad frame but actually identify as white nationalists and make decisions everyday around how policies get operationalized. And so, there's a lot of work we have to do around changing cultural norms in some of these spaces. I just text, Carmen and I both just testified on CBT as well in front of Congress around like policy legislation and a number of interventions. The week before that I was talking to Facebook shareholders and investors around a number of interventions that we see; one, removing Zuckerberg for example as chair from like Facebook. And so, there's like a number of different things that I think we have to do here if we like put all of our chips on this policy and asked Silicon Valley to get this right, frankly, like, we would fail. And if we also did this through strictly an American lens dealing with these like multinationals, you know, companies and not accounting for what's happening in Brazil and India and all sorts of other places, we would also fail. So, it's like one I would say of like a menu of tactics that have to be deployed.

MS. LLANSO: Um, just one point building on, on, um Carmen's point that this is, this is actually a, a different information environment that we're looking at, is the one thing that, that getting somebody kicked off of Twitter does is deprive them of that audience, right? And that is the kind of, the role that a couple of big platforms have for having such a, you know, whether its sheer number of users like for a Facebook or a YouTube or for Twitter it's special case of like having the attention of all of the media and journalists and a fair number of users but like having a, a way outsized role in shaping kind of national discourse, um, at least at the like frothy surface level.



Um, that is something that I think is a, a meaningful ,a really meaningful criteria to think about here and we've seen parallels to this in the, um, in fights about, ah, stopping terrorist propaganda and particularly ISIS networks, um, and a lot of kind of, it was very difficult for social media platforms to identify pro-ISIS propaganda by the content, um, and what they really started doing was trying to identify networks of accounts that were, um, posting propaganda, amplifying it, ah, recruiting people and all of that. Now again, I have enormous concerns about the ability for these platforms to exclude certain people from these big public conversations. Um, so, I, I think it's, you know, I'm not saying that this is an absolutely great response and it should be used in all cases, but it is a really meaningful response that they have. It is a, a particular kind of power. And so, when we think about levers that to push to change, you know, how acceptable spewing you know racist vitriol is in society, I think we have to take that audience share into account.

DR. HOFFMAN: Thank you. Let's take another question.

Q: Hi, ah, I just wanted to thank you guys for opening up this awesome discussion and, um, one of things, um, throughout the presentation there's been a lot of talk about, um, tech companies and their responsibility in, um, you know, regulating social media. But, um, I think another important aspect of it is actually, like, the social influencers. And, you know, the main people on these platforms. So, um, when I, I do, especially on broadcasting, um, like YouTube, I, I know YouTube pretty well and from what I can identify, um, what YouTube has a problem with is, um, what's called an ad-pocalypse where, um, there are issues on the platform that are identified

and actually vocalized by creators, and, you know, YouTube is like hesitant to, you know, respond to that problem. So, companies, you know, companies who are advertising on YouTube actually pulled their ad revenue and they pulled their ads which not only hurts the company, but it also hurts, you know, the creators who are maybe dependent on, um, YouTube for their living. So, um, and that creates kind of a strain on the relationship between social influencers and companies. I know one of the most recent things was there was a creator who brought up the fact that on videos, um, specifically of underage girls doing like gymnastics or something that in the comments there would be people who would leave timestamps or specific times in the video which would, could be viewed as like explicit for pedophiles which is a huge issue that, you know, YouTube probably couldn't see coming. But, at the same time, you know, it's one of those things that you have to take into effect. So, my question is like what kind of role can companies and influencers have in being more responsive to the issues with digital platforms and how can that relationship kind of, um, be helped or like um impacted?

UNIDENTIFIED: Do you want to start?

MS. COLLINS-DEXTER: Um, yeah, I can start. Um, so I mean I think you just named it. I think it's like [chuckle] –

AUDIENCE: [Laughter.]

MS. COLLINS-DEXTER: -- really important, right, for, um, us to all be working together. I know when I do this, or when Color of Change does this work we have like the kind of power map on the wall that I look at in my office every day that has the universe of people that we're trying to like work with or,

um, [indiscernible] that's like black tech workers, it's like and their allies and all of this other stuff. And, and, and users is like a core part of that. Like part of our story of like why we're here and why we come to the table and why we talk to these companies is because underneath it all it is true that technology has in some ways picked up the baton where corporatized media has like fallen short so the more we've seen like newspapers, or TV shows or things come, come under the control of very few companies. These platforms have offered a decentralized place for people to be like be heard and that's particularly true for black users, black organizers. And we actually found, um, a couple of years ago, to your point, that like we had a bunch of black YouTube users who found they might be like beauty bloggers or doing something else but if they talked about a police killing that happened then YouTube would like demonetize their video. So, they were dealing with all of these sorts of issues and we found them to be like a really powerful organizing constituency, one, to talk to the companies, but also to be able to use their voice in a number of ways to highlight what was happening on the platform. So, I think those partnerships have to exist and, yeah, I think the idea that you put forward is already a good one.

MS. LLANSO: So, I, I agree with Brandi that the, those partnerships need to exist, and I think what, you know, in your question you kind of pointed to the power the advertisers have. Right? And, and how the, the companies and the platforms will react to those advertisers, and in certain instances they overcorrect. Right? So, they, they do what the advertisers want but it ends up hurting those small creators. And I think having those



conversations and building those relationships is something that the, you know, these companies do need to do better.

MS. SCURATO: Um, and I'll just kind of flag another similar avenue for, for trying to influence companies, um, having to do with finances and that's, ah, investors, um, or people who are shareholders for, for publicly traded companies. And I know that's something that, um, a number of orgs are looking at of like actually lobbying shareholders to say, you know, to hold the companies in which they, um, they've invested to particular standards. And to say that we as, you know, the, the one entity you have a legal fiduciary duty to, that you are obligated to, to do stuff that's in the shareholders best interests, um, we want you to, you know, tackle hate speech on your platform, tackle harassment on your platform, have a better response to what are you going to do about, you know, terrorist propaganda videos. So, that's, I think, another potential angle that, that is exactly in that, that frame you're looking at of like what are all of the dynamics for trying to influence these companies.

DR. HOFFMAN: Another question?

Q: Thank you very much. Um, one of the things I'm curious about when we're talking about regulation whether it's, um, by the board within Facebook or who government and things like that is, um, kind of the idea of requirement of use. So, I'm totally cool with a ton of regulation on highways, ah, food, those kind of things, um, I'm required by my job to have email and to have a cell phone in terms of a phone number, any of the rest of these kind of things I opt whether or not I ever the scheme or ever enter the world whatsoever and from my perspective that ends up meaning that it should

be less regulated than perhaps something I'm required to use. And I'm curious if you have any thoughts in terms of the impact of volunteer entry into these worlds?

MS. COLLINS-DEXTER: Well, in terms of, um, regulation, and, and I want to make this clear, with Change the Terms we're not asking for the government to, to regulate speech. So, we think that these companies, ah you know, created this problem as kind of, it was like a collateral damage, right? Like they, they wanted to build up their platforms, make more money, um, and so that's why we are asking them to be part of the solution. And, I agree, there is, you know, there is a level of, um, you know, you can, you can choose whether or not to be on Facebook. Now, there's a lot of people that that is not necessarily – like they don't feel like they have that choice, right, especially if they want to connect with family. I have family in Puerto Rico, like, if I'm not on Facebook it would be very difficult for me to have daily conversations with them, post pictures of the kids, you know? So there, it's almost like I've tried to disentangle myself from Facebook but almost I can't, right? Like it's become a part of, of my life. Um, its where I posted pictures of my wedding, of my kids being born, and I just, you know, I feel like there, that's what happens with a lot of these people that, you know, we're on this platform, there is a lot of good there and so we want to make sure that it is a safe place for people to continue to be on.

MS. SCURATO: And I think particularly for, you know, a company like a Facebook or a, talking about wanting a, a safe environment for its users or Twitter wanting healthy conversations, um, I forget exactly how YouTube



frames it. But you know like, they want you to have a good time on YouTube. Um, when, when a company puts itself out there it's like this is what we are trying to offer. Then, you know, that, that begins the conversation and I'm like okay, but, here are the ways that we find, we are users, um, find that that's, you're not meeting, um, those standards that you yourself have articulated you're trying to meet. Ah, you know, I think there's certainly sites out there that that don't proprot to offer a safe or even enjoyable experience and so maybe the, you know, the argument to try to get them to change their, their ways um has less clout. But in that kind of the contract with the user, ah, and then I think it also especially as we think of these as global platforms, um, you know, building on, on what Carmen said, there is, there's a couple of different studies that show that like in different countries in Southeast Asia more people will report using Facebook than will report having access to the internet because the adoption of using digital platforms has been so synonymous with the adoption of smart phones and there wasn't the sort of, you know, ten-fifteen-year runup of dial up internet connection that we experienced here in the U.S. It was sort of, oh hey, you've got this thing, you've got this device in your hand, you can get, do so much through this Facebook icon and then, yeah, the internet's a thing, right? And, and so for especially when you're thinking in situations like that where the people have, um, you know, really relied on particular platforms to do pretty much all of the telecommunications capability that they have, um, than it, it, I feel like it starts shifting back more towards that, that sense of like I, you know, I can't do my job without email, um, kind of perspective,]



MS. LLANSO: Yeah, I would, I would also just double down on it. I think right now where we are is the ability to opt out is a little bit of an illusion. Um, my dad has never had a Facebook account; is super suspicious of the internet; like has a phone that's like the size of a brick but he has –

AUDIENCE: [Laughter.]

MS. LLANSO: -- a footprint on Facebook. He actually has a profile on Facebook and it's because my mom happens to be like way more tech savvy than I am actually. Or that people in his life have like, you know, information up they're still like tracking you. They're still tracking your data. Facebook is building curriculum in schools. So, for kids from an early age their first encounter with the internet or with anything can come through like Facebook. Um, you know, to this point I think I think of this like infamous story that I talk about a lot where, um, um, journalists in the Philippines were talking to Mark Zuckerberg around the issue of like disinformation and misinformation and they were like it's really important that Facebook step up because like 97 percent of people in the Philippines use Facebook. And he was like my question is what are the other three percent doing which, you know, says a lot. But again, like, their, their model is growth. There's more adherence to it. There's more like people on Facebook than identify as Christians in the world right now. So, and, and everywhere you go just to have entrance into our economy you have to do it digitally. Like you can't apply for a job at the gas station without doing it online. So, in many ways, um, that question of whether we can opt out at least at this point and when you add in like monopoly power and have that to plan out so even if you go on WhatsApp because that's a free

way to connect to people, now WhatsApp is owned by Facebook. And now they're pumping, they're getting ready to pump ads onto WhatsApp. So, there's a lot of work that has to be done on it and on both fronts in order to create that, to make the opt out culture an actual reality I'd say.

DR. HOFFMAN: Okay. Let's take another question.

Q: Yeah, this is kind of related to this previous question. Um, and not just in this panel but in, in most of the panels where technology and, and how to handle this on technology came up. A lot of the focus – and I'd say all three of you also hinted at this not being the focus in different ways – but a lot of the focus has been on the companies. And what to do about the companies. And I'm a social psychologist and I see, yes, I agree that this is a new moment or unique moment where we have all this interconnectivity but then so some of it to me seems like, well a lot of this is on the users and these are ,these are human behaviors that are happening because we're so interconnected now. And, so I, I, as, and another said there's a, a report from the ADL that came out late last week, um, in conjunction with the Network Contagion Research Institute, ah, basically demonstrating that when Twitter bans people Gab gets a boost. So, they're not losing their platform, they're going to a more homogenous platform where social psychological research would suggest they're now going to get more extreme because they're in an echo chamber. So, I, and like I said, so I think all three of you kind of have addressed and, and said it's not, we can't just expect the companies to do this. So, I'm wondering if you could talk more about your ideas for perhaps, um, influencing the users a little bit and making it

more of like a bottom up thing where we change these interactions that way?

MS. LLANSO: So, I don't know if this will directly answer your question, um, but, I, I think Brittan actually brought this up earlier and she was talking about design choices that the companies make and how that influences the users. And I think that's a huge part of it and that's why we have focused so much on the companies because they have that ability to manipulate your behavior. And that's something that I know Facebook has done and they've done some studies into that to figure out whether you're, you're happy; whether you like Facebook; whether you're a little bit sad, um, and they can manipulate your feed, um, you know, in, in, in any number of ways to do that research. And something that's, um, someone actually pointed out to me is that every fifth post on your Facebook is an ad. And I was like, really? Is that true? And I sat there, and I went through them and I'm like oh yeah, that's – you're right. Um, or someone's sharing an ad, um, you know, and it's, and it's really interesting that, you know, they, there are these design choices that are being made that are influencing people and I, I believe Brittan mentioned that like seeing people's eyes changes the way that people react. So, I, I think there, again there, there needs to be that level of design choice, um, and they're designing these products in a specific way to get a specific response and to maximize their revenue right now.

MS. COLLINS-DEXTER: Yeah, I, and I think part of it is about, you know, what are the, the tools that a platform makes available to its users, um, and how, how they can use those to better shape their experience. I mean it's the, the promise of the internet is that it is this, you know, potentially radically



decentralized network where anybody can attach to the end of it and create their own website, create their own app. You know, it's like really shape whatever experience they want to have. But of course, that's not how most people are using the internet today. And so, we, I think we are in this interesting tension between, you know, for my part I, I really see the kind of the strongest path forward for, for people is reclaiming that ability to craft and make spaces that really do what you want them to do, um, because it's really, really hard to get companies to change and start doing not what they want to do for, you know, business motive but what you want them to do for, you know, a, a good social purpose. Um, but, it's also really hard – there's a fairly, it's low burden or low barriers to entry as far as creating a new site because there's no regulator you have to go through, there's no, you know, broadcaster you have to get to agree to carry your speech, but there are still barriers right? Its not easy for everybody to go and make a, um – now I'm going to start sounding like a Square Space ad, like, make their own website and make it, you know, work on mobile and all that – um, and there is also this question of is, you know, will anybody else be there? Will you be talking to people? So, so as we are still, I think, always going to be tied to what are the platforms or services that enable us easily to interconnect with other people, um, and that's where questions about design choices. And, there, there's some, threes a lot of different research going into like what makes for functional communities. Um, there's really interesting studies on Reddit, um, which showed that, you know, for sub-Redditt's, for, for particular threads or forums on, on the site, that clearly signposted their, you know, basic rules for that thread. Um, at the

top of the thread it was just like sticky up there so every time you went to it you were just reminded like oh, don't be a jerk, and you know, like this is the topic of the site and here's how we're going to apply things. It both increases, it, it decreases negative interactions, decreases the number of posts that have to be removed for violating rules, and also I think like drew out more new speakers, um, and it helped when people had that it seemed to be that when people had that signal of this is what is, um, you know, these are the rules of the road, this acceptable behavior, it gave some lurkers the confidence to be like oh, I can, I can speak up here, I can make my voice heard and maybe I have that confidence that I'll be treated well when I do. Um, so I think there, there's a lot in that sphere but it requires, you know, I, I'm not sure other than maybe in Facebook groups how you could do that sort of thing in a Facebook experience. Really not clear how you would sort of translate that into a Twitter experience. So, I think it also depends of kind of fundamental site architecture but.

DR. HOFFMAN: All right, I think, ah, I, Dr. Jenny Lambe has asked me to close things. So, first of all I'd like to thank Jenny for putting this together. This was a lot of work. Ah, thank, thank you so much.

AUDIENCE: [Applause.]

DR. HOFFMAN: I'd also like to thank all of our panelists and speakers today. Everyone did such a great job.

AUDIENCE: [Applause.]

DR. HOFFMAN: It was fascinating. Thank you.

AUDIENCE: [Applause.]



DR. HOFFMAN: This is just basically a, a several rounds of applause here. All the high school students and teachers that were here today, thank you so much for being here.

AUDIENCE: [Applause.]

DR. HOFFMAN: So, ah, what I'd like to ask is, is that the speakers who have PowerPoint presentations maybe pass them along to Jenney and we can post them on the web site. That's spl2019.org. Let's keep the conversation going. Ah, we have a reception out in the atrium co-sponsored by Heterodox Academy. So, on that note, thank you so much for being here and I look forward to talking with you more. Thank you.

AUDIENCE: [Applause.]

#