



**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 3:** Difficulties of Responding to Hate Speech on Digital Platforms

Introduction by Ralph Begleiter, retired founder of the University of Delaware's Center for Political Communication; former world affairs correspondent CNN

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

Brittan Heller, Berkman Klein Center for Internet and Society at Harvard

Jessie Daniels, Hunter College and The Graduate Center at CUNY

Transcript of Event

Date: March 15, 2019

Place: Embassy Suites, Newark, Delaware



UNIDENTIFIED: [Laughter.]

UNIDENTIFIED: [Indiscernible.]

UNIDENTIFIED: Okay.

[BACKGROUND TALKING]

UNIDENTIFIED: Thank you, Deb.

MR. BEGLEITER: Okay. Good morning again everyone. I'm Ralph Begleiter, retired founder of the University of Delaware's Center for Political Communication, one of the sponsors of today's conference on Speech Limits in Public Life. In a previous life I was CNN's world affairs correspondent during the 1980's and 1990's where my very career was founded and dependent on the First Amendment's protection of free press. I want to thank and congratulate my colleague Dr. Jennifer Lambe for conceiving and convening this very important program and also for including me. thank you very much.

AUDIENCE: [Applause.]

MR. BEGLEITER: Yes. [Indiscernible.] During this session I think we're going to take a little bit of a turn away from analysis of speech and policy on campus to a more global and perhaps more technical perspective. Ah, we're going to focus on the challenges of responding to hate speech in the digital age where social media and other technologies facilitate what I consider the blurring out of, and circulation of hateful speech instantly, widely and irrevocably. And we've seen a, yet another example of this just today in New Zealand where hate speech has become instantly global and where people all around the world who probably have never been to or heard of Christ Church,



New Zealand, ah, are thinking about things that they would not otherwise have had on their agenda this morning as a result of social media. I think our tech; our attention now will be aimed on technology and technology policy. I'd like to introduce our panelists. We have three panelists, one of whom is appearing as you can see on the screen and with good luck technology will, you know, help us make it through this –

AUDIENCE: [Laughter.]

MR. BEGLEITER: – ah, and it'll be, it'll be terrific. There's a good reason why this is happening, by the way. It's not because, ah, our third panelist is un, was unwilling to be here or anything because he's eager to be here but, ah, so first let me introduce, um, Britton Heller, who is on your screen. She is an attorney and technology and human rights fellow affiliated with Harvard's Berkman Klein Center for Internet and Society. She works on issues related to cyber hate and harassment. Previously, she founded the Anti-defamation League's Center for Technology and Society and earlier served in the U.S. Justice Department specializing in the intersection of human rights and technology. Earlier, she was founder of the Center for Digital Civil Rights and Senior Associate at CSIS and she practiced international human rights law in Afghanistan, the Korean Peninsula, and at the International Criminal Court in the Hague. She's a graduate of Stanford and Yale Law, and this is the one you're going to remember, she is also a Jeopardy champion.

AUDIENCE: [Laughter.]

MR. BEGLEITER: Emma Llanso, who is sitting, ah, she's, she's wearing a black sweater –

MS. LLANSO: [Laughter.]



MR. BEGLEITER: -- is director of the Free Speech Product (sic) Project of the Center for Democracy and Technology, a nonprofit promoting speech protective policies and law here in the United States and around the world. Emma is an attorney who earned her law degree at Yale and a BA in anthropology right here at the University of Delaware. Our third panelist is, sorry, Dr, Jessie Daniels. She is wearing red.

AUDIENCE: [Laughter.]

MR. BEGLEITER: She is professor of sociology at Hunter College and at the Graduate Center of City University of New York. She's an internationally recognized expert on internet manifestations of racism focusing on race and digital media technologies. She is the author or editor of five books including one called *Cyber Racism* and dozens of peer reviewed journal articles including one I remember reading about in *Popular Media* about her study of young men leaving New York's Rikers Island Prison in the early 2000's. Each of our panelists is going to make a brief presentation and then we'll have time for Q and A. And, I think you're going to find their presentations dovetail nicely and will provoke your questions as well. So, first let's turn to Brittan Heller. Can you hear us and why don't you unmute and make sure we can hear you?

MS. HELLER: Yes, I can hear you. Can you hear me?

MR. BEGLEITER: We're good.

AUDIENCE: Yes.

MR. BEGLEITER: We're all good. Go for it.

AUDIENCE: [Applause.]

MS. HELLER: All right. Yes. Thank you, technology Gods. Thank you, University of Delaware, and everyone for having me there today. It's really a



privilege to talk to you and to be on a panel with, um, with these other wonderful women. Today I'm going to cover, and, and everything seems to have a, a, you know, be cast in a new light, um, based on what happened in New Zealand, ah, yesterday night. So, um, I think we're going to have a really interesting discussion today. Today I'm going to cover a few things.

[Indiscernible.] Ah, we're going to talk about the scope and scale of online activity; next we're going to talk about the differences in the way that freedom of expression is conceived of, um, in the, the United States as a [indiscernible] of rights and basically in the rest of the world as a positive obligation. Ah, we're going to talk about the philosophical underpinnings of freedom of expression so why, why do we have this, what are the norms around it. And, finally, we're going to talk about whether or not the metaphors that we use to talk about free speech work with the online context. Do we need new metaphors to understand how freedom of expression works with online activity? So, the first kind of obligatory slide for any internet, ah, internet speech-based conference is that we live in a global internet-based society. Um, for the four million (sic) people online today, and it might be five – there's a study that came out from Pew very recently that said five billion people are now connected to the internet – um, the study that found four billion people connected found that 67 percent of people use Facebook's products and 50 percent are on YouTube. That is intense saturation when you're thinking about the number of people that are connected and, and sharing views. Um, from those a lot, um, a lot of commentators are now looking at platforms that carry user generated material as having unwittingly become the gatekeepers of, of speech and their decisions on content have the direct impact on users'



fundamental rights like freedom of expression, safety and privacy. Um, Emma is going to talk about how there is no international or universal definition of hate speech, so I'm instead going to lay the framework about what international law and domestic provisions may apply. So, in the first meeting of the United Nations General Assembly in 1946 the states passed a resolution talking about freedom of expression and they called it the touchstone of all the freedoms to which the United Nations is consecrated. And this provided a really early definition of freedom of expression. Um, freedom of expression; there was, there were three interrelated [indiscernible]: the right to hold opinions without interference; the right to seek and receive information; and the right to impart information and ideas of all kinds through any media and regard for [indiscernible]. When you look at freedom of expression under international law it's very important to remember that its linked with other rights. You can't look at, at the freedom of expression in isolation. So, it's, it's linked to freedom of assembly and association; and to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; and to the right of privacy. The United States is kind of an odd duck when you look at the way the freedom of expression is treated around the world. Um, for us it's governed by the First Amendment and that's the full text of the First Amendment. I assume that everyone's familiar if you're at this conference. Um, there is speech that is not protected by the First Amendment and these are some of the general categories that that, that we find – incitements, defamation, fraud, [indiscernible], child pornography, fighting words, threats, defamatory lies like libel or slander or lying under oath. And in, in Europe and in many places around the world freedom of expression is protected at the Council of Europe



level, at the European Union level, and in national constitutions. So, the equivalent to the First Amendment in the United States, it's Article Ten of the European Convention on Human Rights. Um, this guarantees freedom of expression as part of all of the regional international human rights treaties throughout the Council of Europe region. It also includes non-EU countries such as Turkey and Russia. So, some exclusions from the convention's protections include, um, but they're not limited to ethnic hate; incitement to violence and support for terrorist activity; um, negationism and revisionism that mostly comes across as Holocaust denial; racial hate; religious hate; and threats to the democratic order. The, the way [indiscernible] that we use case law in the United States, the European Court of Human Rights case law is the major cornerstone for the protection of freedom of expression in the European context. And when you look at the differences in the, in the body of law think about the United States as having over 200 years of precedent. And Europe is going off about 60 to 70 years. So, there's a much better developed legal tradition in the United States but a much more comprehensive, um, body of inclusions in the European context. There are constraints on freedom of expression in the European context as well. Um, any state interference to freedom of expression in the European context has to have a legitimate aim, it has to be provided for by law, and it has to be necessary in a Democratic society. There's two approaches to incitement and to hatred and it's freedom of expression. One is they say that the speech would be excluded from the protection of the Convention and that the second would be that, um, there are going to be restrictions set on this protection. Um, and the, the indicator for this is whether or not the speech is viewed to be in alignment with the



fundamental values of the Convention. So, the, the, um, we already talked about the European exclusions. But, so, so if you remember, if you want to remember the main distinction between the European and, and the global and the rest context that this, this is how you should remember it. The freedom of expression in America is a negative right. It is to be invoked against government interference. So, the government may not restrict the percolation of ideas. Whereas in Europe and in many parts of the rest of the world freedom of expression has to be balanced against other fundamental interests, um, including a, a right to a public life. So, what this means is that it's a negative, its, it is a negative right to invoked against state interference but it's also a positive obligation on states to [[indiscernible] pluralism. So that's why when you look at the emergent regulatory environment you, you may see Europe taking the lead on regulation of social media. There's four reasons that, ah, we have freedom of expression that people talk about, um, as, as the general norms. Um, one is the protection of individual liberty and self-fulfillment, second is the search for truth, third is the functioning of democracy to ensure that democracy works well, and three (sic) on government power. This, this is basically how we talk about why freedom of expression matters. So, with these norms in mind, um, I, we can turn to online activity. So, hate speech is not new. Ah, there, there have been examples of hateful speech going back really far and the, the historians of technology will tell you that it's not the speech that's new but the mechanisms, ah, the online conveyance of ideas which is actually new. The internet allows for the targeting of, um, allows for ideas to be, to be disseminated but in an automated way. [Indiscernible] widely and to micro target its intended, um, recipient. And also,



to micro target an [indiscernible] audience of the speech. And as my colleagues will discuss, hate speech can also be profitable for, um, some of these online companies whose business models are dependent upon opaque algorithms and increased virality which encourages evermore extreme content. Um, in addition to what happened yesterday in New Zealand we've seen how hateful speech has been used to incite online to offline violence in places like Sri Lanka, Myanmar, India, and Uganda. My prior research with, um, the ADL Center for Technology and Society demonstrated how online architectures were being overwhelmed with hateful speech designed to target political journalists and intimidate them into silence. Ah, we, we found that trolls or bots sent 2.6 million anti-Semitic messages to U.S. journalists [[indiscernible] in the nine months leading up to the 2016 presidential elections and the bulk of this targeted ten people and around the clock. We've also seen disinformation campaigns rise, um, and the, with the Russian interference in the 2016 U.S. election we saw a mixture of American citizens legitimate political expression with foreign influence operations in a way that it was very difficult if not impossible for tech companies to disaggregate the two. So, how do you deal with coordinated [[indiscernible] behavior in this context? My times about it so my last 50 seconds I'm going to pose four questions that we can use as a, a jumping point to the discussion. Does today's internet upend the promise of the marketplace of ideas? Is the marketplace of ideas broken? Given the harms that we talked about is there a new way that we should concede the freedom of expression and its relationship to hate speech? Does international human rights law provide a shared framework for dealing with the global problem of hate speech? This is a, been a, a popular debate within the, um,



the internet rights community. And, with the push of regulation, um, the push [[indiscernible] regulation of the tech industry happening across the globe are we about to see a [[indiscernible] version of online life? Will the internet in America look different from the internet in Europe which will look different from the internet in New Zealand? Thank you very much. And, I'm looking forward to get a presentation and to hearing all of your questions.

AUDIENCE: [Applause.]

MR. BEGLEITER: Thank you, Brittan. I'd just add or the internet in China or the internet in Russia which already look different from the, from the ones we have. Our next speaker is Emma Llanso. Emma?

MS. LLANSO: Okay. Thank you, Ralph. And thank you so much, um, to, to Jenny for the invitation to come speak at this conference. It's really an honor to be back here on campus, um, and, and participating in such a, a great event. Um, so I wanted to talk a little bit about kind of what the title of the panel, you know, difficulties in responding to hatred in digital spaces. Um, kind of three big reasons why we have seen such a, a challenge in grappling with the spread of hatred on different kinds of online platforms. Um, kind of the challenge that I think we as societies are facing, um, really coming to terms with what the internet as a means of communication means for, um, things like hate speech, like terrorist propaganda, and other kinds of, um, concerning or, or challenging, or "harmful" content. Um, and the first is something that, ah, Brittan also mentioned is this question of scale. Ah, we, I, this cannot be overstated. The scale of communication that the internet enables is absolutely enormous and it's something that we as societies have not really ever before grappled with. Um, I think the current stats are something like 400 to 500



hours of video are uploaded to YouTube every minute. Um, there are millions of tweets posted a day; billions of Facebook posts, you know, that there is really no physical way for prepublication human review of all of this content before it goes out. And that used to be one of our best checks against things like hate speech or defamation or, um, you know, terrorist propaganda that there would be some kind of gatekeeper, some kind of newspaper editor or a broadcaster who was looking at material and deciding the vast majority of what people wanted to say never made it to air time. Um, the, the internet has really fundamentally shifted that balance, um, and we see in early case law in the United States, ah, exactly what kinds of tensions that scale issue brings about. There was an early case, um, called *Stratton Oakmont v. Prodigy*, ah, for folks who weren't using the internet in the early 90s Prodigy was, was an information service –

AUDIENCE: [Laughter.]

MS. LLANSO: -- that kind of provided internet access but also, you know, essentially webpages and chat rooms and forums, um, and there was a, a defamation case brought, ah, from a, a post put in one of Prodigy's forums. Um, Prodigy had the, the practice of having moderators in forums. They had people who were there to remove profanity or off topic content, um, who were really doing things to try to create a better experience in the forums. And, you know, that, that sounds pretty good but it also was quite relevant in the, um, the legal analysis when somebody said hey, I've been defamed by this post in this forum and the court concluded, well, Prodigy has kind of taken on the risk of defamation by acting as an editor. They, they really do look like a newspaper editor in this context so we should treat them like a, a newspaper

editor. Um, that was a reasonable application of, of First Amendment law up to that point, ah, but it also showed the really strange incentives that, um, content moderation online creates with this enormous volume of content. If you make a, a website operator a forum moderator a social media platform liable because they have done moderation, they are not going to want to do it. If, if the legally safer option is just let people post whatever, do nothing about it, um, you have an environment that's a lot like 4chan, ah, and, and is not maybe constructed to have, um, you know, really thoughtful reasoned debates or to address the real harms that can be done to people through things like, um, hate speech and, and defamation. Ah, but the other way that the scale of online communication has really disrupted things is it's, it's challenged the social norms, the things other than laws that we have used to, um, manage hateful ideas and hateful communication in our society. Right? I think hopefully everybody in the room has some conversation or discussion environment where they feel really pretty safe from, from hearing hate speech, from, you know, having, um, you know, or, ah, you know, or harassment or other kinds of problematic content. We all I hope have those kinds of spaces and ,and it's really not the law that is making those spaces for us, it's the agreements that we have with our families or our friends or in a classroom that these are the standards of discussion, these are what will be respected, um, and, and stuff that's outside of that is not, um, not permissible. Again, not the action of law, it's the action of, of people interacting with each other. Um, and the, the internet complicates that in, um, some really challenging ways. Ah, a second big difficulty in responding to online hate, um, is that so much of what we're looking at these days is happening on globe spanning platforms where

you have, ah, you know, for, take a, for example a Facebook who is trying to have a kind of a single articulated policy about hate speech not being allowed on their platform and then they're trying to apply that policy to hundreds or thousands of different cultural and linguistic contexts around the world. Um, and I think, you know, we all can appreciate that what makes something hate speech, you know, there will probably be some statements that most people in the world would be able to identify as like ah yes, that's hate speech. But a lot of things that are more insidious, um, or that are, ah, you know, really kind of culturally dependent are much harder to identify. I'm thinking of the, um, the, the statement that, ah, that the professor over here mentioned of what it's, it's all, it's okay to be white –

UNIDENTIFIED: Right.

MS. LLANSO: Right. Um, which on its face is, you know, there are no slurs in there, there's not even negative words in that statement but when you know the context in which it's being promoted you can understand that that, and that statement is doing a lot of work is invoking a lot of things like white supremacy, um, and, ah, and you know, and, and contemporary debates. So, trying to apply a single policy to the very complex question of, of hate speech is going to at the very least miss a lot of things and probably over correct on a lot of other things. Um, one good example of just the kind of, the mechanical nature of these policies is, um, Facebook's former policy on hate speech – they, they since changed it but, but about two years ago, um, there was a lot of discussion because some, some slides that they were using to train their content moderators were kind of leaked to the press. Um, and, and so in these slides it was kind of, the policy was sort of broken down that Facebook



didn't want hate speech on its platform. Um, they had a set of protected characteristics like race and gender, um, sexual orientation, and statements that were denigrating of people who had these characteristics could be considered hate speech. But they also had a provision that said, you know, if somebody has combined a protected class with an unprotected class, um, we're not going to consider that hate speech because there may be something else going on. Right? There may, they may have referenced someone's race or, or gender or orientation but that's not really the point of the comment. Um, which led to the completely, ah, you know, not intuitive results that a, um, derogatory statement about white men could be considered hate speech by Facebook on the platform and would likely be removed. A derogatory statement about black children would not be considered hate speech because age of a person, you know, the, the fact that they were a child was not one of these protected classes in, in Facebook's definition. Um, so you end up with a, sort of, you know, it's, it's a very kind of engineering mentality, right? There's a big problem. We want to define out a rule set, apply that rule set and, and proceed because they're trying to grapple with the problem of hate speech at this enormous scale. Um, but, when you take a step back and apply a kind of contextual question of why do we care about stopping hate speech some of it may be we don't want anybody denigrated for any reason. But there's a lot of, you know, um, John and Nadine were talking about earlier this morning this question of power, um, and the, the idea that black children would not be protected in a regime that is trying to stop hate speech is completely, um, you know, counter intuitive to, to why we think we'd have these policies in the first place. Um, and then a final point, and I know we're short on time so



I'll, maybe we can come back to this, but, a big dynamic in today's debates about what to do about hate speech and the fact that there is this enormous volume of content is to, to try to sort of bailout into artificial intelligence and machine learning and say it's like oh but, but we will have AI that can solve this problem because it's a horrible problem that lots of, we all, you know, want to see solved. Um, but I, I definitely want to sound a note of caution that there are absolutely some things that automation can do. Automation has been a big part of managing huge volumes of content online since the very earliest days. You know, we all benefit from spam blocking in our email. Um, that's been one of the biggest challenges of, you know, managing content since the early days of the internet, um, and there are some things that, you know, things like spam where you're identifying high volumes of messages, or particular ways of phrasing things that automation can really pick up on. Um, something like hate speech is much, much harder for an automated system to identify because of all of the things we've been talking about, um, cultural context, ah, and the ways that different groups of people talking to each other will, will do hate speech or, or say things that actually aren't hate speech. Um, and we did a, a study of, of studies of, um, hate speech detection tools, um, and found that, you know, tools that were designed to try to help identify statements that may be hate speech, um, tend to work best when they have been trained on a data set that is very similar to, to the set that they're, um, analyzing. So, we would call this domain specificity but in short it means if you train up a, a tool to try to identify hate speech on Twitter it may work for Twitter or for some parts of Twitter but you, it's probably not going to be anywhere close to as effective at identifying comments on Pinterest or Facebook or YouTube, um,



because the communities of people and the styles of communication and the, um, kind of all of the, the context and modality of how speech is done on those platforms, um, is different. Ah, another thing that machine learning tools really kind of depend on, in fact what they are, are trying to do when you have a, um, you know, a machine learning system analyzing a set of data to come up with classifiers, to come up with ways to find the target information you need a clear definition of what you're targeting. Um, as we've, I think a, a lot of folks have discussed clear definitions that are agreed on by broad groups of people about what hate speech is, um, are not as prevalent as ,as they would need to be for, um, you know, for a, a hate speech detection tool to really be kind of working well or in a, in a way that satisfies, um, a lot of people. Ah, it's interesting if you look at the, the research on these things, um, most studies aren't even using the same definition of hate speech across them. Um, Brittan was, ah, mentioning earlier in kind of international human rights language and I think to sort of answer one of, briefly one of her questions, international human rights law is probably the best recourse we have to a, a globally embraced standard for things like freedom of expression and hate speech. It's not perfect and its' not, um, as kind of detailed as we need for, ah, training into automated systems but that would be the, the starting point I'd point to.

MR. BEGLEITER: Thanks very much, Emma.

AUDIENCE: [Applause.]

MR. BEGLEITER: Dr. Jessie Daniels.

DR. DANIELS: Oops. I brought show and tell ya'll. I'm originally from Texas. I live in New York now, but it just means I talk really fast and say ya'll a lot so.



AUDIENCE: [Laughter.]

DR. DANIELS: Um, so, ah, I'm happy to be here. Thanks so much to Jenny Lambe for organizing this and for inviting me. Um, I want to start by, by forwarding this and it won't let me.

UNIDENTIFIED: I think if you just hit the arrow button.

MR. BEGLEITER: [Indiscernible.]

DR. DANIELS: I did. Nothing happened. [Laughter.] Come on technology, don't let us down now. You did so well earlier.

UNIDENTIFIED: Let me see if this does it.

DR. DANIELS: Oh, that does it, okay, super. thank you. Um, a different button. Okay, we're good. So, I want to, um, start by talking about, um, like a couple of – I don't want to do that. Okay. Um, this is just a way to reach me after. You can reach me on Twitter. I'm actually going to talk a lot about Twitter in this presentation, um, and how we address hate speech online on Twitter. And I'm going to talk about two case studies and then I'm going to talk about something called platform politics which is really just about the platform of Twitter and [Indiscernible] how that effects it. And the first one, the first case study I'm going to talk about is the idea of transforming the haters. So that's one way of addressing hate speech online is you get to the people who are expressing hate and you change them. And you may have heard about this woman, or you've certainly heard about her father and the group, her family. She's part of a group of, ah, the Westboro Baptist Church and they often show up at military funerals and, um, they showed up at Matthew Shepard's funeral, um, and she – her name is Megan, ah, Rope, Megan Phelps Roper, thank you – and she, um, ah, encountered, was expressing



hate on Twitter and someone spoke back to her on Twitter again and again. Several people did. And, they also encountered her in person at some of these protests that she went to holding up, um, offensive hate filled signs and over time they started to build a relationship with her and there was one young man who said, you know, she reached out to me when I was going through a terrible health crisis and she had more compassion for me than anyone else in my life did and so I knew there was a, a person there. I knew there was a connection there. And so, he started speaking to her about her views and trying to change her and then there was someone else who began to change her views as well. Um, and she really has left that, ah, group and is no longer, ah, a hate mongerer on Twitter. So, this is a – oops, too fast (chuckle) too fast even for me – so this is a heartwarming story, ah, much like the one Chris was telling last night but it's really difficult to scale which was some of these questions for him as well. So, it's, it's great to be able to do that through the technology but it's really hard to, ah, ramp it up. So, I'm going to you another, um, case study and the, the idea behind this case study is no platforming the haters. And I'll tell you what no platforming means in a second. So, you may know, ah, Leslie Jones from Saturday Night Live and she, um, did a wonderful summer fun movie. Ah, it was a remake of Ghost Busters with an all-female cast. A lot of people liked it and for some reason, ah, a character on the far right decided that he did not like it. Um, that guys name is Milo Yiannopoulos and he went after Leslie Jones on Twitter and he organized a bunch of other people to go after her. So, he, he along with a lot of his followers started targeting her with abuse via Twitter. Um, now, it just so happened a lot of people were sort of, ah, paying attention to this and she didn't just sort of slink



and go away and leave Twitter, but she was paying attention to what was happening and she said this is really horrible and this shouldn't be, be allowed to go on. And somebody, because Leslie Jones is a, is a celebrity, somebody connected her personally to Jack Dorsey, who's the guy that started Twitter and is still the CEO, and she had a conversation with him and said this is making my life awful. And so, what Jack Dorsey did was he banned Milo Yiannopoulos for life from the platform. He said, this is, Leslie Jones is a friend of mine, this is terrible what's going on here. Right? So, he no platformed Milo – if you've been around the internet for a long time, we used to call this kick and ban, ah, but now we're calling it no platform. Basically, he took away Milo's, um, Twitter account and he can't get back on. Right? So that's not, no platforming. Now what's happened to Milo Yiannopoulos since then? Well, he lost his book deal, he's gone bankrupts (sic), gone bankrupt, he's in, ah, several million dollars' worth of debt and he's no longer a celebrity anymore. So, there's a case to be made for, for this kind of action as a way to fight hate speech on, ah, on social media. Right? No platforming, that is remove people's access to the platform as a way, um, to fight this kind of speech. So, why doesn't (chuckle) Twitter – I'll just speed ahead – why doesn't Twitter do more of this no platforming? It's, it's actually a better solution than trying to change individual haters because it can scale but part of the reason it doesn't do this is because of this fellow. Anybody know who this is off the top of your head? This is John Perry Barlow. Ah, he was once famous for being a lyricist for the, ah, the band The Grateful Dead, for those of you who are younger may not know that band. Um, and, he's also famous for something called the Declaration of Independence of Cyberspace. And I'm

just going to read you the very first sentence of this which is: Government – this was written in 1996 – Governments of the Industrial World, you weary giants of flesh and steel, I come from Cyberspace, the new home of Mind. So there was this, this idea, which we now think of as cyber libertarianism, that the internet was going to liberate us from things like race, and gender, and embodiment and that ,that idea, that set of ideas still shapes what we think of, ah, the way tech companies think about the internet. So, it's part of the reason that Twitter and other tech companies are reluctant to, ah, de-platform or no platform, ah, haters on the, on the, um, on their social media platforms. So, what does, um, platform politics mean? Twitter is actually not that popular of a social media platform. It's much less popular than Facebook or Google. Um, it, it has low numbers in terms of uptake, in terms of people who are using it, but it has an outsized influence in terms of the way that Twitter influences things. Now, news really does start on Twitter, um, and that is not just because of some of the uber users that we're all familiar with (chuckle) – um, but it also means for white supremacists is that they're finding opportunity on Twitter because blacks and, ah, Latin-ex people are more likely than whites to use Twitter. What that means is that Twitter becomes a target-rich environment for online abuse as sport. So, this is something different actually than just the content of speech, but its actually going after people the way Professor Powell mentioned earlier as for injurious, ah, intention. Right? The, the point is not just to say a thing that's offensive, but the, the point is to injure someone. Right? And that's what, what's going on at Twitter. It's what happened with, um, Milo and, ah, Leslie Jones. Um, and part of the reason that this is allowed to go on is that Twitter's growth has stalled and that means



that their revenue has dipped so it's hard for them as a company to, ah, sell the company to investors because they have this, ah, slow growth and because they have this problem with hate speech on the platform. And I talked to a Google engineer who said Twitter chose to optimize for traffic at the, at the expense of user experience. And he went on to say that hence, ah, hence abuse, hence Nazi's, hence all the rest of it. Um, let me see, so I'm just going to leave, ah, leave it here with an article that I wrote that sort of lays out this argument more just in the interest of time so we can open just Q and A. I'll sit down now and am happy to talk with you more. Thanks.

MR. BEGLEITER: Thank you very much, Dr. Daniels.

AUDIENCE: [Applause.]

MR. BEGLEITER: Okay. I'm going to exercise the moderator's prerogative to ask a couple of questions first, but, get your questions ready so, ah, the microphone people can be on the lookout for people who, um, might want to ask questions. I'd like to follow-up with Brittan and Emma on a couple of their sort of technically focused points. Um, it was, um, ah, well both of them actually referred to the scale of communication in these social media environments and Emma explicitly said, ah, that it was just, the scale is just beyond anybody's ability to pre, preview or pre-edit or exercise editorial control over it. So, I want to be provocative by just asking both of you, or actually all three of you if you want to comment on it. Um, we don't say to the TSA inspectors at airports, you know, there are just too many passengers; you can't really be expected to check the safety of every single passenger so do the best you can and then let the crowd through. We don't do that. We don't do it with airlines. We don't say there's so many people that want to fly just keep

putting airplanes in the air, keep filling them up. You know? Put them out there. We'll do the best we can to protect people but, but we know its just physically impossible to pre-edit every person getting on an airplane. Should we, and, and what is your response really? I'm being a bit facetious here, but what is your response to the, the issue of can't we just say to these technical companies, no, we're not giving you a pass on this. You can't just keep expanding and have more and more speech, infinite numbers of, of blurbs being posted every minute, every hour, hours and hours of video being posted. No. You can't do that because we need to defend, let's say, democracy or free speech or protect people against hate speech. Brittan, were you able to hear any of that and, and can you maybe respond first?

MS. HELLER: Um, what you're saying reminds me of, of something that I, I very frequently say to social media companies when they, when they ask for advice about how to deal with offline online, online to offline violence related situations. I think that, um, I think social media could actually learn a lot from the TSA because they do risk-based assessments. Um, but you're right, they can't search every person going on an airplane but they, they do a risk-based assessment about, um, where the, where the points in their system are, that are most likely to be exploited. So, they search you when you're going into the, um, going into the gates. Sometimes they'll, they'll ask, they'll double check your passport before you go on the plane. I think the TSA example is also really an interesting one because, um, there have been, there's been a lot of outcry, um, against TSA for some of the racial profiling that they did in this risk-based assessment. So I think that it, it shows that you can use this to look at systems but you also can't use the system's out, um,



the system's exclusively outside of the type of, um, equity, equality and fairness concerns that we, that we would have when dealing with actual human beings.

MR. BEGLEITER: Okay. And Emma, would you care to comment on that?

MS. LLANSO: Ah, sure. Yeah, and I mean these conversations, um, were very much a part of kind of early days of setting up the legal system around the, the internet both here in the U.S. and in places like the European Union where there's, um, in the way that they deal with the liability that on, on platform space for hosting content there's an explicit prohibition against general monitoring obligations. This idea that in order to have the internet be a place that facilitates freedom of expression at all, we can't have an upfront requirement for filtering or monitoring of all speech because it will inevitably lead to overbroad blocking of perfectly lawful completely legitimate protective speech. Um, so, and, and it's interesting, if, to, to, you know, kind of play on your hypothetical like, how, that, that's to me as a, you know, as a free expression advocate that's such an obvious benefit. Right? That if the, the internet enables freedom of expression in a law that says, you know, you, platform, must overly broadly, overly cautiously restrict people from being able to use your service, to me that's so obviously, ah, a problem. Um, and, and I think the kind of, the, the proposal would essentially try to pull the internet back into something that looks a lot more like cable or, um, you know, or broadcast television. Right. To, to institute some kind of artificial scarcity into, you know, how many people can post, how many people, um, can put their views out there, that is just technically not part of the system. Like one of the main reasons we don't let people just throw as many airplanes up in the air as



possible is that both the airspace and the time that a plane can be in that airspace are, are limited discreet quantities. Right? You can't, you don't want to have two airplanes in the same space at the same time. That's very, very bad.

AUDIENCE: [Chuckles.]

MS. LLANSO: Um, the, you know, the digital world, what the internet enables is a, an essentially unlimited space. So, we don't have that same kind of scarcity, scarcity rationale of bringing in, um, restrictions on who can speak when because the idea at the outset was that, you know, the, we're, we're freed up from those limitations. And so, it can be this kind of profusion of speech, profusion idea, of ideas, and recognizing that the majority of people who are using the internet are using it for wholly lawful protected expression. Um, so it is a, it is a tradeoff.

MR. BEGLEITER: Jessie, did you want to comment on that?

DR. DANIELS: Yeah. Yes, so I think there are ways that we could, um, demand certain accountability from tech companies but I think that there a lot of barriers in the way. The, the kind of cyber libertarian ideology that I mentioned in my remarks is one of those barriers. And I think the, the, the adherence to a kind of absolutist understanding of the First Amendment is another one of the barriers. So, so there are a lot of sort of ideological barriers in the United States so that what I think building what Brittan and Emma both said, I think that the, the European regulations around the internet are really going to have a big impact on Silicon Valley-based, ah, tech companies and we're going to have to, as a, as a country going to have to rethink the kind of, ah, global implications of the internet. One of the case studies that I talked



about in cyber racism which came out in 2009, um, was the France v. Yahoo case where there was a, a, someone in France who was selling Nazi memorabilia on the Yahoo Auction site, like eBay, um, activists in France said hey, that's illegal here. French government went after Yahoo based in Cupertino, California. Cupertino-, um, based Yahoo said we couldn't possibly restrict, um, the content of our site just in France, its technologically impossible. That's a direct quote from the CEO at the time. At the same time that they were trying to get into China and restrict the content in China [chuckle] –

AUDIENCE: [Chuckles.]

DR. DANIELS: Right? Um, and then the French government; what happened was that the French government started, ah, fining Yahoo \$100,000 francs per day and suddenly they found the technology –

MR. BEGLEITER: It became possible.

DR. DANIELS: [Laughter.] Right.

AUDIENCE: [Laughter.]

DR. DANIELS: So –

MR. BEGLEITER: Imagine that? Okay.

DR. DANIELS: And I think that's the future. I think that conflict is what's coming.

MR. BEGLEITER: Okay, real quick answers from each three of you to this one. Do –

MS. HELLER: Okay.

MR. BEGLEITER: Do bots on the internet in the social media platforms have the same free speech rights that you advocate for everybody else and if not

isn't that something that is a switch that just could be turned off technologically without infringing anyone's freedom of expression capability? Who wants to answer that ridiculous question first?

MS. LLANSO: [Laughter.]

AUDIENCE: [Laughter.]

MS. HELLER: It depends on if you think the freedom of expression-based rights attached to the speaker, a speech or the protection of democracy. Each one of those would lead you to a different outcome. If it's the speaker the answer is, um, probably not. If it's the speech the answer is maybe. And if it's, um, to protect democracy the answer is it depends.

AUDIENCE: [Laughter.]

MS. HELLER: Go for it.

MS. LLANSO: Ah, ah, even more complicity –

MS. HELLER: [Indiscernible] morally answer for you.

MR. BEGLEITER: [Laughter.]

MS. LLANSO: [Laughter.] Um, you know at this point, as far as I'm aware bots are still tools that people are using; um, that people are still involved in the creation or, um, proliferation of bots. We don't have pools of data where bots are just like from their own spark of, of interest creating themselves. Right? So, if bots are tools of people then they can be looked at the way we look at any other tools that people use to express themselves and they can be used for good or for ill. Um, there are plenty of, you know, automated accounts on Twitter that are doing really important transparency and oversight things of, you know, posting every – my favorite is Congress edits which posts every time an IP address associated with Capitol Hill edits a

page on Wikipedia, ah, because you can see that, you know, people in certain offices are tidying up their members –

DR. DANIELS: Um-hum.

MS. LLANSO: -- ah, profile or that it's 4:00 p.m. on a Friday and somebody is editing the page for the Transformers movie from their office on Capitol Hill.

DR. DANIELS: [Laughter.]

AUDIENCE: [Laughter.]

MS. LLANSO: Um, there's really interesting things that automated systems like bots can be used for, um, and then obviously there's a lot of really concerning implications for things like disinformation amplifying, um, problematic speech, hurtful speech. So, I think – this is not short – um, I think I'll, I'll stop there and say for me to the big question is about labeling bots, um, and ,and would love First Amendment scholars' in the room perspectives on, ah, where and how the lines with rights to anonymous speech for people come when, when you're told you have to label that you are using a bot or an automated account.

MR. BEGLEITER: Jessie, did you want to –

DR. DANIELS: Yeah. I'm just going to agree with, with both the other speakers and just say I think they attach to individuals and [[indiscernible] --

MR. BEGLEITER: Okay.

DR. DANIELS: I would say –

MR. BEGLEITER: Questions from you. Stick up your hands. We've got one right back here. Okay. Well, I'll come back to you. Go ahead.

Q: This is on. So, ah, I appreciate the mention of anonymity

and I want to go back to a, a discussion that, you know, a decade or so ago would have taken place in this space, namely, ah, the contribution of anonymity and pseudonymity to the problem of hate speech. And so, I, I acknowledge that this is not going to solve the Twitter problem because for the most part people who tweet want to be known, ah, they, they want to stand behind their tweets. But, is there not still a role for the discussion of the freedom of expression of anonymous speech because it seems to me that that's far less defensible, um, in a, a human rights platform than freedom of expression. All right, so, so if we, if we attach or require authentication of speakers online, and so we attach their words to a person, um, we don't automatically solve the problem, but we might make the problem a little more manageable. Again, ah, --

MS. HELLER:       Okay –

Q:                   -- now, now that we're, now that we're here in the, in, ah, the, the 21<sup>st</sup> century there may be a different discussion that's required to handle things like Twitter. But, anonymous speech and pseudo, pseudonymous speech where you switch pseudonyms, ah, at will that still seems to be part of the problem.

MR. BEGLEITER:   Who wants to tackle that?

MS. HELLER:       I, I got this one if you, ah –

MR. BEGLEITER:   Go for it, Brittan.

MS. HELLER:       All right. So, ah, so I have the, the dubious distinction of being the Jane Doe in one of the first cyber harassment lawsuits. So, um, one of the things that, that, ah, and, so I've been studying how online harassment works now for about 13 years. And one of the things that surprised me the



most was when the study came out that said that that, um, anonymous speech and use of screen names actually doesn't have an impact on whether or not people are more apt to be harassed online. And, the reason for this is because if you look at somebody's screen name – so pretend you and I are in a forum and, um, my name is Fluffybunny23 and, and I decide to like troll the heck out of you. It doesn't matter that I'm not using my real name within the dot online space because it's still a reputational economy. I still, um, I still have a presence and I'm still known within the forum by my name. Public accountability is a different question but if you're looking at the way that these online forums work using your real name versus using a pseudonym actually doesn't have statistically a different impact. And, I, I think that's, that's something that I, I think about when I'm trying to design systems to make harassment less likely.

MR. BEGLEITER: Emma?

MS. LLANSO: Um, yeah, I just say one really interesting thing about looking at what the kind of the big social media platforms do is that they have got a lot more leeway than, um, you know, legislatures under the First Amendment would have. I think you'd have a really high First Amendment hurdle to pass to, to prohibit anonymous or pseudonymous online communication because we have a strong protection for the importance of anonymous speech to political expression, um, in First Amendment law. But, you know, Facebook has been running a, you know, real name or authentic identity policy on their platform from the very beginning and it's a great case study both in how difficult it is to actually – you can describe that your policy is people must be operating under their real name, um, but it really lends itself to

ad hoc enforcement, um, kind of targeting people saying with, you know, the claim of hey this account is actually operating under a pseudonym as a way to go after them for something else that they're saying. So, it's a real heckler's veto kind of situation, um, and as Brittan was saying, you know, there's plenty of hate speech and [[indiscernible] propaganda and harassment happening on Facebook. They are, you know, taking steps to try to control it but just the existence of their very strong, you know, authentic identity ethos has not limited that, um, to the nearly the extent that, that people might expect. Um, and it, it does have enormous consequences – a, a real name policy does have enormous consequences for people who, for all sorts of reasons, um, need to shield their legal identity in order to be able to participate in online spaces.

MR. BEGLEITER: Jessie?

DR. DANIELS: Yeah, real name policies are often really punitive for queer and trans folks who may have changed their names for, um, lots of really, um, ah, good reasons. Um, I'll just say that from personal, from personal experience, um, when I was attacked by the far right in Fall of, ah, 2017, um, I got thousands of, um, death threats, rape threats, nastygrams through my, um, Hunter College inbox and through my personal email. Most of them had left their full signature file with their name, their address, their phone number, their extra email just in case I wanted to reach out. So, um –

AUDIENCE: [Laughter.]

DR. DANIELS: So I think, but, you know, the guy who was head of security at Hunter when, you know, when we were sort of assessing, doing our risk assessment on my, um, you know, level of harm, potential harm there, ah,



at, at the campus he was like, you know, um, yeah, keyboards sometimes make for big muscles he said, former head of, former FBI agent. Um, and, and there is, so there is something about the distance but not the anonymity. So, so, so, and most of what I learned from looking at the signature files is that most of these people were very, very far from New York City so the likelihood that they were going to show up at the 68 Street stop on, on the 6 Train to come find me, very remote. But, but they felt empowered sitting in whatever state they were in to type out that email leaving their full signature file, um, to tell me just what they thought about my opinion. So.

MS. HELLER: Yeah, if, if you look at design-based decisions to help reduce harassment in online systems, one of the best things that, ah, that platforms can do is actually show people's eyes.

AUDIENCE: [Laughter.]

MS. HELLER: Think about, think about games. You, you, the, like [[indiscernible] games you never see people's eyes. And that's been shown to actually help people, um, get across that sense of distance that you, that you get from a mediated platform. And the other thing is, um, when, when I design systems and things I actually, um, work with people who are former trolls and let them tell me how to make trolling not fun on a platform because if it's not fun the majority of people who aren't motivated by actual animus are not going to do it.

MR. BEGLEITER: Okay, we have a question right back here.

Q: Um, you mentioned, ah, Jessie mentioned in her presentation about how like, ah, like back in the day [[indiscernible] viewed the internet as this place that can, like, liberate us or unite us and make us feel like



one and they still may hold that view but why do you think platforms still view the internet as this even though facts have shown its not that at all, it's just more divisive?

DR. DANIELS: Wow, what a great question. Why do they still think that? Um, I don't know. I think sometimes when people grow up with ideas and they, they build something like a platform or a company that is inspired by that idea it's really hard to let go of that idea. Um, so I think, so, I think that that's what you hear when you listen to a lot of tech, um, you know, tech bros, CEO's talk about their, their companies is they really still have this kind of, um, fantasy about it. Like when, when, um, Mark Zuckerberg testified before Congress, you know, he kind of kept referencing the dorm room he was in when he created in it. It's like dude, that was a while ago.

AUDIENCE: [Laughter.]

DR. DANIELS: Like –

AUDIENCE: [Laughter.]

DR. DANIELS: Like read the room. Like it's not like that in your dorm, it's not like that no more. You know? So, so I think that there's a way in which when we have these ideas that are really precious to us, um, that it's hard to examine them and let them go.

MR. BEGLEITER: As the cofounder of, ah, Twitter, whose name I can't remember right now, was quoted widely a couple of years ago I think as saying, you know, I never dreamed that this technology was going to not do well for the world. That just never entered my imagination that this was going to be some kind of a negative force in the world.

DR. DANIELS: Right.



MR. BEGLEITER: So.

DR. DANIELS: I think, I mean –

MS. HELLER: What I –

DR. DANIELS: -- I think the other question that I wanted to say – sorry, I'm just going to, um, um, I, I think the other thing that's going on that makes it really hard to see what's happening with the internet is that the majority of the, of the tech CEO's are white men and for white people it's really hard to see when race is happening if you haven't sort of, you know, done some work [chuckle] to go beyond, you know, your training. You know? So, I, so I think that that's part of what happens as well. There's a kind of white blindness that happens.

MR. BEGLEITER: Go ahead, Emma.

MS. HELLER: I do –

MS. LLANSO: I also think that the age of the internet now has something to do with it. The internet turned 30 yesterday and, um, I always, I, I kind of like to, to joke with people and say that I think we're in the awkward adolescence of the internet and now we're actually kind of moving out of that where, um a lot of the people who built these fundamental architectures are, um, now at the point where they are well into adulthood and are having families of their own and I think that being a parent actually changes somebody's perspective on, um, on their work and the longevity and the impact of, of their ideas. So, maybe that's why we're now, um, seeing a, a transition in the way that people are talking about these ideas, thinking about these ideas and, um, it's, it's slow but I, I can see it happening.

MR. BEGLEITER: Emma.

MS. HELLER: And I think at some element there's this element too of not wanting to throw the baby out with the bathwater. Right? To, like, recognize that there –

MS. HELLER: Yes.

MS. LLANSO: -- are some incredibly horrible things that people are using the internet for that are facilitated in ways we haven't seen before, um, because of the internet. But there's also, there is still a lot of positives. The kind of, the change we've seen even in, just in our country around, um, social movements like Black Lives Matter or like the Me Too movement which are talking about issues that have been part of American culture for centuries, um, but have, you know, I don't think it's a mistake that we are finally getting kind of nationwide and sustained attention to these problems of racism, of misogyny, and sexual harassment because people are using the internet as a tool to help connect to, you know, reinforce and, and organize around these issues, to draw attention to what's going on in communities when, you know, mainstream media isn't covering it. And so, there's data still also part of what you can use the internet for. Um, and that's the, I think the, the kind of utility that is precious to a lot of us who, who are kind of like internet optimists and who think that there, there really is something positively transformative about this communications medium. Um, but, it's, you know, the positive does not solve the negative; it doesn't, ah, even necessarily outweigh the negative in, in most cases. Um, but it is, it is there and so figuring out how to keep the positive while addressing the negative I think has to be the, um, the goal.

MR. BEGLEITER: We are, we are the last thing between everybody in this room and lunch. But I do want to take one more question if you promise that

your answers will be concise. How about right over here?

Q: So, since the advent of social media but especially I have in my mind Twitter, um, public figures have had an opportunity to have opinions and share their opinions and the group I have in mind is journalists. Journalists have now been propagating their ideas on Twitter publicly. Does this give trolls an opportunity and what, how do you see this, people who would traditionally be neutral now having very strong and very forward opinions?

MR. BEGLEITER: Who wants to tackle that one?

MS. HELLER: Oh, Ralph, can you repeat the question please?

MR. BEGLEITER: Of course, I'm sorry. Yes. The question basic, correct me if I'm wrong but the questioner is asking that social media have given journalists suddenly an opportunity to express their personal opinion sometimes in very strong and direct ways when people in the past had assumed that journalists were being to use the word neutral on the issues and now suddenly they're expressing their opinion.

MS. HELLER: Okay.

MR. BEGLEITER: You want to tackle that, Brittan?

MS. HELLER: [Exhalation.]

MR. BEGLEITER: No.

MS. HELLER: I'm –

MR. BEGLEITER: Okay. Anybody else? Jessie?

DR. DANIELS: Let me –

MR. BEGLEITER: Jessie, go ahead.

DR. DANIELS: -- do this one. So, yeah, so it's, I think it's a really point



about the connection between journalism and Twitter and there's a lot to be said about that. One of the things to keep in mind is the broader context in which we're living in a moment because of the internet that journalism is in crisis. Right? So, journalism jobs are going away and so what that's meant is that there are fewer on the ground reporters to go out and talk to people face to face. And so, what do people do when they're strapped for time and money is, they're sitting in their office or someplace looking at their phone and going oh, here's a person that I can quote and they're grabbing stuff from Twitter. So, there's that part of the interaction that's going on and that's part of what's changing the, what I call the medio (sic), media ecosystem that we're in. So that's really having a big effect. And then the, the second part of your question about the kind of are journalists neutral or not, I mean, there, there are lots of people who've critiqued the idea that journalists should have this view from nowhere, that, that and then sociologists we talk, you know, we talk about, um, [[indiscernible] like having a, a, a perspective and saying this is my, this is my standpoint. So, I, and, and that actually lends to a certain kind of credibility that's better I think than the fake, ah, not to use that word and trigger everyone, but, um –

AUDIENCE: [Laughter.]

DR. DANIELS: -- then the, then the, not, yeah, then the not true claim of objectivity which is never true. Like, I mean, it's not true that, that you are just always neutral. Journalists always have a perspective, they always have their own background, they always have their own, ah, viewpoint that they're bringing to something that they're, that they're translating their, they're taking in the news through and giving it to you through their own perspective. So, I



actually think it's a, that part of it is a positive thing. I think the, the decline of journalism and the decline of on the ground reporters is a bad thing and the over reliance on Twitter is a terrible thing. [Chuckle.] And especially the way a certain incumbent in the White House uses Twitter to get his views out. But that's another talk.

MR. BEGLEITER: Emma, did you want to comment on this one or no?

MS. LLANSO: Um, nope, just –

MR. BEGLEITER: Okay.

MS. LLANSO: -- plus want everything Jessie said.

AUDIENCE: [Laughter.]

MR. BEGLEITER: I feel like I could comment on it but --

PANELISTS: [Laughter.]

MR. BEGLEITER: -- I'll leave it alone.

MS. LAMBE: Um, lunch is ready. It should be out in the atrium. There are spots to sit out there if you want but we will be starting our lunch speaker, um, at 1:15. So please make your way back in by 1:15. Um, I want to remind you also that there are listening stations for the audio essay competition – the, the top ten student, um, essays are in a room if you go straight out and go to the left. Um, those are available for you to listen to as well and there are books in there for all of our panelists and speakers who have, um, books that related to this topic. Those are available for sale, um, in that same room.

Enjoy.

MR. BEGLEITER: Let's say thanks –

AUDIENCE: [Applause.]

MR. BEGLEITER: -- to our panelists. This was a very – you guys are terrific.



Thank you, Brittan.

MS. HELLER: Thank you very much. This was great.

UNIDENTIFIED: Oh, yeah, yeah, yeah, absolutely. Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED: Is it your study or –

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes. Yeah, yeah, yeah, and I'd be happy to – I don't have any cards on me but um –

UNIDENTIFIED: [Indiscernible] by email.

UNIDENTIFIED: Oh good, oh that's right, yeah. [Indiscernible.]

MR. BEGLEITER: Thank you both.

DR. DANIELS: Thanks so much. [Indiscernible] someone else started [[indiscernible]].

MS. LLANSO: There's so much more we could talk about, yeah.

MR. BEGLEITER: [Indiscernible.] In case you ever have to answer that question [[indiscernible]].

DR. DANIELS: Sir, do you want to sit here?

[BACKGROUND TALK]

# # #