

ROUGHLY EDITED COPY

ITU

JUNE 14, 2017

8:00 A.M. CST

WSIS FORUM

Services provided by:

Caption First, Inc.

P.O. Box 3066

Monument, CO 80132

1-877-825-5234

+001-719-481-9835

[Www.captionfirst.com](http://www.captionfirst.com)

This text is being provided in a rough draft format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

>> INDRAJIT BANERJEE: Hello, we are about to begin the session on "Countering Radicalization and Violent Extremism Online Including Fake News and Hate Speech".

Excuse me; may I have some silence here, please? Thank you.

All right. So this is, of course, a burning question and it seems a critical issue. It has been touched upon partially in many sessions but given UNESCO's leadership role in this area and its mandate, we thought we would dedicate a full session to this very important and critical question.

As you may know through Resolution 21C8, the Security

Council makes explicit --

(Audio cutting in and out).

>> INDRAJIT BANERJEE: -- Which can be conducive to terrorism. It requires collective efforts, including preventing radicalization, recruitment around mobilization of individuals into terrorist groups and becoming foreign terrorist fighters. Extremism is not associated with any particular culture or nationality. This is of fundamental importance to underline. Nonetheless, this youth radicalization is a source of violence. It's threatening the security and fundamental rights of citizens all over the world. It's embodied in universal human rights and fundamental freedoms. With a mandate to force cooperation and solidarity through communication information, UNESCO supports its Member States and Civil Society actors in responding to extremism and radicalization on the Internet.

As some of you may have followed, UNESCO has initiated a number of events and activities. Most notably we have done a very major conference last year in Quebec in Canada and the conference titled "A New Integrated Framework of Action - Empowering Youth to Build Peace: Youth 2.0 - building Skills, Bolstering Peace". And this gave birth to what is called the Call of Quebec, "Internet and Radicalization of Youth: Prevent, Act and Live Together."

So without much further ado, I will very briefly introduce my panelists.

Our first speaker is Dr. Divina Meigs, who is a professor at the Sorbonne Nouvelle. And she's the creator and director of the Online Master's Programme. She's also author of several UNESCO reports and has contributed extensively to our work in the area of preventing extremism, violent extremism and radicalization. So Divina, the floor is yours.

>> DIVINA MEIGS: Thank you, Indrajit. You yourself are a professor in the field and we have been for a long time on issues of communications. Yes, UNESCO has been among the places where these debates on content are taking place. I think it's about time the two parallel conversations, on one hand, the technical, on the other hand, the non-technical come together. And unfortunately it's coming together in moments

of crisis. And the idea of a suspicion of the role of social media in radicalization is one of them. So how to use best the controversy to advance a higher cause? That's basically what we're trying to do.

UNESCO has asked me and two other colleagues of mine who are specialized in education and in psychology to produce a report, sort of state of the art, of research on radicalization and youth by social media. This document is available in the room somewhere. I'm sure Shanhong (phonetic) will have distributed it to you. And we'll be referring to it. And of course it's available for you on request at UNESCO. I'm not sure it's online yet.

Just to carry you through our main results on this issue and maybe to start the discussion, the discussion and the research is inconclusive. Which is to say that we may be going too fast by task social media, youth, radicalization altogether.

The current state of the research is not enough important to make these connection of causality. But there are correlations.

And this is what is important to look at.

But definitely we are missing empirical data. We are missing original data. We are missing studies that go beyond case studies of loss. And partly we're missing that because it's very difficult for the research community to have access to this data, social media data are economic secrets.

And therefore, it's very hard for us to be able to have insights into the pathways of how radicalization processes could take place from the perspective of reception.

However, we are well informed and well aware of what is happening from the perspectives of the radicalizers. Those who want to push radicalization and extremism. And we prefer actually to talk about violent radicalization because as you know, radicalization can be very positive. If radicalization was not positive, there would be no gender progress, for instance. Since feminism can be seen as a radicalization. Yeah. Thank you for the gender balance at this table. (Chuckles).

>> DIVINA MEIGS: The -- so what is interesting is that

definitely from a perspective of the extremists and those who want to radicalize audiences there is a certain number of strategies that are related to social media. And they are using all the advantages of social media to push their ideas. Ubiquity, mobility. Anonymity. Et cetera, et cetera.

So these elements are important and can point to some action in terms of the perpetrators.

In terms of youth at the receiving end, this is much less sure.

It's always difficult in reception studies to separate the impact of media from the impact of society. And we definitely at the moment are lacking models that show how the socialization process to radicalization could take place online.

So we have a certain indication of how this happens. The process of isolating young people in real life and online. So that then they can be susceptible to the discourse of the recruiters.

We know that this is happening.

But we think that Internet is more an amplifier than the cause of this. When a young person is radicalized, it will have -- she or he will have a tendency to go for social media. Considering, of course, that not the most youth social medias are very good. This is difficult information. It's not that accessible everywhere.

I said she because what part of our research also looked at gender. And as you know, women are no longer just victims of violence and extreme violence. In some cases, especially in (off microphone) they become perpetrators and --

(Audio cutting in and out).

>> DIVINA MEIGS: Of course told some key recommendations, recommendations to --

(Audio lost).

>> DIVINA MEIGS: Care for the way we speak about it. For the way the general media speak about it. Don't criminalize young people. Pay attention to this as a complex process. More research is necessary --

(Audio cutting in and out).

>> DIVINA MEIGS: As to the states, which, of course, in

the UN context are the main target, definitely the research shows that applying censorship doesn't work. On the contrary, there is very little proof that censorship prevents radicalization online.

So measures of radicalization -- of prevention used by states on the pretext of radicalization are preposterous. And the resolutions are everywhere and they are education we have been looking at media and literacy solutions. They are about research. They are about more cooperation among the various stakeholders and definitely we are all seeing the great interest, the recent emergence of proposals by journalists to identify radicalized sites with fake news, et cetera. And the participation of Facebook, among others, to contribute in this process.

However, this is a decision that is only part of self-decision making, self-regulation but these platforms. It's very difficult to verify. Very difficult to have the rest of the population, adults, teachers, participate in that. So here this is a call for more coordination for research.

And we are very happy to see that Facebook is actually considering that some regulation of these platforms as media, which they are, because they are content providers, distributors, et cetera, and they have through their algorithm they have editorial control of content.

This is the moment to start thinking again on how to deal with social media in a different way. For the sake of young people. Thank you.

>> INDRAJIT BANERJEE: Thank you, very much, Divina. I mean, it's very clear from the extensive research that you are conducting. Of course you only provided us with a summary. That it is a very balanced report. It doesn't draw hasty conclusions because there's a big risk as you rightfully say to mix everything up, to blame social media for all kinds of ills of society. So this research is very, very important for UNESCO to have a balanced perspective to identify what the real issues and challenges are and then based on that I recommend to Member States policymaking and so on. Thank you very much. I'm sure we're going to come back to you with some questions from the audience after the presentations of our

panelists.

Our next speaker is a lawyer. Mr. Dan Shafet. He holds a philosophy degree and law degree from the University of Copenhagen he specializes in computational law and human rights in general and in the I.T. environment in particular he also gives conferences in academic venues, I.T. law, human privacy and laws on the Internet. More importantly for this particular session, he founded the Association for Accountability and Internet Democracy, AAID. I request you to check the Web site of this organisation of which the main objective is to introduce a general principle of accountability on the Internet in order to secure the protection of human integrity and by that way, same manner, enhance freedom of expression. So it is not about controls. It is an answer of freedom of expression but by ensuring there's greater accountability on the Internet. Mr. Shafet, the floor is yours.

>> DAN SHAFET: Thank you, as you can see from this chart things are moving very fast. Of course I tried preparing a couple of weeks ago a presentation but I found it was absolutely impossible in this particular field of law and politics because things are moving so fast that yesterday I had to include this as the first shot and there's probably more stuff coming right now as we're speaking.

The economists had this really interesting issue and you should read it. But of course the most important is the press conference that took place yesterday at the palace at the garden of the palace I suppose you all saw that yesterday evening when Theresa May came to visit her friend and they all made an interesting speech about attacking the social media and the other I.T. giants putting the blame of radicalization on them.

It was also very interesting that actually they referred to the last one of these trio who is not present who is Andrea and now they are known as the three Ms, May, Merkel, Macron and I think we should all pay attention what's going on right now because this may be a historic moment in the development of law and policy on the Internet.

For the first time these three get together, these three

countries, and formulate a very clear policy on even including fines and penalties and specific legal initiatives for content regulation. That has never happened before. And I venture to say that we will see in the next coming weeks that's what we're talking about in the next couple of weeks, initiatives from these countries that will -- maybe not in that short run but maybe over the next three or four months -- revolutionize content regulation on the Internet.

So these are indeed historic times.

We could actually go back one year to see that what happened yesterday is a culmination of an accelerated process that started with the attacks a year ago in June in Orlando. For the first time ever, Obama and the FBI confirmed that the Internet led to radicalization.

Now, it's very interesting from Divina that -- or Divina, sorry. That referring rightly so to the lack of consensus as to what degree the Internet actually has in the radicalization process. But I also noted that you mentioned that there is a certain level of correlation. And that's what's important. There is a certain level of correlation.

Anyway, Obama and the FBI, they were a year ago of the opinion that the Internet led to radicalization, to the attack in Orlando.

What happened in London here last week actually led to quite a few initiatives. One of them very interesting, I had the great privilege of being interviewed by Christiane Amanpour and that's the other fellow you see and this is a tweet sent by Christian it's important you try to get ahold of that tweet it talks about the legal and policy issues we have look at the title it says why working with policymakers in the U.S. is key and that's a point I'll get back to from a legal point of view in a second.

In terms of research, I'll just put this chart up it shows if anybody is interested in looking at the research in addition to what you have just shown us, there is this paper that presents all the research over these ten years. It actually includes some research also in '17 but it's also '16. That's not actually right.

How does it actually work? Self-radicalization. I mean

what the prosecutor in Paris said very recently after this individual took out a hammer and attacked a police officer in front of the Notre Dame, you probably all heard about that story was that he was self-radicalized within a couple of weeks. And that the result showed absolutely no signs of being radical or isolated or in any way someone you would suspect. He wasn't on the famous S file which causes the police to keep an eye on him.

Self-radicalization again the French police are of the opinion it can take place I mentioned the Americans and Obama had that opinion and now the three Ms are also whether or not they have science to back it up. It is a political fact they are of that opinion. How do they say it works? Well they say it works by the dissemination of information, that's on social media, that's on Web sites, that's on the Darknet. It works by giving instructions, instructions how to blow yourself up, things like that.

It allows you to communicate. That's basically what Twitter is charged with doing through encryption. And these are the ways that the policymakers today around the world see that the impact of the Internet works.

Very quickly as Indrajit mentioned, as you also mentioned, radicalization is not necessarily a bad thing. The first signs of online radicalization go back to the 1994. You can have a look at this as this chart if you're interested you can look up the chart yourself the electronic civil disobedience was an extraordinary initiative that really created the positive radicalization which may have led to gender equality so on and so forth.

The international policy on radicalization came out later on the 24th of December, informal consultations, 2015 from the UN this is a chart that already then focuses on social media and online tools saying that they are to some extent accountable for what's going on.

Definition of radicalizing content is extremely important if you look at it from a legal point of view how can you make social media accountable? How can you make anybody on the Internet accountable for radicalizing content if you can't define it? There's a big discussion in science as we have

seen already. But from a legal point of view we cannot live with law that is not -- that criminalizes acts without defining those acts. This is the major legal challenge we have.

Theresa May came out and said enough is enough. And I'm sorry that's not enough from a legal point of view we have to define what enough is enough means. You know, I really don't know how to defend anybody against a crime that's not defined. If anybody knows in this room how to do it, be my guest. It doesn't work in the rule of law. So we need to define it. I've shown you some of the attempts to do it.

They really are not -- they don't provide a general definition. You can look at the -- at how people have struggled over the past couple of years to do it. FBI, Canadian Mounted Police, so on and so forth.

This is my personal proposal that I made in a report to UNESCO last year. Again, I think that if you're interested in this you can just tell me and I'll share the slide with you. But you see that it's extremely important to be precise when you're talking law and again enough is not enough unless you think it through all the way.

Now, one of the questions that we had when we want to hold Internet players accountable and actually ultimately impose fines, penalties on them, maybe even prison sentences, there was a very famous case in Milan a couple of years ago where a judge in Milan actually sentenced to prison three of the top directors of Google. These were prison sentences. For not having taken down a video on YouTube which portrayed an autistic child being bullied at school. Now, of course that was turned over by the Court of Appeal in Milan. But already do we see or have we see -- we will see it increasing even prison sentences I don't know how we can send the Google executive to prison. First of all, without having a clear definition of what the crime is.

And second, without taking the step that I'm going to describe now, which is applying media law to the Internet. You mentioned, again, that Facebook arguably and I think that I agree and I do agree with you is already a media corporation. They are what we call in law vertically

integrated. They are no longer just platforms that disseminate third party generated content. They actually deliver their onus. Sometimes they buy the news. Sometimes they just deliver the news. Sometimes it's fake. Sometimes not fake. But it's news.

And this is, of course, media. So you can't just say that you are like media 10% and 90% you're not it's like saying you're half pregnant it doesn't exist so if you are media, you're media, media law applies sorry that's the way it is and this is probably what we will see happening over the next couple of weeks as I said these are historic times as the three Ms get together we will see things happening and maybe they will include the fourth which is media on the Internet that's at least the way to do it in law.

The big argument in law and I have to go fast on this because I probably already exceeded my time but the big argument in law just so everybody understands is whether the actor on the Internet -- you gave me five minutes, lovely.

Whether the actor -- okay. Whether the actor on the Internet is a publisher, or whether they disseminate information or editor if they are a publisher or editor which is not the same then the media law applies if they are not that means they are just a mere conduit. That mere conduit concept, that distinction between publisher and editor and mere conduit is absolutely essential to understand what's going on in terms of law or not Internet. If you are just a mere conduit and that's of course what Facebook, Google and all of the others claim sometimes desperately that they are, then they are completely immune to content that you find on their infrastructure.

So of course they fight for that. That they based on the law that I cite here, the Communications Decency Act, Article 230C if you wish to look it up from 1996 which creates the regime we still live under and in the rest of the world because these companies are based in the U.S.

(Audio lost.)

(Re-establishing connection).

>> Extremely interesting perspective. And I know knowing you, you could have gone on for the next hour keeping us

rather entertained with a legal perspective thank you very much. It gives me great pleasure to introduce our third speaker.

>> World association newspapers. Chief platform officer and Director of the Belgrade based media centre more recently published by -- Mira, the floor is yours.

>> MIRA MILOSOVIC: Good afternoon and thank you for coming to the session. I think I'm going to change most of what I was planning to say. Just to kind of get back to and clarify some of the things that you were saying. I represent a network of 190 media development, journalism associations, reporting investigative reporting networks. People who are trying to produce high-quality content and to ensure we have systems that work for systems and democracy.

And we are very careful when we speak about violent extremism. And especially using the expression countering violent extremism. We are very careful, also, when we talk about developing new laws. It seems to me we are all coming to this debate from the wrong end without doing more research of the find that Divina has done. And really trying to separate issues that are really, really complicated so we have violent extremism that has been leading to terrorism and of course we all want to protect our societies from it. And online radicalization is just one piece of the puzzle so if we start from that end and try to regulate even more our media space and Internet space, we might be missing all kinds of other factors that lead to this. Then there is the issue of fake and false news. And disinformation that again is not new. We had propaganda in the offline world for ages. It's thanks to online specificities of online content and social networks is again amplified. But it's not a new thing. And there are laws, principles, self-regulations that address these things. And the third one of course is how do we deal with the whole issue of Internet governance that is new for us and of course we can't apply some of the media laws and practices to it. So just one warning. It does go hand in hand with what Divina was saying violent extremism and countering extremism can be taken too far in expressionism. If we don't understand the principles well we are offering a

tool to states to increase online surveillance we are offering tools to the governments to use extremism and terrorism as an excuse for censorship and we are seeing that happening in a lot of cases.

I agree with you that radicalization needs a definition but before that I think what you were pointing at, the role of Internet intermediaries that is some of them are social networks some of them are blogging platforms needs to be defined and we need to see how the existing principles that we have in freedom of expression world apply to these organisations. And that for us is really important. Then we need to look at them from the perspective of ownership but also algorithms. For journalists and media to be viable they need to know these thing for us to have high quality news we need to know these things for instance I've done a lot of media research and what was happening in the online space and it's still happening, the business model of big intermediaries especially in the social network space is based on number of clicks. Number of clicks, if you chase just clicks and click Bates lead to sensational and at the end of that process fake news content. The only way for us to address this is to A get more transparency from different social networks, work together with them to develop algorithms that assign value not to the click but to the quality of content and engagement of audiences with that content.

Our stand is the only way to address both violent extremism and false news and this information online is to provide a system that works for journalism and good quality information and at the moment we don't have it. So these are -- I'm just trying to be really brief and quick. These are some of the concerns that we have and I think we are starting to look at this issue from the wrong end and we are going towards the times as you say we might have again something that's expression being criminalized and that's the last thing we want to spend years and years working with UNESCO UN and other bodies to decriminalize the information that's libel around the world because the act of writing something should not get you to jail. I think we are heading towards the times where this is going to happen and I think this is really, really

dangerous. Thank you.

(Applause).

>> INDRAJIT BANERJEE: Thank you very much Mira for yet another fascinating panel. We had resource perspective freedom of expression human rights perspective so thank you very much for also highlighting the downsides of excessive enthusiasm when dealing with social media and as you know UNESCO has always been one of the standard bearers of freedom of expression and human rights and therefore what you say is very much in line with what we believe. But the question is getting more and more complicated. When there were traditional media only and that is perhaps the only slight difference I'll have with you, which is that when you had only traditional media, there were checks and balances, there were media regulations, which regulated media, although there were countries like the United States which had the First Amendment. But everywhere there were reasonable restrictions as they say but today we're in a landscape where anybody and everybody can go online and say whatever they want so the scenario has changed and therefore our approach to the issues must also evolve. That was the only caveat I'll put in your presentation. But thank you very much. It's very good to hear the perspective of media, of journalism. Because they are also principally concerned with this discussion.

Our last but not least speaker I must stress that is Mr. Peter Micek. Who leads the access policy team, business in human rights work the organisation is called Access Now I believe advocating for more rights respecting telecom and text sector he is a lawyer by training. And in 2010 he published a genealogy of home visits I would certainly like to know about that of home visits critiquing surveillance of at risk places for five years Peter led youth and ethnic media development at new America media and was web editor at KALW the radio programme your call Peter it's a long CV you have. As part of a young age so I'll give you the floor and I hope you bring in another perspective which is going to be a rights based perspective.

>> PETER MICEK: Thank you and thanks for letting us speak I work for Access Now we're an international organisation that

defends and extends the digital rights of users at risk around the world. We do this is -- we do this through providing direct technical support to users at risk. These are Civil Society journalists, environmental justice advocates peoples whose rights are trampled and threatened for their exercise of human rights for their advocacy and for their work. Our digital security helpline runs 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. We get more than 100 new cases per month of users coming to us for support essentially where they can't find it elsewhere. We have study this of encountering violent extremism and many proposals and programmes that governments have put forward. We found more often than not these programmes do not operate in a fashion that respects the rule of law that prizes human rights above Government control. They don't take a nuanced look at security I want to emphasize as we saw up the road at the Human Rights Council rate of Internet shutdowns is increasing. Governments are increasingly throwing up their hands in front of the Internet in front of this powerful tool and shutting it down entirely 56 incidents we recorded in 2016 up from around 20 the year before. I want so stress that this really going blunt form of censorship is also symbolic. As more people go online and exercise their rights and use social media to connect, access to information that wasn't otherwise available and that's not available on Civil Society spaces and places where traditional media is no longer accessible or open to diverse perspectives.

As they go online to access the information and their rights they are increasingly met with obstacles and sometimes outright blocks. So these are often the people that come to us on the helpline looking for ways to circumvent these blocks. What we do on our helpline where we can we connect them and raise their cases to the companies responsible.

We do this by establishing relationships with companies. We do it through our conference, RightsCon just held in Brussels with around 1600 who came to create a consensus based approach to these issues and to have dialogue around regulation.

And we want to stress that not only is shutting down not an option, takedowns do not equal security. Shutdowns do not

equal security and neither does Web site blocking. We have around 50 news Web sites blocked in Egypt right now. And we found that this can actually have an inverse effect on fake news, for example. On misinformation.

If you block news Web sites, if you block peoples' access to information, they are not going to stop talking, they are not going to stop seeking out ideas and information of all kinds of media frontiers. They are going to continue to look for those who will speak to them and who they are allowed to speak with.

And you know that's why we really stress that in countering extremism or countering any kind of radicalization human rights frameworks need to be applied. And that's why we really applaud UNESCO. I think several of the findings in the countering paper really draw this out. That especially at critical times during elections, the concept of hate speech may be prone to manipulation. We should not let these momentary kind of passionate emotional moments in the hands of those very interested in the outcomes of those elections lead us down routes that don't respect the freedom of expression or privacy.

More findings from the paper that international standards require that any limitation of expression has to be conform to the test for freedom of expression. It's of legitimate European Union. It cannot just be an exercise of power.

And that's what we're trying to avoid are these somewhat whimsical rushed-through notional ideals and laws that are passed or more often Codes of Conduct that are forced that don't really have a grounding in international Human Rights Law.

So when we're countering extremism we need to respect freedom of expression and also the right to privacy.

There's been an overwhelming push to criminalize encryption. It is something we all use. We use it every day when we go online, it's not something that should be feared. It's basic math. It needs to be respected if not entirely AODA as it's really essential to the exercise of our rights in the Digital Age.

Getting to some principles around violent extremism we came

up with three in a recent study that we undertook. First we need these programmes to foster dialogue and education transparently without bias countering violent extremism promotes education online we need to use these networks to incorrect access to information not increasingly shut down, take down or block access. We don't want to privilege certain forms of speech when I'm talking about transparency I'm talking about dual accountability, companies as well as governments. From governments we need to know how much content are they requesting through these Internet referral units that companies take down. What are the compliance rates and laws they are using to take down for that European Union from a company's perspective we need to know what kind of flags are you getting what are appeals processes what are people seeing when they put something online and it gets taken down are you informing them, are you taking that opportunity to educate the user on why this content is not acceptable on a certain platform. Takedowns should be used with extreme caution by the companies adhering to only international Human Rights Law as interpreted by independent legal authorities.

Our second principle is avoid coercion of private industry to undermine freedom of expression protections. Governments must not compel companies to do extra legally what governments could not compel them to do through a legal order. It's fairly simple. The rule of law needs to be applied. And extra legal pressure is not a substitute for a properly scoped legal order.

And on that point, I do want to clarify Section CDA 230 in the U.S. the intermediary liability standard that was referred to it has some genius or logic to it in calling online platforms con do you wits and protecting them as such and essentially saying if you're not the author of something published on the platform you shouldn't be held liable for the content. You're going to have two basic outcomes first companies will overcomply if you treat them as mere conduits they will take down more speech than necessary because the risks are either get a huge fine or trample on one user's rights it's not a very difficult decision for a profit seeking company.

Second, you're going to create new platforms that will pop up that will undercomply out of indifference or incompetence or inability or just because they see a market opportunity. If we're having this conversation in the U.S., often we don't focus so much on the large platforms like Twitter or Facebook. We talk about smaller platforms or lesser known like Read It or Fortran there will be an opening if you increasingly pressure the major providers to restrict peoples' rights online. You're going to create an opening that's going to be filled by people seeking a new forum to exercise their rights more freely.

And trust me, these are often not profit-seeking entities. And you will not be able to apply such pressure on them.

Just getting to the last principle is respect for privacy we should not overlook the surveillance aspects that are often inherent in efforts to counter radicalization or extremism and that any social media monitoring programme, algorithmic content reporting, content referral programme, needs to comply with the principles of necessity and proportionality. Thanks.

(Applause).

>> INDRAJIT BANERJEE: Thank you very much, Peter. That was, again, another additional perspective from the rule of law to human rights. The balance between them. And I think we have had four excellent presentations. And we are proud to be chairing this session. It makes my work much easier with these panelists. So I think we have still just about half an hour? And I would like to take this opportunity to invite all of you to join in an interactive dialogue, Q&A, whatever you want to call it.

But invite you to be very brief. Introduce yourself. And ask a question either to all of the panelists or specifically to any panelist.

Yes.

>> Thank you. Richard Hill, Association for Proper Internet Governance. I agree with you, Chairman, this has been a brilliant panel.

How about now? The microphone is theoretically on here. Can you hear now?

>> It's on.

>> Can you hear now?

>> Yes.

>> Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Chairman. I agree with you, this has been a brilliant panel. And I would like to thank and commend all of the panelists. But particularly Divina and Mira, I really appreciated their comments as well as everybody else's. As Mira and the others said, I think we're on a dangerous track where we're using terrorism, which is a criminal activity to justify censorship and also as was mentioned mass surveillance which is a violation of privacy and it's going the wrong way and giving the wrong message to many other countries. You mentioned enough is enough. And that made me think of the old-fashioned in the French before the French Revolution.

(Speaking in language other than English).

>> Where people were thrown into jail without any particular justification which eventually sparked the French Revolution and the taking of the Bastille in 1789 I have a dumb question I don't know if anybody wants to address it and please do say it's dumb because I think it is a dumb question you quoted a UN Security Council resolution in the beginning, Chairman, now if the UN had existed back in 1776 or 1789 and if that resolution had been enforced would that resolution have been a condemnation of the U.S. and the French Revolutions which as we know are the genesis of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICPPR. Thank you, Chairman.

>> INDRAJIT BANERJEE: I guess the question is directly addressed to me. So I will take on the challenge. And begin responding to you.

Very good question. Because of course, somebody like the great Mahatma Gandhi not only got a great Nobel Prize for peace but also he was considered to be an extreme radical.

So different times, different forms of radicalization, different contexts.

Revolutions did happen. They were also -- you can argue very much fundamentally based on the fight for human rights, justice and equity.

(Speaking in language other than English).

>> INDRAJIT BANERJEE: As we say in French. So yes, things would have been different if these UN resolutions were passed then. But I could also reverse the question and say the UN was created in order to prevent these revolutions from continuing. So that's the way I will respond to you. Dan, do you want to take the floor.

>> DAN SHAFET: Thank you, yes. There are many theories. What actually spurred and created the French Revolution, let's not discuss them right now. But there are very many theories. And I think that the main way to address your question is that if you look at the Universal Declaration of Human Rights from 1789 it actually says in Article 12.2 that freedom of speech is restricted -- airline -- that freedom of speech is restricted within the law if you look at the resolution 1791 as we all know it says Congress shall never pass such a law of course it's extremely interesting that the French Revolution they are owe allows freedom of speech to be restricted by law and American law two years after does not Benjamin Franklin -- it's an interesting question how do you explain that difference? That was my regard on that.

>> INDRAJIT BANERJEE: Divina.

>> DIVINA MEIGS: Yeah, I think what -- I'm not speaking on behalf of UNESCO project now but of what it taught me and with my thinking and like you, being for so many years with WSIS Internet governance, we are at a crossroads definitely. Not just legal. But on how we need to think the Internet. And on how we can use what we know about it.

So I would put forward to you something different, try to think of it in a different way. What fake news and radicalization, what do all of these terms of revolution tell us? They tell us that it's not the foundering of truth. They tell us that the circuits that confirm truth, trust, are changing.

And those changes are dramatic. Because they cannot and no longer can come from the top. In one single linear vertical way.

What fake news, what rumors, shows us is that the audience is running away. And out. And the audience is acting the way the Internet acts in a very more horizontal though

manipulative way. And that the audience works as communities.

So talking to the audience in a linear way, the way we expect in the traditional news, in the traditional ways of governing, in the traditional ways of having laws about media is not going to address the issue. Addressing the issue requires a leap of thinking in the legal and the social way on how to see the advantages that there is a more democratic potential in opening up the audiences that are not elites. And in that there's young people but not only. So we have to stop thinking in the predigital way including the media law. We have media, new media, that are social media, that are these platforms. They are about communities and not audiences. They are about multi-linear causes including to radicalization and violent radicalization. And this is how we have to address it, in a complex way. The good news is with media, with the digital world, we can address this complexity.

And so for instance, yes, there is this conduit approach that the Americans have made us believe about information provider systems. But the Americans themselves have much more complex and hybridized way of dealing with media that are not just conduits like audiovisual media of which Internet is a lot of. YouTube is a social media. May I remind you?

And the alternative model that's hybridized in the United States is one of a public trustee. The public trustee is also an American media model. Dan will tell you about that and extrapolate about that.

All of the other media systems in America since have mixed and have hybridized from that. And that means not censorship, not control. This is America First Amendment.

But it means public service obligations of media that are using for free the channels the time, the attention, the minds of people. And I think it's time to think about what these public service organisations are for a critical resource that is the Internet as we are all constructing it. Thank you.

>> INDRAJIT BANERJEE: Any more questions?

(Applause).

>> INDRAJIT BANERJEE: Yes.

>> Thank you, to all of the panels I'm Daniel James. I'm a Master's candidate at the International Studies and Diplomacy

in London at the London school at SOAS and very interested in hearing from you today. As part of my course we look at issues in international security. And I'm interested to hear both sides of the debate. One area I was interested in that Christian and other panelists alluded to was the potential for the people to be pushed further underground if you restrict the platforms.

So my -- if you push people further underground and take away those platforms potentially you're making it more difficult to engage with those people and bring out those views or counter those views. Might it be an opportunity instead of taking away those platforms to give them a toolkit to better challenge and understand the content which they are receiving? So give a context, for example, around the authors. So they can better discern it.

Why are we not all affected equally by so-called fake news. Why can some of us distinguish it from credible news but others can't?

>> INDRAJIT BANERJEE: Thank you for the question. I will say very quickly and I would ask both the people who are asking questions, as well as the panelists to be very brief in their remarks.

I would say basically what you are trying to point out is one of UNESCO's major programmes which is media information literacy. How do you empower people, receivers of content, to be able to distinguish what is fake, what is not? And that's a huge other discussion, which I don't want to go into. But I think it's a very -- a good point you're making about media and information literacy. I'm sorry Christian was not here. Unless he was talking to you from some other planet. But it's Peter. So I'll give the floor to Peter first. And then to the other panelists, thank you.

>> PETER MICEK: Thanks. Yeah, and no, I think you did capsule my sentiments well. You know, we can point our finger to these big platforms largely based in the U.S. where most people think of when you say the Internet, a lot of the world Facebook is the Internet. I wish that weren't so. I wish there were diversity in platforms. But we -- I think we should respect the origins of the Internet, its decentralized

nature and the freedom it's provided. And work with -- work with what we've got. And say, you know, we need to respect peoples' ability to exercise their rights on these platforms. And that doesn't mean we can't ask anything of the platforms. We need to know more about how they make decisions, how they decide to regulate content or decide not to, about what they tell users, what they tell governments. These disclosures are necessary and unfortunately in a lot of countries. Companies are actually denied the ability to disclose what governments are asking them to do or requiring them to do or pressuring them to do.

So we need to drop these bars on disclosure. If you read the corporate transparency reports from a lot of telecommunications companies they would say we would like to tell you what South Africa is asking us to do on our networks but they don't allow it on their overbroad national security provisions. So governments need to open up about what they are demanding of companies, what these Internet referral units are up to just as they need to both allow and perhaps pressure companies to be more open on their decision making.

>> INDRAJIT BANERJEE: Okay.

>> DAN SHAFET: Very quickly very specific answer to your question I think what you are also talking about is the counter narrative and one of the study on the radicalization on the Internet report I was really surprised to see that apparently the most effective counter narrative initiative was based in Saudi Arabia called the Shakinek (phonetic) campaign and they have professional people following what's going on in these sites and they intervene when misinterpretations of the Quran the organisation which is not the only one in the world is not taking place speaking their language and telling them that they are wrong that's one way of dealing with it. I totally agree. Counter narrative.

>> INDRAJIT BANERJEE: Very good, Divina.

>> DIVINA MEIGS: Unfortunately the research on the effect of counter initiatives is inconclusive. But yes, of course, the more they are out there, the more alternative for better. I just wanted to answer on the media information literacy issue. Of course it's the long term solution it's a solution

UNESCO is saying something I do in my spare time providing with toolkits what's important and what comes out of research also is media literacy has been lagging behind we are still addressing media as the predigital media and we haven't yet addressed enough what data does to media. So I'm pushing for something that could be around data competencies for young people and for adults actually in sort of a general discussion about that which has been sidelined by the big debates on code. Coding is not data literacy and data competency. So I think we really have to go in this direction as researchers and teachers that we all are.

>> Thank you I'm Julia from the Internet software here and I would like to thank all of the panelists for very insightful contributions and specifically one thing that Mrs. Meigs mentioned very rapidly which is the stuff of the efficiency of censorship to counter violent extremism and terrorism eventually. But ironically this type of study apparently not taken into account by many states which are now resorting to radical measures against the Internet based on counter terrorism laws and initiatives and I'm thinking specifically of countries which apparently you work with which are France -- France enacted the state of emergency in the (inaudible) -- I don't know how to call that in English. So what's the dialogue? Is there a dialogue between researchers and institutions such as UNESCO where there are state members and those state members -- and I'm asking this because if all of these countries, western countries specifically, I will be very specific take the lead in this response to terrorism and violence online it will send a very, very negative signal to other countries which usually rely on these countries as examples. So what's the dialogue? Is there a dialogue? Is there a way to make this better.

>> INDRAJIT BANERJEE: Divina first.

>> DIVINA MEIGS: I'll respond in French. There's a research dialogue in France.
(Speaking in language other than English).

>> DIVINA MEIGS: Sorry; maybe I can answer in French then so yes there's a dialogue in France that we have established with researchers. There's a radicalization platform that's

maintained by the.

(Speaking in language other than English).

>> DIVINA MEIGS: Where nearly all of the research done in France and around the world is taken into account. We work very closely with the Ministry of Defense and the Ministry of Education in France. There are programmes in schools that have been drawn up to help us understand what fact checking is to produce counter narratives and so on. Conflict resolution, promotion of peace. In France close attention has been paid during the state of emergency period that the media were not included under these emergency measures. That was a very smart move. Because it doesn't apply the censorship where you think it might be applied. In other words, everywhere.

>> MIRA MILOSOVIC: It's very difficult to get people even interested in research to read it and let alone apply it. And we have been -- we've been -- well let's be realistic. We have been trying for a long time to get research on communications media and related subjects to be applied both by governments that do media interventions and by journalists and media association and organisations. There's a network called International Association for Media and Communication Research IAMCR. And they are bringing together all of the researchers around the world in the field of media. And they have a biannual conference this year in Colombia in July so maybe you could take a look at what they are doing and they are trying to also bring all the newest research closer to both governments but also to Private Sector.

>> DAN SHAFET: You're perfectly right. In France we live under emergency decree the first was 1st of November 2013 right after (inaudible) took effect at midnight and it's been extended and probably unfortunately it will become law on a scale.

The personal experience I have with that because I actually interviewed the judge who has judicial oversight with the Minister of judicial decisions to block Web sites that was extremely interesting he's Alexander Landin and a judge. And he's what you call.

(Speaking in language other than English).

>> DAN SHAFET: Under the emergency decrees. Now he

reviewed 2500 Web sites when I spoke to him last which was a couple of months blocked by the Minister of Interior by radicalization. He only objected to three of them. It was extremely interesting to see the legal grounds for objection but the point I want to make here in relation to your question is that Alexander Landin works very closely with psychologists and sociologists on that and I actually know the persons that he works with. So I must say at that level it does work but it probably doesn't work at the policymaker level.

>> INDRAJIT BANERJEE: Please.

>> (Inaudible) from the Broadcast European Union I have one question and one information to share. The question is there was an interesting article in the New York Times some months ago where Zuckerberg said he would hire 3,000 people to fact checking and to control to take down illegal contents that could be harmful. This article was saying that they see that there was a contradiction between the business models of the platforms. And the fact that you try to go for -- going against the hate speech or against the extremist news or against the fake news.

Because the fake news are the ones that are most fastly spreading and are getting more successful around -- and viral around the community.

So they think that there was a contradiction between the business model and the fact that they can really tackle the fake news.

I would be interested to have your opinion on that.

And the information I want to share as you probably know within the traditional media, the broadcasters but also the publishers of the newspapers and magazines around 25 different fact checking organisations that are in a structured way working to try to counter the fake news spread around. And that this has been applied during the French elections, during the German elections and in other cases. And we hope that we will be more and more able to deliver credible alternative to this kind of viral information. Thank you.

>> DIVINA MEIGS: I'll give you research returns on that. We have very few. But on this speed of spread, speed of spread of rumor, the rumor that is sent -- when it is real

when it is confirmed as truth, takes about two hours to be fact checked. When it's false, it takes about 14 hours.

So the speed is very different. And of course in 14 hours, you can see the damage potential of replication, et cetera, et cetera.

So that's something we know from research. So there's real damage in fake news.

We also know that people who will duplicate the Twitter feeds have different patterns, according to how loyal and how affiliated they are to certain search groups. Remember we're talking about audiences, but our communities. And they follow each other. There's influencers.

I was telling you there's more horizontal -- this more horizontal way of thinking about these communities.

So if you think about it like this, they follow the influencers who are not necessarily people who are, you know, best knowledgeable.

But among the most -- the biggest influencers as you know it's you guys. It's the traditional media who are online. And who are behaving like digital native users. Which is to say journalists today who are only trained online, they behave like a digital native.

They print and they push on the button telling themselves, oh, it's okay. If in five minutes, I have something else, I push a button again.

But you have 14 hours when it's a fake kind of news.

So fact checking is key. Fact checking in terms of research and from a perspective of some of the journalists who do it, I will tell more like the deCodex is not working fact checking is not working because again, the change in the circuits of trust is such that if it comes from traditional media that are now distrusted, you can check and you can counter check, and you can respond. It is not going to change the perspective of that -- those communities.

That's the damning fact. Is that these communities don't trust anymore some kinds of media. There's a lot of damage control to be done here.

And they are behaving like influenced communities. And that's what we need to take into account. The deCodex which

is a fact checking system in France and started by Ramon that asked people to come and check or propose Web sites that are dubious, et cetera. It's very frustrated. Because of the fact that they are fact checking is not convincing these audiences that are disenfranchised.

>> MIRA MILOSOVIC: Thank you for your comment and for a very good question.

Fact checking is a lengthy process. But it's also very expensive. And having an investigative team who is going to follow up a story, who is going to do proper fact checking and then investigating, where it came from and why, like in the case of both French and U.S. elections take time and a lot of money.

And a fortunate fact that these not only traditional media outlets, we now have large investigative journalism networks that have trusted audiences because it has shifted from big institutions towards smaller institutions and especially individuals. So you have that. It exists.

But the mold for them to sustain and to last and to focus on many issues does not exist. And then there is a Catch 22.

And of course business model for big networks not only Facebook but Twitter, as well, is based on short sensational content that has I don't know how many clicks.

So for instance, if you are earning from advertising on Facebook, your video needs to be seen a million and a half times for you to be able to earn \$11,000.

So that needs to be viral. And the benefit you have from it is really small. Facebook, by the way, has reported around \$3 billion revenue in the first quarter of this year.

So majority of the money goes to Facebook. And very little of money goes to country producers who of course all have tried to have cat videos. Of course I'm exaggerating here. But that's the issue. And of course no one has the motivation to change that. Because it took them ten years -- not ten years, five years to come up with a viable business model for their shareholders.

I wanted to add something else on that but I'll remember later and maybe come back.

>> Hello, can I ask a question?

>> DAN SHAFET: Yes I just want to say in terms of the business model, it is actually a question of to what extent does retargeting our programmatic advertising which is what you just described, to what extent does that conflict with other values on the Internet because actually what is happening on Facebook with the algorithm is that they create these echo chambers of groups of people who think alike which allow you to target your advertising to that group. So is that business model in contradiction with protecting other values? I believe that unfortunately that is the case, yes.

>> PETER MICEK: Yeah, the advertising is a thing and that's something that's being dealt with, that's something that the companies have direct control over that won't necessarily limit peoples' freedom of expression if they limit the ads they receive or that they receive money for or that they pay for but I think the business model is a little bit more fundamental. You're talking about what shows up in your feed. And I wouldn't -- I do have stats like the top 20 fake news stories on Facebook outperform the top 20 real news stories on Facebook in the last 3 months in the U.S. election.

And you know but again, these news stories aren't created on Facebook. That happens to be the road that they travel on to get people. They aren't necessarily even advertised on Facebook. They are being shared.

If you create a tag that says, this is fake news, I guarantee you that's going to increase the popularity of a lot of these stories. People love that.

Who has got the fakest news, you know? It does take it to the elites. So we need to use a little bit more sum might here and perhaps invest in real journalism and invest in the journalists who do have the time and the money to run the facts and to not just create counter narratives but to show us the truth and the evidence-based policy.

>> INDRAJIT BANERJEE: Okay. We are running out of time. I think we should organize a world fake news contest. (Chuckles).

>> INDRAJIT BANERJEE: You'll make a lot of comment for yourself.

(Speaking in language other than English).

>> MIRA MILOSOVIC: I remembered what I wanted to say and it links to your question, thank you for your question. I don't know if there's an official call from the European Union or any other body to support this. But I think that finally we have some sunlight as Peter said in the whole kind of situation around algorithms. For the first time, big advertisers have started reacting to their ads being placed against content that's problematic in many ways.

Be it pornographic content, extremist content, different things that they don't want their brands associated with.

And for the first time your association and other associations and organisations like mine have an opportunity to work with the biggest companies who are advertisers to try to set up some standards and see how programmatic advertising works. And what's happening with YouTube videos. And et cetera, et cetera.

So for the first time we have some kind of negotiating power. We need to come together of course with big companies and I think they because of all of the pressures from violent extremism reactions have interest to sit with us and think about self-regulation. And that's I think one of the points for me that I will never ask for more form of regulation but a self-regulation is something that we need to start to talk about as soon as possible.

>> DIVINA MEIGS: Okay 30 seconds that's hard yes I can also ask for technology to help. Technology, I'm asking, I've been asking hackers to come up with the algorithm for journalists. Create a journalist minded algorithm, which seeks out and debunks elements like that. Fake news.

And the other thing I would like to say, I'm sure it's possible. So I don't know if there's European money for it. I think it's not that expensive. We put clever minds at it and hacking minds at it. Hack fake news, damn it. So that's one.

The other one is when you tell kids to be hoax busters so it's also finding new ways of teaching fact checking as a game. So probably it will be -- and this is a call again not to hackers this time but to serious game developers, please find us -- create a playful and evocative games for young

people to be their own hoax busters.

>> If I can react to your comment, to your answer. I am a serious game developer. And basically Hack-A-Thons are good. But without proper -- without proper funding I don't see the problem solved.

>> DAN SHAFET: As I said we live in a historic moment right now I'm pretty sure the three Ms come up with tough legislation whether you like it or not very soon I just hope that legislation will meet the standard of the rule of the law, have clear definitions and also that it will be policed and enforced in the right way. I do not like that it should be under a state of emergency. I want it to be with appeal, with legal remedies and so on and so forth. I'm strongly against legal uncertainty and I believe the best way to find the solution to this is by working very closely with our U.S. counterparts and U.S. friends because we're not going to find a solution just in Europe.

>> PETER MICEK: Actually, I agree.

Yeah, I do want to, again, put up the call for people to invest -- for governments to invest in greater education, bringing more people online actually might be an antidote to some of this. Vulnerable and marginalized users who might be in political groups or cultural groups that are excluded from discourses in society are often the ones kept offline. And they are often the ones who might turn to more extremist forms of speech. So again the tough answer is to integrate main organs of society so we're not just trying to come down on the top or after radicalization or whatnot has occurred.

>> INDRAJIT BANERJEE: Well, we are absolutely spot on time. We started 10 past. We are finishing at 40. I would like to applaud the panelists for excellent --

(Applause).

>> INDRAJIT BANERJEE: Excellent presentations. Very diverse points of view. Which shows that we have to have a balance in this debate. We cannot take any extreme position because the risks of any extreme measures and the consequences can be very, very severe, freedom of expression, under production of human rights. And so on. So I think this is a very good debate. Thank you very much for the audience for

your participation for being here. And let the debate go on.
Thank you.

(Sessions ended at 9:41 a.m. CST)

This text is being provided in a rough draft format.
Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided
in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not
be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.
