



CLUB DE MADRID

DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES FOR 21ST CENTURY DEMOCRACY

Final Plenary: Making Governance Better, Democracy Stronger and Citizens More Powerful: Getting from Here to There

November 9, 2011 – 14:30 - 16:30
Grand Ballroom, Waldorf Astoria Hotel - New York City, USA

TRANSCRIPT

Max Ramon:

Can I have everyone's attention? Just before we start the final plenary, we have one short message of Miss Neelie Kroes, the vice president of the European commission who couldn't make it today but she wanted to make sure that her message was here. She wanted to share something with us today.

Neelie Kroes:

I'm sorry that I can't be with you in New York to celebrate your tenth birthday at the Club de Madrid. The Club's mission to promote democratic values is as relevant today as it was ten years ago. In fact the economic difficulties we are going through make it even more important, even more urgent. Economic hardship, lack of opportunities and loss of trust in the future can easily turn into social unrest, nationalism and destructive anger. In the worst cases it can mean the erosion, sometimes the destruction of democracy.

Fortunately many of the younger generation in Europe today have been spared such experiences, but others are all too aware it is our collective responsibility to insure that this does not happen in our time, in our countries, to our citizens, but I'm not here to send a message of pessimism, I'm a pragmatic person. I believe that by looking to the future, but acting in the present we can change the world for the better. Of course we need to have the right tools and instruments to do that.

Let me talk today about one of those tools: information and communication technologies, in particular the internet and the ecosystem that has grown around it. The Arab spring reminded us that the desire for democracy is not a rich world luxury but a universal and basic human wish and of course, in the wrong hands or under the wrong government system, ICT can be an instrument of sufferance or repression. But it can also play a significant positive role in exporting and enabling democratization. ICT allows free expression of democratic voices, it helps peaceful protestors organise rapidly and it resists attempts at authoritarian control. ICT's promise of economic growth and smart jobs in the future, the use it finds for people skills and talents, is often of a voice for the dispossessed; these are all antidotes to anger seen in our city streets.

We in Europe can use ICT to strengthen the democratic link; ICT can get all citizens involved, strengthen accountability and bridge social gaps. In particular, and I know that you have been discussing this at great lengths already, I think we can take a significant step forward in opening up public sector data. It is citizens who pay for such data to be collected; it is citizens who can benefit from making it open, accessible and reusable by all. The payoff is not just in terms of transparency and accountability. Public sector data is also a rich raw material for innovation, offering economic impacts that amount to tens of billions of euros per year, and significant social benefits too.

In my view all search data in Europe should be open and available by default, and I want to propose legal changes so we can have this huge potential and I could talk for hours on those

subjects but I will keep to my time and let others have their freedom of speech too. So let me just close by stressing that the many opportunities offered by ICT will not become reality by themselves. Our policies on ICT must be informed by a strategic vision, by a concrete digital agenda that offers clarity on what we want to achieve and how we intend to do it. The ecosystem that supports democracy and transparency will only flourish if other elements are in place. Widespread probe and access, new creative content and trust in the security and safety of the online world. The right public framework can insure this because the right public framework can give the private sector the confidence to invest, can let citizens look at their future with renewed hope and can make the internet a valuable tool for democracy. Thank you.

Beth Noveck:

Thank you very much. It's a pleasure to be here again. My name is Beth Noveck; I'm a professor of law at the New York law school and the former director of the white house open government initiative. I'm very delighted to be joined on the panel today to my right by Jorge Dominguez, professor at Harvard University and a long time advisor to the Club de Madrid, to my left of course, Jorge Quiroga, former president of Bolivia and Cassam Uteem, former president of Mauritius, and to their left Clay Shirky, professor at NYU and author of *Here comes Everybody*, *the Power of Organising without Organisations* and *Cognitive Surplus: Creativity and Generosity in a Connected Age*, two of the really seminal works which describe the phenomenon we've been discussing over the last two days.

So I'm going to start with the presidents if you will to lead us off with some opening remarks on what we've heard, the goal of this panel really is to now reflect on what we've learned over the last two days and to do this as in dialogue and in conversation and to involve as many of you as possible in this conversation about what we heard. So they are going to start by offering some reflections and then I'll post some questions to the panel and to you as well in the hope that we can have a focused conversation, we'll do a series of questions and try to make this as interactive as possible. There will be some mics. Let me just get a hand of where the mics are so we know – one over there and one over there. So as we open it up for conversation in a minute, please raise your hand and we'll get you a microphone. Who loses the coin toss to go first?

Cassam Uteem:

Well by way of introduction perhaps, I would like to say that during the last two days we have heard of the extraordinary challenges and opportunities provided by ICT for democracy and governance. We have also learned among other things the changes brought about by that technology as a new way of citizens participation, citizens engagement. They are all of special and relevant significance to the Club de Madrid for the future of the members' actions and involvement, if as President Wim Kok said we want to contribute to more effective and democratic public institutions for the 21st Century using 21st Century tools.

To answer to the question I would like, if you allow me, to share with you a recent experience I had in Tunisia. Two weeks ago, my colleague President Quiroga of Bolivia and that's a happy coincidence that we should be together on this panel, and I, we had the opportunity of observing the constituent assembly elections in Tunisia. As you know, the Club de Madrid do not generally observe, general elections, we do not provide observers to general elections, but as members of Club de Madrid, we are often called upon by other organisations to act as observers, as international observers, and this is how both President Quiroga and myself, we found ourselves in Tunisia.

It was as you can imagine a historic moment, a historic moment for us but a historic moment for Tunisians who were for the first time participating in a democratic election, and they came out in their thousands at each voting centre in the cities as well as in the rural areas to cast their votes. There were as many women as men and the rate of participation at the registered centres was around 90%. I think many countries of the West would want to know what is the secret, how do

you get so many people mobilised for an election. I'm not suggesting that we have to go through a period of dictatorship to bring people out to vote but I think there are many lessons to be learnt from the Tunisian experience.

Tunisia is the country, as you know, where the so called Arab spring started and we are all aware of the determining role played by the social media, by the young people to inform and mobilise the electorate, first in Tunisia and then later on in Egypt, as a result of which two autocratic leaders were deposed. These exceptional events in North Africa and the Middle East are pointers to the usefulness of technology as a tool for political change and liberation. Some researchers have even defined such technology as liberation technology. The use of social network, Twitter, Facebook to mobilise citizens and call in for the downfall of the autocratic regimes are clear cases therefore of successful promotion of democracy by using technology.

In other countries we know that civil society organisations have also employed technology in their demands for good governance and respect for the rule of law. By using mobile telephones and online feedback platforms such as Ushahidi mentioned this morning by Patrick Meier, people's participation in the governance process has increased considerably. But on the flip side of internet usage for democracy promotion and protection, the emergence of internet censorship has raised concerns about the repression of citizens even in cyber space. The expansion of ICT across the globe has increased people access to information but at the same time there has been a corresponding increase in regulations regarding access to information, sometimes in the name of national security and other times in the name of national interest.

Freedom of information according to me should be one of the entrenched closes in all democratic constitutions, and Club de Madrid's action should aim at encouraging the free access of the population to alternative sources of information. I'm sorry to say, experience has shown that we must protect democracy from the onslaught of not only autocrats and dictators but also of many democratic political leaders themselves. The Club de Madrid and other organisations with similar objectives should first and most urgently underscore the importance of information and communication technology generally and start by urging us, their members, to become conversant or rather more conversant with the new and latest development in that technology.

Being given that more and more democracy will be successfully promoted by the use of such technology, the Club de Madrid should both encourage and help the emerging democracies in particular to have resources to technology in governance and development processes. However we must also realise that the resources required to deploy and sustain modern technology to the point of achieving efficient service delivery is yet to be available in many countries, especially African countries. My colleague, President Chissano referred to that earlier in one of his interventions. Specifically, internet accessibility is still limited to urban centres in many if not most of the African countries, thus government information available online can not be accessed by the rural population. Dependence on internet based technology in itself is a challenge within the African context because precisely of the challenge of accessibility.

The use of other forms of ICT like mobile technology needs also to be further increased, but coming back if you allow me, to these elections, the independent election authority, that is the election management body, had recourse to ICT for compilation of the voters list, which is a process fundamental to electoral incomes. Very few cases – if any – of complaints were received from voters not on the voters list which means that all precautions were taken and that the use of technology allowed a proper compilation of the voters list. The application of technology in the printing of the ballot added to the credibility and security of the election process. However the counting of votes, the tabulation of results was done manually and it took a whole week before the election results were published. This as you can imagine gave rise to a lot of apprehension and to a certain extent, anger in the community, as people became suspicious that fraudulent acts might be taking place. “Why hasn't a voting machine been used?” could be a legitimate question. Even the machines as you know are not universally accepted and two years ago the use of those machines were abolished in Germany on the grounds that they were not certified. Australia has abolished E-

voting because it was deemed unsustainable while paradoxically, Democratic Republic of Congo has adopted high tech methodologies in election management. Another paradoxical instance would be India where E-voting has been more effective among the illiterate population than the use of ordinary paper based ballots. But we think as of today, and as member of the Club de Madrid, I don't know whether I'd recommend, that we advocate the indiscriminate use of e-voting machines.

Anyway, Members of the Club de Madrid including myself of course, we need to have the knowledge and capacity to understand and assess the processes that take place in the black box of technology that leads to the election outcome. This is what I wanted to impart to you as a result of our observation of the Tunisian elections two weeks ago that is, for the promotion of democracy, the technology was made use of and it was very successful to a large extent but I don't know whether the same could be applied, I'm speaking of the e-voting, the same could be applied in all countries, which was not applied of course in Tunisia. Thank you.

Beth Noveck:

Thank you. President Quiroga. A geek and a politician, give us your reflections.

Jorge Quiroga:

Thank you Beth. First, I'm happy that the Club de Madrid is here in New York for our tenth anniversary. As the fameless political philosopher Frank Sinatra used to say, if you can make it here you can make it anywhere, so here we are. I'd like to put my comments in three lines of thinking on changes to democracy, cautionary and positive effects of a globally connected world and poverty.

First the changes. All of us inevitably measure the passage of time through milestones of our personal experience, when did you first go to school, when did you finish school, when did you start college, when did you get married. Then you start measuring the passage of time through your children. So just how much the world has changed, I'll just look back on a couple of instances. One with my father, when I finished, you said geek, I finished engineering school, and I went to work for IBM as a systems engineer, I learned more about mainframe computers than I will ever need for the rest of my life in Bolivia, South America. And I remember my father banging his head against the wall "Oh my God, IBM, you're going to get lost, it's a computer company, you'll never apply any of that in Bolivia, it's a different world, computers will never get here". And you should see him now, with his WIFI network in his house, he's got the latest gadgets, he skypes away, emails away, downloads Frank Sinatra, Armando Manzanero, los Panchos, he's one of those ideal Amazon customers, he will always buy five times more books than he can read and now that they are electronic he buys ten of fifteen times more than he can read. But that's how the world changes.

Now let me look at the changes in the last few years, say from the time our fourth son was born, about twelve years ago. If you go back twelve years ago, Amazon was a river in Brazil, Facebook was somebody with their head in a novel, flicker would have been a malfunctioning light, Twitter would have been a bird chirping and Google would have been a Latin sports caster of a soccer game going goooooooooaaaaal when somebody was scoring one. And this shows you how much the world has changed. My son now has 3D high definition of every goal that Lionel Messi scores. When I was around his age, the first world cup I remember is the 1970 world cup, the best team ever, I heard it on the radio and you had to imagine how they played. First cup I saw, 48 hour delay, black and white, with, President Kok, Netherlands as the second best team ever. But now they have access to all the great players, all the time, it is certainly a much different world.

Certainly, barriers have tumbled, if you lived in Bolivia, Nicaragua, Honduras, you had your local paper and perhaps somebody would get a two week old Time magazine. Now we have various barriers of information that have crumbled, everywhere, but we must not forget that there are pockets of poverty where those barriers still exist in developing countries. We in Bolivia, in Peru, in Mozambique, we can have access to everything you have access to in New York, but that's for a large percentage but still not everybody, not as widespread in terms of the use, of how the world

has changed. The last point I'll note on the evolution or change is the writing habits have changed. I'm old enough to know that I learned how to read and write with hand on pen through a paper, and then you go to ten fingers on the typewriter, then to ten fingers on the keyboard of a computer, then to two thumbs, now one finger swipe, now you can dictate, I wonder what our children will be able to do, maybe their computers will read their minds by the time we get through this technological revolution.

Comments on democracy specifically. I think technology and interconnectedness compresses time and widens the scale. The old adage of you can fool some of the people all the time or all the people some of the time but not all the people all the time, certainly changes with technology. I would venture to say that you can fool fewer and fewer people all the time, or if you want to fool all the people it will be for a very short period of time because as was noted here, transparency and accountability and access to information are available for everybody or just about everybody, we were talking to Jorge Juan Sanchez is debating, Raul Castro's daughter and the blog , I don't know if they can be seen in Cuba but at least we can read about it here.

Some cautionary notes about this and some positive aspects.

Cautionary notes: lecturers tend to be very impatient. The old saying about doing things for the next generation and not the next selection is changing to let's do things for the next generation and not the next tweet, or the next blog, or the next very visible ways and means by which people will follow what ever somebody's doing. It's also changed what authoritarian regimes do, in the old times, not very long ago, an authoritarian regime; a coup would first seize the TV and radio stations. Now you try to clamp down on internet and access to Facebook and Twitter. But I would say that today you can still disguise bad policy under propaganda even using modern tools and a lot of regimes do that. Another cautionary note that I would put on the table is the six most dangerous words in democracy "I saw it on the internet", or "I heard it on the internet", gives an instant credibility and it could have been something that somebody was making it up. "I read it on the New York Times or El Pais" at least would have been better, would have gone through some process of filtering, now "I saw it on the internet" it's very powerful in terms of rumours and spreading things that are not necessarily true.

A final point, authoritarian regimes have two ways of dealing with an interconnected communicated world, one is to try and fight it and to clamp down, another that we've seen a lot in Latin America, is the most expensive and dangerous project for democracy in my part of the world is the one from Venezuela, instead of clamping down, they use the technology. The best network to disseminate political news is TeleSUR, they have great blogs, they have great writers, they tweet away, and I think they have figured out the Google algorithm because if you look up stuff for the side of the Venezuelan government, all the good stuff comes up at the beginning, if it's for somebody who's against, then all the bad stuff comes up at the beginning, so I think they are onto something. I think that we should know, if you want to know what's happening in Honduras 2008, TeleSUR was the place to be, and BBC and CNN would hang on TeleSUR, and if you wanted to follow the Arab awakening, Al Jazeera, which is funded by a state was the place to find this information.

On the positive side, we've heard those comments, governments can spin journalists in developing worlds, governments can spin, intimidate or buy journalists, you certainly cannot spin, intimidate or buy the internet, and the call to action is much quicker. President Lagos has noted that in Chile you issue the call to action at noon and at 9pm there is the `cacerazo`, people banging on the pots and pans, it is very immediate that response is very quick. Probably the internet helped those customers of banks that didn't want to pay the debits fees, mobilised and then knocked those things down fairly quickly. I heard a wonderful presentation on the use of Facebook, Twitter and Youtube, I made it a poem, Facebook to set dates, Twitter to coordinate, Youtube to disseminate, and I think that, in a nutshell, it is a memorial slide that captures how those tools are used to fighting authoritarian regimes.

I think the key thing is that tools help, but they are not the whole game, I think that what makes it very different is that if you're trying to generate a revolt against an authoritarian regime, it takes you a while to take off and get more people and more people and keep coming up. Authoritarian regimes, if they have 500 people in the street one time, they can disregard it. If they have 5000 people in the street protesting a few times they can jail, intimidate, tear gas. If you have 50 000 people coming out several times and repeatedly, "down goes the dictator", or there is massive killings, because the flip side is, it allows you to get out more people and somebody who is willing to rule with the same power has to shoot more people to keep it. I think the velocity with which you can add more people and compress the times it takes to call them to come out on the street, the call to action is where the interconnected worlds help.

We were in Tunisia, as was mentioned, I heard this anecdote that a lot of what happened was owed to Ben Ali's grand daughter, who did not let her grandfather shut down Facebook because she had some friends, I don't know if it's true, but we were told that in Tunisia. President Toledo, who was there also said "why are you here", he said "democracy has no nationality, the power of free vote has no borders" and I would say freedom of human rights, women's rights in the long term will not accept regional restrictions, and that's a wonderful example of what we saw, there.

But a couple of things, and I'll close with this on democracy. Lurimia (?), a guy from the Ennahda Party said that while he was in jail, Ben Ali's jail, he had seen Toledo marching and protesting for democracy in Peru, so don't ever disregard the effect that some of these things can have and how can they propagate to places that you may not even know. But we must never forget that it still took a young man with a grievance to douse himself with gasoline and set himself on fire. All the Facebooks and Twitters in the world are wonderful but without that catalytic event I don't know if this would have happened.

The last comments on poverty, more than a third of the world still live in poverty, in my part of the world poverty has a face as an indigenous woman in rural areas. If we could get them all smart phones and I pads, we could educate them and pull them out of poverty a lot faster but how do you do that without access to energy in rural areas, there is a whole set of challenges still there to address. I would submit to you that if a Martian were to land on planet earth, he or she would rightly think that poverty causes digital exclusion or digital illiteracy. As we move down this century the reverse would be true. Digital exclusion or digital illiteracy would be a cause for poverty rather than an effect. And I think that there are challenges in Poverty, I love Patrick Meier's Ushahidi, presentation of the crowdsourcing for revolts, for earthquakes, for tsunamis, for snowstorms in Washington DC, and I think the challenge is to use those types of tools for some of the public policy challenges that we have. In developing countries you very solemn get teachers to deliver 200 days of public schooling, but with crowdsourcing and GPS and cell phones it would be very easy to track if teachers are in school delivering 200 days of public schooling, conditional cash transfer programs that are so wide spread in the developing world in lure of a social safety net, you can see the power of technology, cell phones, to get the payment mechanisms to know who's getting them, to avoid double payments. There is a lot of not only reactive to tsunamis, earthquakes, but proactive to public policy delivery, micro-credit and what have you.

I'll conclude by saying the world is changing at a speed we have never seen before, there is some cautionary aspects of democracy that are mentioned but the positives clearly and by a large margin outweigh all the negative elements of having citizens being connected and communicated. I think there is still a challenge of poverty and I'll end with a couple of recommendations of what we do as the Club, we have a program for access to energy for rural areas and the poor, and that is certainly a fundamental program if that access to energy would also then entail access to a communicated digital world for the poor. I hope that works and I hope we work on all that. Since my country has half of the world's lithium reserves, we love to see people with five or four gadgets running on lithium batteries, I hope they get to cars, I hope they get everywhere and that lithium reigns as the premier source of rechargeable energy in the future.

I know a lot of us were impressed by the presentation of the LEND network, the Leaders Engaged on Network Democracies, if it were that under the preview of the State Department it would be a very good program, I think that the suspicions that arise by being under the state department make it difficult but perhaps as the Club de Madrid we can lend a hand to this LEND Network so it can land on the Club de Madrid and we can work with it.

Final point, Dilma Rouseff, the President of Brazil, has a wonderful phrase, probably as good as what Jefferson said about free press and democratic institutions. She said: "I prefer the noise of democracy than the silence of dictatorship". I think you can extend that in a forum like this to say the best thing is the noise of an interconnected, communicated, global participatory citizenship in the world, rather than the digital exclusion and silence of authoritarian regimes, they do not go with one another and I hope a forum like this will help us make the first scenario possible for everyone. Thank you.

Beth Noveck:

Thank you, President Uteem and Quiroga. That I think is the thing that was the most surprising to me about the last two days, is the really consensual embracing and excitement for the noise, for the messiness, for the disorganisation that we all know is necessary if we are to unleash the cognitive surplus, the collective surplus, the power of collective intelligence, first to make governance for effective and more efficient, and ultimately to transform what we mean by governance. So I was really heartened and surprised by the embracing of the reality that we are inevitably shifting from a world of closed and hierarchical institutions to more open and collaborative ways of working.

But, President Toledo, you're going to get cited twice now on this panel. Peru also made the point in our opening session that we have 7 billion and we will soon have 10 billion people, 40% of whom don't have access to clean water, education or healthcare, some of the really basics, the great challenges that we face and the ensuing discussion we've had over the last two days and that I think will continue as we move forwards to focus on these same themes, is looking at concrete strategies that we can use to harness the collective intelligence, the crown to solving these great challenges, to involving our institutions so that we can actually respond effectively. This is what I think was meant when people repeatedly said throughout this conference that technology by itself is not enough, we can't simply have tools, we have to use the tools well and that means in the context of the right laws and policies, of the right projects, of the right people, so I want to now pose this to you as a question, first to Jorge and then to Clay and then to you in the audience, what does it mean to use technology well?

Jorge Dominguez:

So my role in the conference, as it has been in other conferences of the Club de Madrid, is that of a rapporteur. I know relatively little about the very exciting world that we have been discussing. My function as a rapporteur is try to listen to the discussion, both informal panels and along the hallways to try to understand a bit of the relation between technology and democracy and given that this is the Club de Madrid focussing on democracy that delivers, to think a little more about democracy. So I thought we began the conference just exactly on the right note when two things were said within just a couple of minutes of each other.

One was three words in the welcoming remarks from Wim Kok, the President of the Club de Madrid, when as he introduced, turned his remarks to talk about technology, he used the following words: "if used well". It became for me a theme throughout the conference, but immediately so when Mayor Bloomberg in what was a very exciting, very interesting account talked about other things, the use of hand-held devices where you could take a photograph of a pothole and report it to the authorities so that there could be a proper and instant response. It then occurred to many of you as I overheard the conversation that the exact same technology could be used in Damascus to take a photograph of a protestor, to take a photograph of a dissident, and report it to the authorities with diametrically opposite repressive anti-democratic effects. The same technology, two

very different uses. One enhances the circumstances of our life and makes it better and the other one is an instrument that is an enemy of democracy.

Two other broad themes I think were discussed and they were echoed just now by President Uteem and President Quiroga, but in the first panel they were first highlighted by President Obasanjo and it is broadly speaking inequality. In many, many discussions inequality of access, inequality of engagement, inequality of participation, disgusted, so in one of the break-up groups, President Chissano noted that in the village where he was growing up, there were telephones but the only ones that had telephones were the police. That is one way to talk about technology and inequality, in another panel, President Freiberga talked about how in the Latvia under the Soviet Union, it was the policy of the State to make sure to control, to manage and to censor all information.

If used well, really matters, it matters not only whether it is a hand held device to take photographs, it matters whether only those who have the power to oppress us have access to that technology. Hence the other large theme that occurred very early on in the conference and that continued throughout the Conference: the new technologies, the technologies that have been addressed throughout yesterday and today, and explicitly now by President Uteem and Quiroga, is disruptive technology, technology that may disrupt the monopoly of the powerful and the means to use ICT. So on that I can do any better than to try to echo what I thought were eloquent and insightful comments on the first panel from Yochai Benkler.

He was building on the example of Wikipedia, but he was talking really about crowdsourcing more generally, and he was describing with eloquent insight and with great passion what I will try to give you as I thought were six distinctive points that he made, although he made them all very quickly. First that this is an activity, and endeavour that may be in hundreds of languages. Secondly that it engages huge numbers of people who are included, who get to participate and who do so in dramatically decentralised fashion. Thirdly, surely in the case of Wikipedia but in many others addressing disasters, addressing any number of other questions, they are addressing of very complex issues. This is not just 140 characters. Fourthly, they are producing individually but also collectively because they are working together answers. Fifth, not only are they producing answers but they are collaborating and they are so effective and they are advancing so they are solving problems that they actually care about. In that way, to play on the slogan of the Club de Madrid, this is innovation that delivers. This is a form of democracy that delivers. The sixth point that he made is this was all absent property rights, without proprietary claims. But then I must say, when I thought about it, I remember another interesting reference that Mayor Bloomberg made, almost in passing his remarks, he said “Yep, I’m very savvy about technology, but I do remember the printing press”. And when I point those ideas together, the six points that I just mentioned could have been said about Gutenberg’s Bible, in the Sixteenth Century about the origins of the protestant reformation in Germany and its spread first through Europe and throughout the world. It is the same phenomenon, hundreds of languages, huge numbers of people addressing complex issues, producing individual and collective answers about the God in which they choose to believe, not ecclesiastical authorities who are telling them, solving the problems about meaning and life that they truly care about and eventually the political authority and surely no property rights at stake. So at global.gutenberg.com, yes but with a point that Prime Minister Bondevik was the one who brought it to me most forcefully. There is one difference between the discussions that the Presbyterians and the Quakers and many others who are able to have religious issues, that this technology is not quite the same and it’s face to face, can I look you in the eye, can I look you in the eye said Prime Minister Bondevik and actually try to understand what are the ways that bring us together in our humanities, our social activities, our economic activities, and our politics.

Beth Noveck:

Is this a good point o break in? Ok, I’m going to break in because the members will forgive me. We are blowing up the format of this here a little bit, and I wanted to make this as much a conversation as possible so I want to put the question now to Clay. So if you would raise your hand, if you would like to speak on this specific point, on what does it mean to use technology well, what did you hear

that impacted you and that struck you. There will be other questions to follow so we'll just take a few remarks on that point and then there will be more opportunity for engagement. So Clay, let me turn over to you and if the mics are passed to the people that want to engage on this point, what does it mean to use technology well?

Clay Shirky:

Sure, I'll confine my remarks to good use by democratic governments; I think we all recognise that autocrats given the same tools can bend them to ends that we would not approve of in this context. I want to play up on this comparison with Gutenberg because one of the interesting things that happened with the spread of movable type was an early assumption that the increase of the printed word would mean that Europe would finally get it together intellectually because if everybody could read all the books, they would finally just agree. I will leave it as an exercise to you to determine whether or not that actually happened or not. The prediction of convergence and world peace after any given communications technology gets launched is a common trope of these new tools, it was predicted for the telegraph, it was predicted for the telephone, it was predicted for the television, how can we all disagree after we all see how each other thinks. The answer is, very easily, we can disagree very easily, in fact anyone who's ever deployed a piece of social media recognises that the general public never misses a chance to disagree with one another.

So I think, Beth and I have had this conversation in various contexts, one of the ways in which democratic governments in particular, as opposed to just regular deployers of these technologies, have to think about using technology well, is to assume that if they open the opportunity for public speech to their citizens, they are going to get an increase in disagreement, not a decrease. Many people think "Oh I will let them all talk to each other and then they will tell me the answer they want or they will somehow manifest some kind of shared opinion to the government that we can act on" and no such thing ever happens. What happens instead is that arguments that were bubbling beneath the surface of society then manifest themselves as enormously emotionally thwart cultural and political clashes. That means that these tools I think don't offer us a way out of the political dilemma, they just offer us a new platform for the political dilemma, one of the mistakes that people mad over and over in deploying these tools is to assume that if you give a group of people a chance to speak to one another they will converge in their opinions rather than diverge.

The United States government in particular in two different occasions, the day after Obama's election and more recently with the petition has opened up sites that allow users to go and enlist the areas of great importance to them, and very high on the list of problems that President Obama should be thinking about in the middle of two wars not even counting the war on terror and the worst economic crisis in 70 years, is medical marijuana. This is not because this is an issue that is core to the country's well being, but because there is a group of people that really care about that issue, so as a classic democratic faction, a contention of faction all over again.

What I think needs to happen when democracy deploy these tools is that there needs to be some set of rules for hashing out disagreements among various special interest groups for assuming factionalisation and assuming that the tools have to be used to bargain rather than converge which sounds a lot like the task of democratic government itself. That I think has been the surprise the last ten years is that these tools don't get us out of the political dilemma; they get us deeper into it. And I think deploying the tools well, the if used well in a democratic context means accepting that increased communication means increased argumentation and trying to figure out ways to make that argumentation asymmetric and valuable rather than divisive and destructive.

Beth Noveck:

I will add my own thought on this. Just want to bring you into this dialogue as much as possible, is there anybody who would like to reflect? There is a hand other here and a mike, great. Using technology well, what has struck you?

Íñigo Ramírez de Haro, Consul of Spain in New York:

Well, let me differ. For me, to put it that way, it could be dangerous, because the problem is, as always in history, who decides what is well and what is wrong. The problem of this is what traditionalists call censorship, someone decides what is well what is wrong, what is good, what is bad, and it becomes some kind of a moral problem. I think it should be the opposite. I think that one of the big problems facing the world of technology is coming back to Big Brother is watching us. The more you go into Facebook and all that, we should never forget that we are more controlled by public and private controllers and that can be a problem. So I think that instead of putting the debates in terms of well and bad, it should be objective-rules and try to apply justice as in other cases in our society, and to Mr Dominguez, sorry to tell you that, I mean, Protestantism may be interesting but we should never forget all the killings in the name of Luther, Calvin, Henry VIII, etc.

Kim Campbell:

Just very, very quickly, just to add or to pursue this comment about argumentation, I think you're right and one of the things that was my experience as my years as a policy-maker, was that it was very helpful to consult with people, to bring into the same room people who were advocating different things from me on the same issue, so they would actually have to hear what I was hearing from the people who wanted the opposite. That was the kind of civilising process, it is often humbling for people to realise that there are others who had very strong arguments, very good arguments, and that they wanted me to do something different. I think that what you were talking about, and with the internet, people can gravitate, towards places that tend to confirm their own biases, there is a sort of deepening, commitment to a certain point of view. I think technology well used would be technology that finds a way to bridge this and bring people together so that they can actually see different points of view, and I don't think that that's completely absent on the internet, I think there are sometimes opportunities to have genuine comments and dialogue, I think it's becoming less and less because, certainly in the United States with the abandonment of the thermostat standard on television, if we see the 1980s that the television stations themselves have become much more polarised in their views. I think that one of the challenges in using these wonderfully broadly scoped opportunities that the internet provides, is trying to preserve the notion that there will be safe places for people who don't all agree rather than refuges where people will go in this battered world to have their preconceptions and biases simply reinforced. Real debate and understanding that people have legitimately different ways at looking at issues is the beginning of being able to find some kind of wisdom and in the context of policy making trying to define something that vaguely approaches the national interest, the community interest that people can live with.

Beth Noveck:

So using technology, to use technology well in this case, it means if you want to intervene, don't signal me, but signal to the people who hold the mikes, the people with the technology controlling this case. I want to move the conversation forward so we can have lots of interaction, but please do pass the mikes and we'll capture the remarks in a minute.

You raised the point about the Gutenberg printing press which leads me of course to ask both of you whether what we're seeing here, both of you referred to earlier historical developments, earlier historical evolution, what have you heard that has signalled and said to you that there is something qualitatively different here, or is there something qualitatively different in this technological and this institutional evolution. Is this the same old same old, or are we talking about truly new forms of institutional arrangement, new forms of creating accountability, new forms of communication, what's the new shiny object here that excites you?

Jorge Domínguez

So, one of the reoccurring themes, whether they're participants or members who referred to the printing press, as did Mayor Bloomberg, or others who talked about pamphlets and the American and the French revolution, or newspapers in the year above 1848 or the fax machine in 1989 Tiananmen Square in China or in Eastern Europe, is a theme that combined continuity and change, namely disruptive technologies have been around for a long time. Disruptive technologies are recurrent in the human experience, citizens, public institutions, civil society, coped with it different ways, but there is repeatedly a transformative effect in practice in theory in an institution, and so to those who were saying in the conversation the last couple of days, the internet has yet to have had that transformation, the most important word there is 'yet' because the main impact of that earlier reflection is that indeed political regimes focusing on democracy that would not change to take this new disruptive technology into account would be in real trouble.

There is one worry and then one great promise that I think was reflected in the Conference, the one worry, partly thinking back, partly thinking about the present, is that new technologies sort by strengthening the capacities of those who are already strong. Simply focus on not only on the example of taking a photograph of a pot hole and also of a protestor or a dissident, but bear in mind that the capacities of the state in the long established democracies to spy upon you and upon me has increased dramatically by reading our email, by hacking into our telephones, that the capacity of the State to do these things could indeed be for purposes that we may endorse, preventing acts of terrorism, but there also may be for purposes that worry those who are concerned by civil liberties.

But promise is ultimately the main theme of this Conference, it is what President Quiroga and Uteem referred to in their remarks. It is the grand theme that there would be able to be yet again, as there was in the 15th Century, a person-centric technology that's different from radio, different from a newspaper, different from television, a person-centric technology that enables in a highly decentralised fashion, as I heard members and other participants, this broad element of participation, the possibility of accountability, the election monitoring which three of the Club de Madrid members just participated in Tunisia but also to be carried out by those in civil society. This extraordinary capacity for innovation, individual or collective, or if you will to discuss sacred texts, not just the Bible, but sacred texts of our own choosing with those whom not only do we don't know, but we might never had imagined that we could have had contact and serious argumentation with and the hope that Kim Campbell just indicated that we would talk not just with those who agree with us but also take risks of knowing and engaging with those we may have yet to meet.

Clay Shirky

I was in the journalism panel which was amazing to hear stories from Vietnam, from Spain, from North America, from Egypt, and you can see the kind of global nature of this just from seeing the similarities across that range of experiences, and it struck me that there was sort of three different groups of changes we were talking about, particularly in this sort of journalism part, one was improved access to information, it's just a lot easier to get information, whether it's from the government transparency movement that's improved access to newspaper websites, whatever it is; second is the amateur access to public speech, the ability for people to use phones the cameras to take a picture of the pearl roundabout in Bahrain, or to document what it is that's going on and to publish it on their own, publish is now the name not of a job category but a button on a piece of software. The third is group coordination tools, the ability of a group of people to synchronise their opinions and to coordinate some kind of public action, and all three of those things seem to be going on at the same time, they are all obviously implicated in a journalistic ecosystem that supports the public sphere.

I was reminded of, you know again in the theme of the early history of technology, in the earliest days of the internet, there were only two applications, two pieces of software, one was for remote access to computers and the other was for remote access to data, that is how the internet had been

designed, that was the goal, they built it, they shipped it, it worked and nobody used it. It actually turned out that remote access to machines; remote access to data was not that big a deal. Then somebody as a, you know, a side experiment ported an email system from a computer on MIT onto the internet, and it turned out the most valuable thing connected to a remote computer wasn't the hard drive and wasn't the screen, it was the user. Within three months, 75 per cent of internet traffic became email. That afterthought turned out to be the core of the use of the tool. So when we're faced with new technologies, we have the tendency, particularly in the early days to overestimate the value of access to information and underestimate the value of the access to each other. What really struck me in the journalism session was how much the platform, the way that journalistic platform is changing and the way it's changing the relationship between citizens and governments, isn't just as a conduit for information, but as a platform for citizen coordination, as a way for people to synchronise their opinions and coordinate their actions, and that revolution has largely not happened yet, it's implicit, we can see some examples of it having happened, but it seems clear it is the thing that journalistic institutions are increasingly able to provide, so long as they are willing to and the public is obviously willing to participate in and I think that a lot of the new uses of these tools are going to be heading in that direction.

Beth Noveck:

I got a very similar impression also from the big data panel and some of the other sessions that I went to, which is that when we talk about what's really exciting here and how we're using technology well, a small piece of it is opening up the data and that's a minimum precondition that we need the technology, the law, the policy to make the data of government open. But the really interesting part of the story is when Todd Park from Health and Human services tells us that they're putting data out there but then they're inviting people to use the data to build tools to improve people's health and wellness at no cost to the tax payer and in a relatively short amount of time. Because what that does, the combination of data plus citizen engagement and participation and the development of platforms to enable that is that it unleashes what I think is the truly new phenomenon here which is this opportunity of people to take action together. In the political sphere we have too long, I think, assumed that what citizens can do is either vote or talk. They can deliberate they can chat with their neighbours, but the notion that people can actually do things together, whether it's reporting on the pothole or engaging in crisis and disaster management of the kind that we see in Ushahidi or anyone of the other examples, that's I think the truly powerful new thing here, that guides us in this question of also how we use technology well, which is first to get out the data, yes, and the tools are helpful for that, but then in designing and developing the engagement platforms that let people do things like suggest ideas, gather information, make decisions and I think importantly; designing and offering the platforms that allow governments to get out of the way, and this was an important theme in the panel of "Politics as Usual" is Micah Sifry told us that the important thing is creating places for sharing and connecting, places that governments can foster by creating the new digital public spheres of the future online where people can take action together. That is going to require the government fulfilling its age old role as convenor by fostering that kind of engagement of the sorts that we see. Let me pause and open it up and see where the mics landed.

Lord McConnell:

I think it's undoubtedly the case that any communication system and any technology can be used for bad purposes and for good purposes and as has been noted by many speakers, particularly the former leaders over these two days, the determination of that use is nobly in the hands of the people who are making the use and therefore people are a key factor in all of this. But that said, I think there are two truths that have come out of the discussions over the last two days. The first is that on balance, the momentum with this form of technological development is bound to be, certain to be, progressive. I believe very strongly that the level of impairment that is involved here is so strong that even where people would wish to use this technology for bad purposes or which to exclude people from use of the technology, then they will be ultimately unable to do so. I think that we are in a very exciting period where that can and will be the case and where technologies are

embraced we will see more and more people empowered and societies improve as a result but where the technology is not embraced and control is attempted, that control will fail, because it's impossible to stifle the information for ever.

I have one concern, and it may be illustrated by just referring to the banner on the stage, I would like to add at the end of that banner "getting from here to there and everywhere" because I think one other thing that has been clear over the last two days is that there is a significant part of the planet and a significant proportion of the population of the planet who do not at the moment and are unlikely in the near future to have access to this opportunity and I think that one of the things that the Club de Madrid and those of us here today could commit to is to find faster and more sustainable ways of extending access to this opportunity beyond the countries and, perhaps the cities, maybe some other countries where it's currently available to those sections of the population who don't have access but who might actually benefit from it more than anybody else.

Member of the public:

May I just offer one other insight into this, I agree that internet has changed the world and it is changing the world and it is for in many ways looking like everybody's opportunity and it can not be controlled, and should not be controlled. But in the core of internet is a set of servers, and as far as I know they are located in California, and they contain all the URL addresses needed to make it work. If that committee decided to or was forced to close it down, we had in the meantime been completely depending on it, so what would then happen, and what should be done to make sure that that does not happen?

Beth Noveck:

I'm going ask you a) to introduce yourself and b) to be brief.

Tim Phillips:

Okay, I can introduce myself, I cannot guarantee to be brief. My name is Tim Phillips and I'm an advisor to the Club de Madrid and somebody who's been involved with the Club since its inception with many of the members here and the subtitle of the Club is democracy that delivers, and it's interesting to hear all this conversation about data and data and data being aggregated and it relates to democracy. What I really worry about hearing over the last two days, is we know that governments and not just established Western democracies but even transitional and more recent democracies are finding it more difficult to respond with the pressure on budgets, the economic crisis and the overwhelming demands for government services. Fundamentally, what democratic leaders are about is making sure their governments and democracies can respond to the need of their citizens. With this environment we're living in, I really wonder if this is going to actually not only increase the demands on governments to try to respond but because the governments are finding it difficult even before all this data gets dropped on them, to respond in a effective way and make democracy deliver, if it's going to increase citizen frustration with government and democracy and its capacity to deliver and I think that is a really serious problem we are going to be facing in the future particularly with the inability of governments to really provide these services and the more and more people in the sense get empowered with this technology, matched with the decreasing capacity of the governments to respond, I wonder if that's good for democracy.

Atul Singh:

Atul Singh, founder and editor in chief of Fair Observer, a new journal that analyses issues of global significance. So the way I have seen the discussion, and I see it, Jorge Dominguez on the left and Clay on the right and here you see the optimistic view of decentralisation which is the parabola of Gutenberg, many regional languages, collaboration, folks around the world in a decentralised manner, and on the right you know we have Clay talking about freedom leading to disagreement

and often discord and we do know that the protestant reformation did lead to bloodshed in the 30 years war, eventually the treaty of Westphalia came but that took a while.

The question here is, we are at that stage wherein we have technology that is moving incredibly fast, you have great opportunities for collaboration, the Wikipedia example which is a great example for the optimistic side, but then we have the example of blogs and we have two problems, the focus problem and the substance problem, the focus problem being shortened concentration, substance problem being that footballers and let's say models get far greater attraction than a discussion like this on the internet and so I think I'd go back to an observation made by Professor Yochai Benkler and Irving Wladwasky-Berger, I think fundamentally the issue here is architecture and the rules of the game, this is a new medium and we are still figuring it out just as we were figuring out Gutenberg and the key question here for us is to figure out the rules of the game, how do we agree to disagree, how do we disagree without discord and how do we come up collectively with answers and harness the various perspectives, the plurality of perspectives around the planet to come up with something that works for humanity as a whole.

Member of the public:

I'm an independent arts and culture practitioner. I think it's worth repeating something that has been echoed on this panel and also I had the chance to hear earlier in the engaged citizens panel and that's the notion that it's important to pay attention to the tools but it's just as equally important to pay attention to the human networks that will support these tools and implement them especially as we talk about technology as a tool for liberation as a tool for human rights, as a way for historically marginalised communities to get a voice and make change because ultimately, rights cannot be given, there is no technology, no tools that can give people rights, they have to be taken, they have to be used and it's the human networks of solidarity, of support that will enable people to fully take those rights and use them as appropriately and effectively as they see fit. And I think it's really important for us to think about going forward using culturally appropriate human networks to forward those tools and to couch those tools within.

Beth Noveck:

Thank you, let's pause the questions for a moment just to come back to our panel and ask you for a second, we've heard a lot of talk about the trade offs and choices that we have to make in moving towards a new world order, new kinds of institutions, we've heard both reflections on the trade offs and choices around the digital divide. We've also heard trade offs and choices about the kind of dialogue that we are actually enabling through these processes, so I'm wondering if you could reflect a little bit on what you've both heard.

Jorge Domínguez

So as I listen to Club de Madrid members and to other participants in the Conference, I heard five trade offs and I will simply list them rather than elaborate on them.

First trade off is between the instantaneous and the deliberative. The instantaneous may have many good dimensions; it means that there could be a quick and effective response. It may mean that we may hold right away someone accountable for her actions. The deliberative, however speaks as Prime Minister Bruton mentioned in his question in the first plenary session, addresses the question of the quality of democracy, of being rushed to make a decision before in fact it is possible to make one that is wise and effective, a point that I heard in different sessions by President Mbeki and by President Lagos so that's the first trade off.

Second trade off might be, quite different nature, on the one hand the thrill of connection with others, wherever they may be, could be in our neighbourhood, it could be on the other side of the world, the thrill of connection with other, and on the other side the risk of exposure to unknown

others who may do us harm and that harm could be cyber-bullying a little kid in a school, that harm could be to a reputation, that harm could be through inaccuracy.

Third trade off is the enormous value of the engagement, of the participation, of the creativity, of those who are called activists of the internet, activists of the new technologies, activists of the new activities. Yet activists have never been a random sample of the public, activists have never been fully representative of the public. That is the genius of democratic elections and a set of activists is no more representative if you look at those who in all media, newspapers would write letters to the editor than those who own smart phones might be representative of the entire population of Bolivia, given that President Quiroga is on this panel. The risk of exclusion, the risk of inequality by social class and by generation is one that was mentioned again and again including by the two presidents on our panel.

The next trade off is one that on this panel Clay highlighted but many others have mentioned as well, and it is a debate as old as literacy, the ability to read, the spread of education. Will it make us nicer, will it make us more tolerant, will it facilitate our getting to know each other and work with each other or will it make us more effective at hating each other. This has been one of the important effects of technologies in the past just to make sure we do not just blame bloggers, remember that radio was one of the instruments of the Third Reich, that radio was one of the instruments of genocide in Rwanda, these technologies add enormous capacity may be good if used well to go back to the three opening words of Prime Minister Kok's remarks.

The last trade off that I want to mention is one that was discussed again and again, one that I can formulate most readily by evoking the words that the president of my university uses as she welcomes the new graduate lawyers. She charges them with shaping the wide restraints that make us free, and that trade off between restraints and freedom is at the heart of who we are as democratic citizens, as democratic leaders, as democratic governments and institutions and it's something very difficult to actually carry out again and again.

Beth Noveck:

Do we have to trade off between being deliberative and being instantaneous, between being thoughtful and?

Clay Shirky:

Yes, that is a trade off, because you have to choose sought of when and how to react, but what I'm struck by is the number of trade offs that are going away, the number of places where trade offs are being reduced. Historically there has been almost a set of arbitrage opportunities with the way traditional media environment has been laid out so that you can treat your citizens in one way and you can treat the professional media in another way. There was just a case in Britain where there was a super injunction, talking about a certain soccer player, certain football players' extra-marital alliance and many Britons were then tweeting the name of this football player and the judge said "well they're just going to have to abide by the super injunction too if they're going to behave like publishers. But of course the point of the super injunction is not letting the public know that there's something you're not talking about. So telling the public that they now have to not talk about this is violating the super injunction as a function in forcing it. The law becomes self eviscerating when everyone is a media outlet. So this is a trade off the governments used to be able to make, we'll treat the professional media makers in one way and the citizens in another way, that trade off goes away.

In our country, the Secretary of State about a year and a half ago got up and made a big speech, made a big push for internet freedom as US policy and then Wikileaks comes along and does something to us that if it had been done to the Syrian regime we would have been delighted, but because they did it to us instead we flipped out and we pursued Wikileaks through a whole bunch of extra legal means of censorship. One of the trade offs you used to be able to make pretty easily

in this country was “well here’s domestic policy and that’s foreign policy and they’re really different.” But in global communications it’s just policy and the damage done to the US standing as supporters of internet freedom was incalculable based on the behaviour particularly of our legislative branch vis-à-vis Wikileaks. So in many cases, freedom the government had to treat two different populations differently, amateurs and professionals, near and abroad, those trade offs are actually being squeezed out of the system and States are having to start saying “anyone with a camera, these are the rules that apply to you” or “anyone speaking in public whether you’re in Washington DC or Pearl roundabout, these are the things the US hopes to accomplish.” That is actually reducing the freedom to act and reducing the freedom to trade things off that States have typically enjoyed.

Beth Noveck:

So in this case the technology does win because I’m getting tweets appear on the stage so that overrides the mike, Alex you have a question.

Alex Howard:

It’s a two part, I’ll ask the short one that another person short-circuited the question line on and that’s Andrew Rasiej, he asks if someone can ask the question “what do you want democracy to look like in 2025? Let’s craft a vision of what we want to see” so he jumped the line. I get the mike so I get to make a couple of quick other observations before you get to it. One is that, to your point about the internet, when it was designed, it was designed against nuclear attack. If you knocked out California it would persist. So let’s recognise that it’s a network of networks and it was built by civil society, we give the government a lot of credit for, we’ve been spreading it around the world for a long time and when I talk to people online, talk to the activists you mention, one of the things they keep saying is “keep government’s hands of my interwebs.” There are more risks to free speech online coming from this country in terms of some of the legislative proposals before Congress right now, to stop online privacy act, to protect IP act, which would restrict free speech in the name of IP protection. Can you talk a bit about how to balance protecting platforms for free expression against the rights of copyright holders and how we should be thinking about the intermediaries that have produced extraordinary amounts of value of jobs of communication of all the things that people have been celebrating here against some of the significant market forces that exist. So again, how do we protect the internet that we built against some of these forces and B, to Andrew Rasiej’s question, what should the vision for 20 years from now be?

Beth Noveck:

You know what I’m going to add a question to that back to you combined with these because I want us not to run out of time for the following which is, what can the Club of Madrid do, so to Andrew’s point to create the democracy we want to see in 2025 and to Alex’s point of to create the right policy framework that will get us there, let me fold into that if you could make that specific to what this group can do, both in terms of it’s convening power as a group and what individuals could do when they go back to their home countries, if you would be willing to reflect a little bit on the opportunity here.

Clay Shirky:

I’ll answer Andrew’s question and fold it into the Club de Madrid question which is, I think a healthier state of democracy in 2025 would look like better structured fighting and if I had to pick a phrase that I thought could be implemented, I think that you’re comment about “we are still inventing the rules around these technologies” is exactly right, that we didn’t get peer review until we had a printing press, we didn’t figure out that method of hashing out scientific arguments until after we had a tool that could spread this information widely and I think that one of the problems right now with the crisis in democratic legitimacy that comes from increased citizen access to data is exactly that when the government asks for your opinion you’re basically saying “if you really want a

pony, tell us here in this form, and when you click the submit button maybe we'll send you a pony" and then it turns out to everyone's surprise and horror that the government is fresh out of ponies that day. I think that that implicit model sometimes encouraged by the government, sometimes simply let to float around these kinds of aggregate citizen demand interfaces, it isn't actually squaring with the citizens that there are real deep trade offs baked into democracy, that democracy isn't a set of rules for getting what you want, it's a set of rules for losing. It's a way of asking "under what circumstances would you not get what you want and still stay a member of this society?" and the answer is almost always "because I get some of what I want elsewhere and because the bulk of the trade offs is acceptable to me" rather than because "I get everything I wish the government would give me" because no government in the world can provide that. So what I think, to this idea of better structure of fighting, what can the Club de Madrid do, I think one of the things the Club de Madrid can do, to the degree that there's any leverage over this kind of citizen communication, square with the citizens about what's involved in making trade offs, provide them the space in which they can see that their demands are stacking up, exactly as you said, against demands of people on the other side who are also citizens, legitimate the idea of disagreement within a public space because if all we get is increased tug of war around special interests, none of them can see each other or respond to each other's arguments, that doesn't strike me as a better state of the world in 2025 but something that could happen would be that in certain kinds of political interaction to the citizens, reminding them that they're citizens and not just consumers and that there's a degree of civic engagement with one another including with people they disagree with, that democracy isn't designed to produce ideologically coherent policies, it's designed to produce acceptable trade offs and that *that* becomes the shared exercise because without that we're just going to have broken pony dispensers as a kind our kind of model for 'this is what citizen interaction with government is like,' it's going to raise demands exactly as we heard around big data, but it's not going to raise the answer to those demands in ways that citizens would find acceptable unless they're reminded about the trade offs at the same time.

Jorge I. Dominguez:

So again in my usual role trying to summarise what I heard, since this is the question specifically about what the Club de Madrid and its members may want to do, I heard five things. One is members want to recognise good things that are taking place as a result of these new technologies. Secondly, as is most evident in the holding of this conference, they want to create an opportunity for reflection, for analysis, about the wide spread, highly significant and yet not entirely clear in near terms and certainly long term effects, which these new technologies may have. Thirdly, as President Uteem on this panel indicated in his opening remarks, to use it where appropriate to facilitate tasks such as election observation or other means of endeavours that are already part of what members of the Club de Madrid do. Fourthly, when something goes really wrong and sometimes things do go really wrong, to ring the alarm and whether as individuals or in small missions, to try to make it clear that there has been an unacceptable misuse either by a State or in other forms of activity. Finally, as we've heard again and again in this conference and from Presidents Quiroga and Uteem in this panel, to be prophetic, to remind everyone that access remains highly unequal, that only the few not the many have use of these new technologies, that enduring inequality with regard to access to these new resources for the 20th Century is an unacceptable condition for the world and that therefore it is important, not only for ordinary citizens but for those who have public responsibilities, to remain focused on how to reduce that gap in the years to come.

Jorge Quiroga:

Just a couple of quick comments. Interconnected, hyper-connected, hyper-opinionated world is very good but it can have some troublesome side effects. Mexico knows it very well, the Mexican cartels muzzle the press, if you publish anything they will wipe you out, and when somebody denounced it on Facebook they went and found out who posted a video on Facebook or a posting on Facebook they didn't like and they killed the people who did the posting on Facebook. So there can be gruesome uses of technologies sometimes. From a birds eye view from outside, I think the hyper-opinionated, two sides Fox News, MSNBC, the red blog, the blue blog here, has some

consequences, it lets the extremes capture everything and I'll give you examples on Latin America. The Mexico free trade agreement, Chile, Central America, went through relatively quickly, probably the best two allies, Colombia and Panama, Martin is right here had to wait five, six, seven years for the free trade to go through the US congress and in the meantime China is smiling all the way through the bank because Panama canal world is Chinese now. We deal with them, quick investment, lots of economic development and the US is basically off the field.

One particular example, close with Tunisia's example, it's very heartening to see the process in 23 days, they knocked down a 23 year old dictator, the tools probably helped, minimised the killings, made it quicker, the voting was exemplary, cathartic, emotional, joyful, you forget how people get caught up in the moment and they cry when they vote for the first time in a free election, you kind of take that for granted but it's very heartening to see that for the first time. But that's actually the difficult from a threat, tear gas and shooting stand point, but it's easy in term of the time for it, now comes the hard part. How do you draft a constitution that allows a country like Tunisia to channel that energy, how do you set up a interim government that says to people "ok now you voted, you want to eat, you want a job, you want development, how do you deliver now that you have democracy to use our motors" I think that there's plenty of space, that's the long frustrating part, the cameras are gone, the tension is gone, but now comes the hard work of building democracy and if I could use a tool like the LEND network or some other technology tool that would allow we to take the political capital, the State craft capital represented by several members and just take it to Tunisia and then hopefully to Libya and to Egypt, I think that would be a great contribution to democracy, using the tools that the 21st Century brings us.

Beth Noveck:

With moderator's prerogative, I'm going to quickly answer my own question before we continue the dialogue about action items for the Club de Madrid with Prime Minister Shipley. Where we want to be in five years Andrew is using crowdsourcing, using the tools to make governments smarter and more effective, so it's getting the information about where the light is broken, where the pothole is, how we adjudicate the pattern application, in 2025 we want to be erasing the boundaries completely between government and governed, it's creating the WeGov vision that you have talked about so eloquently where what I like to think about this is truly learning the lessons of the social media, governing like a network and more like Twitter. What do I mean by that? Twitter works so well and Facebook works so well and they're so popular and effective because they create minimum rules of the world, the conditions for communication between people and then they get out of the way and let people develop the applications on top of them. We need to do more of that in government in my view, which is to get out of the way of people developing solutions together to deliver services, to make decisions, to do that work collectively which they're capable of doing.

What can the Club de Madrid do to get us there, and now I'm going to act in my rapporteur role of reflecting what I heard as well. There are a series of policy recommendations which we can be championing, around open data and transparency, about government giving up ownership of its own content, being sure that crown copyright is never asserted but that information paid for by the tax payer belongs to the tax payer, of promoting open access and more liberal IP policies, of promoting internet access and broadband adoption so that we can remedy the digital divide dilemmas we've heard about, of making sure we focus also on how to protect personal data and privacy, not simply from governments who control data but increasingly from the large companies that control so much of the data that we hold and something that was not mentioned of thinking more about how government collects data from and about companies and organisations so that we can hold them accountable, not only government accountable.

There are cultural things that we can do in terms of practice. We need the people in this room who have been in government, to legitimise these innovations and pave the way. So whether it's starting to use Twitter or Facebook or engaging in the practise and the use of new technology, I think it has a huge demonstration value that's incredibly useful but more importantly perhaps is the fact that people need to hear from you about the fact that they can and they should be adopting these

innovations. We've had open data laws and open and freedom of information laws on the books for a long time, but it's the actual translation from principal into practice that only happens when we have the demonstration of when you can explain to people why it's worthwhile, when there are not enough hours in the day and no budgets to go around, of why it's worthwhile and possible to be more open and collaborative.

Finally I think the point about, is not just the cultural practices and the policies that we promote but the projects and platforms that we adopt. So I want to echo your recommendation again whether it's tools like the LEND platform, that get us talking to one another or the kind of things that Aneesh talked about in his plenary session at dinner last night which was some of you who were there, some of you who weren't, might remember that he mentioned this idea that we could work with the private sector to label every job listing so that it becomes searchable, in this case, what the United States government did was just a simple label that says this is a job for which veterans are eligible and unleash now 500 000 job listings that people can find from Google sitting in their homes from one place. It's a project that costs no money, that leverages the power of the private sector and technology and it took 90 days to accomplish. So it's these examples of these kinds of concrete projects that can be done in difficult economic times that I think are quite crucial to get back of, to participate in and so that we're proposing things that we can do now in 90 days, not simply in five years, or in ten years or twenty years. So with that let me thank our panellists and you for your interventions, we're going to go a few minutes over, I thank you for your indulgence Prime Minister of letting me take this panel where it wanted to go and we invite you to come up and please share with us your closing thoughts on what you heard.

Jennifer Mary Shipley:

Thank you Beth. My name is Jenny Shipley and I'm the Vice-President of the Club de Madrid. I think we've heard an exceptional conversation this afternoon and can I begin by asking you to thank the panel for both their engagement and insight.

I think I can speak for all the members of the Club de Madrid to say that it's been our absolute great pleasure in this tenth year of the Club to be able to convene this very important Conference here in New York, a conference that rather than looking back and perhaps celebrating our achievements has the courage to pick the topic of the decade and insist that we look forward, the question of how we will use digital technologies to create a 21st Century democratic society within our countries and across the world. The Club of Madrid as you know has the privilege of having members who've also had the responsibility of leading their countries even if it was yesterday but then coming together as a group, we feel that we have the ability not only to share our experience but we often find ourselves in that unique position where we are along side those who currently bear the responsibility of leading their nations and we find ourselves in that unique position as either confidence or trusted advisors or associates or perhaps mentors to the leaders of our previously connected political parties. All of those opportunities continue to inspire the members of the Club de Madrid to try and keep up with the issues of today and tomorrow so that while sharing our experience that we gained through governance, we can reapply that as others have to then make the decisions.

This Conference as we have tried to ask the right questions and shape the debate doesn't seek to release a communiqué today but rather collect up the ideas that have been presented by the speakers developed within the panels and I can assure you this material will be assembled in a comprehensive conference report but much more than that, it will be taken by the Club of Madrid members, our associates and I hope others who have been with us in this Conference and championed in the forum in which they find themselves so that we are actually leading in this conversation.

But to come back to some of the challenges that we've heard, it is very important as we think about what's going on not to become despondent. There are enormous mega trends going on. At lunch yesterday we were reminded that in 1989 there were only 69 democracies worldwide. By 2008 they

were 119 and as you and I know since then democracy has continued to break out because people's desire to be free and to vote for those who will then lead them is a right and a desire that is repeated year on year, generation on generation and century on century.

I think some of the stories that have been told, whether it's the stories from Tunisia where people weep with joy because they have the right to vote or indeed those who are now finding their voice and while they're not sure where their voice will take them, they actually celebrate the right in the squares of many of the cities of the world today that they are free to at least have that opinion to express, all these are significant elements of expression, of the human's spirit desire to be free and it is one of those rights which is at the heart of the purpose of the Club de Madrid.

Ladies and gentlemen, as we think through where we can go from here, I think we should reflect on Aung San Suu Kyi's comments at the beginning of the Conference when she said "it's important for us to differentiate between sticking together, that is having a voice where we simply speak to those who share our view and finding a way of coming together which is when we, while we may have different points of view, agree to find a common ground or common purpose." Democracy in its heart is not a single view; it is many views which agree to tolerate each other's points of difference yet share the desire in common to be governed effectively and I believe many of the discussions we've had during this conference give us insights on the platform of the digital system to allow us to keep convening conversations. Some of you will be aware that some of the most important work that the Club de Madrid has done in the last few years is promoting a major project on shared societies, which are safe for difference. In other words we foster difference but we challenge people to find the space in common where they will come together whether it's in a government structure and the choices that have to be made if economies are to be viable as Tim suggested or simply to respect people's rights and points of difference whether it's ethnicity, culture or religion.

In looking at these issues we've come to question the levels of engagement that are necessary to state, what citizens will think and journalism. I don't intend to go over the list, there have been so many people commentate in such an enlightened and insightful way but I do think that there are some obvious differences if I might say so from the 15th Century. There were *not* 7 billion people on earth in the 15th century. Today I think the challenges that those who govern face is simply the mass of numbers and indeed I think it is true that those who govern in nations with large populations who are now well connected, that they face challenges that even some of us who were leaders in recent time did not face and yet we need to apply our thinking as to whether or not it's governments that will impose the rules or whether we should challenge civil society that they too need to discuss and debate how they will self-regulate and moderate the conversation. Remember the purpose of governments is not only to create prosperity and security and define the rule of law, surely in a well-connected world, civil society is going to have to step forward further and engage in ways where they too moderate each other's behaviour and perhaps become part of the rule of law in terms of defining how the digital age will finish up enhancing and enriching democratic values.

When we come to the issue of citizens, in addition to they having to participate effectively, it is my own view and I know that the Club de Madrid members share this at the heart, that we also have to face up to the issue of the choices that good government require. Tim talked about the issue of whether big data could empower people to at least then share the decisions that governments will have to grapple with, particularly in the next decade. In my own country, when we were grappling with the Asian crisis, we had political parties that were promising the world and the media that just kept repeating the promises. One of the ways to try and move from that speculative and unrealistic environment was that we introduced what sounds like a rather boring tool, the Fiscal Responsibility Act. Ladies and Gentlemen, what it requires today is that our treasury has to in big data terms, publish our quarterly accounts and so today every quarter the actual state of our debt and our revenues and so on are published in the public space without the fingers of the politicians all over it. Today ten years on and in a general election, it is much more common for the journalists to ask politicians, what is this going to do with our public debt, how are you going to pay for this; does it lead to tax increases? In other words big data well-disseminated has allowed democracy to be far

better balanced and durable because information disseminated well adds to the democratic process and moderates the excesses while allowing good decision making to come through the middle. I believe that one of the challenges that has been awakened here in this conference, will need to be carried forward by the Club, whether it's at the global institution level, in our country to country visits or when we're engaging with NGOs to both inform them in terms of these issues of both big data and social networks and their respective roles but also this issue of: so what can the state do, what can citizens do and what can journalists do?

One other important moment for me in the early part of the Conference was the Huffington discussion where perhaps we do need to look to new alliances that will help the digital age be more meaningful to us all. I was very interested when the commentator from Huffington said "maybe it's journalists and experts that need to then coalesce in alliances in order to disseminate big data so citizens can interpret it properly and then the dialogue and discourse can be more truthful and realistic and informed. I think that it was a good illustration of the fact that the platform is only part of the story and data is only part of the story and social networks are only part of the story but we will need to think of new ways in which we engage in order to make the outcomes or solutions genuinely meaningful.

Ladies and Gentlemen, without overstating the importance of the Club de Madrid, we believe we are in a very special space. You can't buy experience and while we don't for a moment claim to know everything about governance, good governance, we do know that while democracy is in the heart of many people and is being fought over for generations, it is only the starting point of what truly liberates societies. This organisation is committed not only to helping people achieve a democratic environment in which to live and be governed but also to deliver democracy that works. A democratic architecture is so much more complex than simply the electoral system and voting and there's been much talk in this conference about different elements whether it's the education platform, whether it's the information platform, these are issues that the Club of Madrid is committed to taking forward and in many of the areas of our work, we are in a position to support countries depending on where they are in their stage of development, to continue to explore how to enhance this democratic architecture that improves people's societies in real and meaningful ways. I think there have been some great insights during the conference on how those elements can be done more effectively. You know what does a modern education system with a digital platform look like? And can we think about those further? I don't think the Club or indeed governments have a monopoly on knowledge here. I think it's magnificent that we have some technology partners in this conference and frankly the sort of democracy we will enjoy in 25 years all depend on whether it is the club and current governments and civil society and those who can deliver solutions whether or not they will engage. I think I can speak for the Club of Madrid that not only have we valued our partners and sponsors in being part of this conference in these last two days but we have a great appetite to work with people who have a desire to help shape the future in meaningful ways and I hope there will have been some lightening shots or sparks that have been ignited and you will want to talk further with us and we with you about how we might find the pathways forward to increase our effectiveness, to increase your reach in order to improve democracies and the experience of people worldwide as they seek to live their lives well.

I won't get on to journalism because politicians often give a narrow and focused interpretation of it because of our own experience other than to say it is such an important channel to market. All I would ask is that as the journalist system or the media system asks those who govern to continue to modernise, interpret and seek effectiveness, we must also ask the media to continue to challenge themselves as to what sorts of new skill sets and interpretation they must bring to this enhancing of democracy. We live in a time of change and change is a positive thing rather than a negative thing and we should not be afraid of that.

In conclusion, I want on behalf of the Club and all of you here to acknowledge the partners who have made this conversation possible. A Sheikh from Kuwait, the President of the Centre of Dialogue amongst Civilisations very much was at the forefront of our thinking for this conference, he saw the moving conversations happening in the Middle East and was very keen that he got the

best access to world thinking and was been to be a part of this conference. We of course also appreciate the support of the Regional Government of Madrid, Telefonica who have been so supportive in many aspects of this Conference, our friends from Australia from the Hyatt Regency, the Rockefeller Foundation, a long standing friend of the Club de Madrid, and our new technology partners Google, Samsung, Microsoft and of course McKinsey and GDF Suez. The media partners are also up on the screen in front of you and I want to acknowledge and say how much we appreciate your being here, the sharing of your insights and also your reporting of this event. I want to thank any of you who have tweeted or used the modern platforms to keep getting these messages moving. I want to particularly thank Beth. I think Beth has been absolutely instrumental in shaping the conversation that's laid the platform for this Conference and I want to particularly ask you to acknowledge her and her team for the leadership she's taken here. Many of us attend conferences and we know when we have seen someone with great skill, great commitment and insight, Beth we appreciate your work but also the talented people you've been able to draw to the Conference over and above ourselves who have made up the panels.

I also want to thank the team from the Club de Madrid. They are a talented small group of people but a very talented and committed group of people and you and I would not be here either the members or those who have joined us if it weren't for our Secretariat. I want to acknowledge the Secretary General and his team and ask you to also acknowledge them now. While it may be unfashionable to acknowledge publicly the sponsors, I want to ask you to do so because frankly democracy depends on partnership including funds and we genuinely appreciate the list of sponsors up in front of you who I mentioned and I want to ask you to publicly join me in thanking them in making this conference possible.

And so where to from here? Well, again I'm not going to try and add to what we have already heard, but I do want to challenge each of you. Leadership is not the obligation of those who are the head of government alone. If each of us leads a little in this world enormous amounts will get done and while I think we've talked a lot about platforms and dialogue in this conference, the Club of Madrid members I know would want to say that in the end though, leadership is required and leadership is not only the prerogative of those who have been elected to lead. Outstanding participatory democracies have leaders everywhere who understand that the fragile bird of freedom relies on people stepping forward and stepping up to help define what that freedom means and I want to encourage each of you in your sphere of influence to take what you've heard and to become champions for change, in seeking ways in which we can adopt technology to further enhance democracy worldwide. I can give you the commitment of the Club de Madrid members to do exactly that and we look forward to working with you all in some form or another in the future. Can I on behalf of the President, the board and the members of the Club de Madrid, thank you all for attending this conference and I wish you well as you travel safely home, thank you very much.