ASIA PACIFIC REGION INTERNET GOVERNANCE FORUM
TAIPEI 2016
A NEW INTERNET ERA

29 JULY 2016
ROOM 402 C-D
11:00
WORKSHOP 51
RADICALISATION IN THE DIGITAL AGE - HOW TO COUNTER ONLINE EXTREMISM AND
BUILD A COUNTER NARRATIVE

                         ***
                         ***

     >> LUAVUT ZAHID: Thank you for joining us.
     I would like to start by introducing myself. I'm Luavut Zahid, I work
with the Digital Rights Foundation. I'm overlooking the Internet Campaign.
We're here to talk about Radicalisation in the Digital Age: How to counter
online extremism and build a counter narrative.
     I think with radicalisation our minds immediately go to the ISIS track,
but that's the object threat, that's the obvious threat. In South Asia,
it is Bangladesh, in others it is the attacks that happened recently, extremism
exists and it does in a concrete form. That's not the only problem that
we're facing. Taliban are using online platforms to further their Agenda.
There are religious extremists but there are different kinds, you have
extremists in India, you have extremist monks elsewhere in the world,
radicalisation is taking different forms and shapes all over the Asian region
and we're basically going to be talking about how these issues manifest
and how they can be countered.
     Should I -- first I'll basically ask all of my panelists to keep in
mind that we want them to define what radicalisation is from their perspective
points, and I will be starting with Irene Poetranto with Citizen Lab, and
talking about censorship and the impact it has in terms of controlling,
you know, information online, even when you're trying to control hate speech
and radicalisation content it has a repercussion.
     >> IRENE POETRANTO: Thank you, Luavut Zahid, and Digital Rights

Foundation, Pakistan for inviting me as a panelist in discussing this important topic.

I'm Irene Poetranto and I work with the Citizen Lab in the University of Toronto in Toronto, Canada. We conduct research on Internet censorship and filtering and surveillance and the tools to carry out surveillance and how they are used against Human Rights and Civil Society groups. From our research we know countries have installed national level URL filtering systems to block content, including pornography and extremist content. However, in our research we found that doing so runs the risk of over blocking, for example, blocking entire domains as opposed to just the offending content. That websites may be -- and in our research we have seen -- that they have been miscategorized and, therefore, runs the risk of infringing on freedom of expression.

One example of such system that we have published reports on is Netsweeper, a Canadian company that provides web content filtering technology. That's -- the product can be used to block inappropriate content to meet government rules and regulations based on social, religious, political ideals. We conducted research as part of the open end initiative, an effort by the Citizen Lab in Harvard and a group in Ottawa and in our research we found that for instance Tumbler.com and all blogs were blocked in the Qatar and UAE and others based to a mischaracterization on the site as pornography and evidence was found of the filtering of extremist sites with the political autonomy groups in Pakistan and also due to content being circulated in on social media sites like Twitter, YouTube, and Pakistan authorities have blocked the entire domain of the sites.

In 2013 we released a report on Netsweeper installed on Pakistan Telecommunication Company limited PDCL Network, that's the largest telecommunication company and also operates a Pakistan Internet exchange point. Our findings suggest that the Netsweeper filtering devices are being actively used to censor at an ISP-wide level in Pakistan. The concerned voices is that there is a lack of accountability and transparency surrounding around the blocking of the content, including extremism content. In Pakistan the 1996 Communication Act was criticized for having too many broad restrictions in order to protect national interest and then there is the controversial cybercrime bill that's controversial. Lastly, a point, sometimes voices countering radicalisation can be attacked and silenced. As I mentioned before, we conduct research on targeted attack against Civil Society groups, including those that speak out against radicalisation and the status quo I guess. For instance, we published a report in 2014 where we documented a malware attack against Syrian ISIS critics so we documented how a Syrian citizen media group critical of ISIS was targeted in a customized digital attack designed to unmasker their location. The group is being slaughtered silently focusing their advocacy on documenting the human right pieces by ISIS.

I'll end there. Thank you.

>> LUAVUT ZAHID: Jac has a flight to catch so I'll have her go first. No. No. It is fine. Jac is with the APC from Malaysia with interesting things to share with the gender question. Over to you.

>> JAC SM KEE: There you go. Hello.

Hello? Okay. Sorry. I was not switching on the on button. This is a really complicated topic. I'm trying to think of what angle to come in

starting to discuss this. I'm from -- I'm from Malaysia originally. This
I know radicalisation, which is not a term that I'm so familiar in terms
of working with, I'm into the sure I'm familiar with the terms of
fundamentalisms which has a longer history in terms of women's rights. That
often demonstrates and expresses itself in religion, IE Islam. I started
to do too much reading last night and now my brain is all in a jumble.

      You know, it happens to be right when you over prepare! Then I started
thinking what is it that I want to contribute to this conversation? What
is it that we're looking at here? I started to think about the relationship
between radicalization and fundamentalism and whether   nobody is a
distinction here, posing the question of how do you define radicalisation,
it really started to get me thinking like what does this mean? I started
to have a lot of conversations with different colleagues working on this
issue in Malaysia and elsewhere, what they   how they think about this.
One of the responses that was given to me is about you're holding on to
a particular belief but believing that you're constantly under siege, under
attack and that you have to respond. Immediately.

      Then I started to think about the context. I really feel that the
context that facilitates violence extremism is really fundamentalisms in
all of its forms. We're talking about -- by this I mean by one points of
view dominates and asserts truth in all segments of society. There is only
one point of view. This is a fundamentalist's point of view. By
fundamentalism I mean propagating fundamentalist -- for example
fundamentalist liberalism. There is only one view and this is the right
view. All fundamentalists nationalism, there is only one way to be a citizen
and this is the only way. A fundamentalist sexism, where there is only one
way to be a man and woman and this is the only way. Or fundamentalist capitalism,
there is one economic model and this economic model must trump all. All
of this monolithic pillars, they come together and really create a situation
where critical thinking where diversity in points of view, being in the
gray area is unattainable. You can't sit there confident. We somehow have
to subscribe to one or the other kinds of fundamentalists notion in order
to fight back. In order to counter back one point of view, it is another
deferring fundamentalist point of view. We sort of exist in a weird
fundamentalist age by all kinds of thinking and notion and engagement that
seems to rest within this way of truth making. This is where the Internet
sits in a very interesting   in an age where we have the Internet, you know,
this shouldn't be the case. Right? I mean, that's what the Internet
facilitates. It facilitates a diversity of opinion, facilitates a diversity
of being. But the way it's being developed more and more we are seemingly
being reduced more and more into narrow points of views. For example, in
relation to conversations that happens on Twitter, in many research that's
been done by APC as well as by Internet democracy project and by the digital
rights foundation, as more and more women occupy the Internet as a public
space the backlash is very, very extreme. The backlash becomes something
that is violent, that's targeted to your gender, sexuality, I want to kill
you, I want to rape you, shut up, go away. The whole momentum behind the
backlash is to shut up an opposing, diverse points of view. Even as we create
this space that we supposedly are allowing a kind of bubbling of differences,
it is at the same time closing down through different things through different
reasons.

Social media plays a role in facilitating -- I'm sorry for saying fundamentalist over and over again. Expect it for 5 minutes -- social media plays a role in facilitating this fundamentalist way of being by placing us in interest bubbles, by algorithms that lock us in what we like, what we will consume and buy. It doesn't allow us to actually explore what we're already comfortable with. It is designed that way, it is designed to connect to networks that we already are connected to. It is very easy for us to reach out to people that we think will somehow be friendly and familiar to our discourse already. This is something I actually realized quite belatedly in the last general elections in Malaysia in 2013 I think -- when was the last -- 2013? Right? Was it? I completely and totally and utterly believed that the opposition government was going to win because that was the energy I was getting from all of the spaces I was occupying, you know, that something was going to happen, that this tide would shift. When it didn't happen, when it didn't happen quite spectacularly I sat up, thought my God, there is something weird about the spaces I'm occupying online and off line. I imagine myself to be occupying spaces where the public is, where there is diversity of thinking, opinions, but actually I'm occupying spaces particularly in social media that just locks me in to people that I like! Of course, these days we're familiar with this already, that something is happening here. There's something   this is something that deserves interrogation if we're serious on thinking about the Internet we're constructing to counter this way of thinking, this way of living, right? I have a few kind of examples if you don't mind carrying on.

Governments then deal with -- governments that deal with different crisis that we're facing at the moment, whether it is economic crisis or migration crisis with a nationalistic discourse that's really based on dangerous rhetoric of race and religion, propagating the fundamentalist nationalism that is based on what is race, religion, citizenship. In Malaysia recently, a religious official made a statement that said anyone that opposed the passing of the law and Malaysia is a multiracial country, we have   Islam is the official religion but our laws are based on the constitution. We have a duel legal system and there was a proposal to have a law to deal with criminal offenses. This the religious official is propped up in the state, one of the states said anyone opposed to this, it is basically a harpy, a non-Muslim that deserves to be killed. What does the government do to respond to this rather than reject this as a, you know, we don't support these kinds of fundamentalist rhetoric, extreme rhetoric, they say it is a civil opinion, not a fact one, it is okay. It is   they're using the same kind of logic to gain   to gain support. They're resting on the same mechanics to gain support. It is a flattened belief to consolidate a monopoly over the interpretation over what is right or wrong and to feed this to you. We see this in all forms and ways. I think we need to really challenge ourselves for people working in these areas in terms of the issues we're working on, whether we're actually propagating, propping up this very narrow, uncritical ways of thinking or whether we're opening things up. I'll bring in another example, which is slightly more controversial, which is around, for example, child protection online. The way we respond to this is not through encouraging a critical approach but rather a protectionist approach saying young people don't think, we will protect you. Do not engage in education because it is an unsafe space, but rather engage in protection. Sometimes I wonder

if this is the same things that we're doing around addressing online violence against women. Women don't think, don't be critical, but instead, let's look to the private sector and state to provide some kinds of protection. It is really dangerous. It is sort of a dangerously -- yeah. It is dangerously perpetuating a cycle of fundamentalist in many, many ways. I decided to read about why women decide to join, what are the reasons for it. I started to think about young people, really early on. It made a lot of sense to me, young people, they're curious and young people care, they're not jaded like me. They really -- you know, they give a shit and they care a lot about injustices and suffering, about things that all of these fundamentalist rhetoric, the crisis that everything is causing. They care a lot. None of these things are offering a viable solution or response, whereas they do provide a viable solution and response. This is all terrible, it is caused by this, this, this, this and this is one way we can solve this and belong. It becomes very attractive. I want to do something, it has meaning to me, it makes me be able to contribute meaningfully in this life. I have a community that I can belong to. It is bigger than myself. Because I care, I'm doing something. Nobody cares more really than young people. Nobody wants to do more than people who have been rejected by society.

When young women go and we don't understand because we're sitting on the other side of the fence, we're like   you joined that and that rhetoric, it is that you're had just going to be there to sort of serve the men who are actually going out to fight, to do the jihad, why do you go? It doesn't make sense? It sits in a social structure that's deeply sexist that does not provide space for women to assert themselves as equals without a huge backlash. If that's the case, in the research that's been done by a few scholars, what this provides, it is join the jihad, you have a unique, important role to play and this unique, important role to play is equal by the role being played by the men. It is different but equal. It provides a sense of that, okay, I can somehow be perceived as equal in this new social structure even though I play a different roll.

For those critical of that the equal but different role, then they leave in the sign of protest. At the heart of all of this recruitment, joining, leaving, it is really the same kinds of social structures of engagement that really interrogates the same issues about injustice, about discrimination, about suffering, about crisis. So how do we then deal with this by facilitating a much more open space? How do we deal with there by facilitating thinking about an Internet that -- an Internet that's a new social structure that facilitates an openness rather than the closing down, that facilitates new economic structures rather than a closing down of it, that facilitates broader than closing down of organizations.

To encourage censorship, filtering, but it is very blunt and it tends to end up silencing those with very minority views anyway.

But we have an opening of that. That's the challenge, the things -- I'm sorry if it is not very pinpointed. That's the thing that I'm sort of really thinking through and very deeply concerned with.

>> LUAVUT ZAHID: Thank you, Jac, it is interesting to hear you talk about those things. I'll talk on Arthit now, he'll talk about the irony and how sometimes radicalisation doesn't really just need to come from, you know, group elements but can somehow come from people in authority as well.

>> ARTHIT SURIYAWONGKUL: Thank you.

I will pick up the points that follow the discussions of Jac. I will start with this first; I probably try to see this radicalisation issues from the point of view that sometimes it is also   how do I say? There is some intention to make people look radical. Right. Once you're about to label someone radical there is probably some legitimacy to the comments. It is basically coming from the radical person maybe there is a tendency to even censor some of the comments because the radical comments may create a public address of this order in society.

I'm going to look at the complex of the critical associations, that he is another word, so Jac, talked -- we started with radicalisation, Jac, talking about fundamentalist, I'm going to another word, polarization. In the context of in the past 10 years you probably heard about yellow shirts, multicolored shirts, whoever, other groups that are active in the last decade I can show you how people, how people who is not   they identify themselves as yellow shirt, blue, yellow shirt, also -- it is basically like this. Yellow shirt movement start from against correction movement. This is what yellow shirt, how they identified themselves it, they're like come this way, they're very unhappy with challenges and society so they're against corruption. To some extent a lot of corruption in Thailand, a lot of them, it is traditions. There is a little bit of   not the content itself, but a lot of people in yellow shirts, they think this is correct. There is a degree, because of this, say, first anti-corruption and then a follow up on that, all politician it is, all politicians are corrupted. Some of the people outside yellow shirt see the yellow shirt movement as anti-politician. This is not actually shared with everybody inside yes he Human Rights online shirt. Some of them say yes, I'm totally anti politician, they're corrupted, not everybody says this, this is actually those outside of yellow shirt, they say, anti-corruption, anti-politician. There is a bit of a degree where they try to push yellow shirt a bit away from what they actually identify themselves and follow the anti-politician. People outside of the yellow shirt with men say yellow shirt people, they're anti democracy which is actually not the thing that yellow shirt people actually say. They're against corruption but as time goes by there is some radical -- it is from both sides, from the yellow shirt side itself and people outside of yellow shirts. Suddenly 10 years go by, a lot of people outside of yellow shirt especially see yellow shirt with men as an anti-democracy which is actually not true in the first place. You come to the red shirt, okay, it started because of the military coup in 2007, 2006, a lot of people come, we didn't want the government, we come out here to support democracy. We need the representation of the people. We want election. When they say they want election people will not identify themselves as red shirt. Oh, here is an election, that means that you support politician. Politicians are corrupted. That means that you support corruption.

It's like bit by bit society in the past ten years, we are -- actually there is some common values that this group can share. But the simplification, whatever that happens, I will cover that in a later part on social media, this makes these two groups polarized from apart. From the first point, red shirts may see themselves as democracy supporting group, but in the end the other people see them as the supporting corruption group, also those against corruption group and later people see them as the anti-democracy

group. Because of this, in recent years, you see a lot of my screen shots off of Facebook status is around, one is very interesting, they discussed about the coming referendum in the 7 of August, so that screen shot on Facebook status said, hey, you see a lot of politicians come out against these draft charters. That means actually -- that's -- that means draft based charter should be really good, right? If it comes like this, we'll get rid of corruption of Thailand.   That's why we have to vote yes for the draft charter. Similar things happen as well.   In the end, because of this, nobody has actually read, not many read the actual draft charter, they're just like oh, oh, charge it on the ability of the draft charter on who actually supported. If the politician supported, that means support corruption. Sorry. If the politician gains it, it means that the draft shot is against corruption, that means it is good.   I think it comes down to the point that   the process, the ideas, it happens a lot on the Internet, social media, not necessarily only about the input of the political context.

I think one of the things -- I made the last point here, another thing that Internet has been changed in the last decade, it is centralized, this platform where you have a web forum, you have the webpages, links, Jac talked about fundamentalist in a sense of you use the idea as a tool all the time. In every context, right. In the end, you don't care, it is out of context, every time you say this thing, it should always be true, right? It used to be that we see a lot of webpages and overview. We want to know something and we should have a newspaper, a web forum and had inside of that there are links to other articles, other webpages that give them more context. This is one particular article that's not actually coming out of nowhere, essentially in all of the pages as well, other articles as well, that gives one context to the -- that gives context to the statement. This is light to normal about this thing, you follow the links.   That can make the discussion more and more fruitful. All of this comes from the accumulation. Accumulation can make people more exposed to different ideas but also at the staple time it can make people blind to the context. We have found that at least in this part of the world those apps, it is more and more popular, one of the differences between chat apps like live we chat compared to traditional social media like Facebook or even more traditional websites, the message, the messages sent in chat apps tend to be self-contained. There is no limit. Most of the time people send video of graphics, picture, screen shot, right. They tend to be self-contained. So I think as I have described I think among other things we can stop the process offed a Calizeation, keeping the context and implementing that we try to make or are discussed in the public. Because of the popularization of these chat app applications that actually promotes a self-contained messages without the context allowed. I think it is getting more difficult as well how to actually stop the process of this radicalization.

I think this is the thing that maybe -- I don't know, by technology, actually this is the platform track, trying to probably do as well, like right now when you see some links that your friends share you can probably see another small focus underneath that link that tries to suggest the means or articles. This is also due to   we actually have not issued how this works, whether it is going to provide a multiwest context or is it just like confirming the same statement, same belief.

Thanks.

>> LUAVUT ZAHID: Thank you, Arthit for that elaborate explanation. I would like to call on you.

>> NICA DULAO: Good morning, everyone.

Mine is more of a maybe a part of what Jac has already started. In the Philippines you hear the word radical, it is not   it doesn't connote to a negative, it doesn't have a negative connotation. Usually radical is equivalent most of the time to activism. In the Philippines activism is a part of most everyday life of most advocates in the Philippines, especially if we refer to the history of the Philippines where we have a dictator, Marcus, no.   I think because of recent events which have been mentioned earlier, radicalisation has eventually been translated to negative meanings. It might be more for us for our context to use fundamentalism rather than preferring to the radicalisation particularly in context of the Philippines. When we speak of radicalisation I think we must not lose sight as how this radicalisation has also worsened women's worst cost of expression, that's fundamentalist. Women has rights. When women starts to challenge this every day existence of oppression women sometimes are put in a very challenging situation because they're not supposed to question the status quo. When women question the every daisies tans, it is like -- I'll try to be a conceptual a bit just to explain where am I coming from, the countries of many, whether it is embedded in social structure, you know that when you speak of fundamentalist, fundamentalist, it is embedded in social structures, not only in our own homes but even in a micro level of analysis, in the of economics, political, social struck challenges and even in the text, in the language that we have, the laws that we have. For example, in the Philippines, it is always referred to as the male, it is male referenced always, most of the time. If women try to question these stories or the status quo women are publicly ridiculed both online and off line spaces.

In other countries maybe it is the must live   it is -- it is usually equated when we speak about radicalisation or fundamentalism. In the Philippines, it is Catholicism, continues very conservative on what can or cannot be qualified as mainstream. With regards to issues of moralicy or the value system, the church has a power to deny Holy communions, excommunicate citizens who disobey its orders. I remember when we were on the verge of our campaign against reproductive health there are women who even were not allowed to take communion inside of the church because they were wearing something similar to what I'm wearing right now but without my jacket, wearing maybe   they term it sexy clothes. Usually that happens not in the church. The church and women's groups have stood opposite each other, particularly on issues concerning women rights and their bodies. The church has been evasing the opposition to propose laws which seems contrary to the teachings of the church. Most pertain to women's decision making and sexuality. I would like to cite an example in a school in the central Philippines was not allowed to graduate, she posed a picture in her Facebook account wherein she was wearing a swimsuit. She's studying in a Catholic college and not allowed to march during her graduation, she graduated but was not allowed to march because of that picture in her Facebook.

Even that case, which the Supreme Court is challenging, is Facebook a public or private space? The Supreme Court of the Philippines say it is a public space and, therefore, she was not allowed to graduate, not allowed to march because that picture where she was wearing a swimsuit s.

Another case I would like to highlight as regards to the issue of fundamentalism is where a transwoman, her name is Jennifer Loudis, a transwoman and she engaged in sex with a U.S. serviceman in the Philippines. Of course you know the relationship of the Philippines with the U.S. We have we're not supposed to have military basis but there are U.S. servicemen going to the Philippines.

According to this serviceman he thought that she's a woman. Finally, eventually ended up that she's a transwoman and then he killed Jennifer Loudef but the way she was killed, the way that the U.S. serviceman justified the killing, it was like a rage. He was shocked that she was a transwoman. Other groups supported the advocacy for the justice for her and we received a lot of negative messages from our page saying how come we're supporting someone like Jennifer Louden. Again, another case, another example I would like to state is that we tried not to question the status quo, it is when we filed a case, we supported the filing of a case against our current president right now. He mentioned a rape joke when campaigning and we used a law that said all public officials, even those running for election should not make fun of women while campaigning. So eventually when we posted that in Facebook we received a lot of comments saying even come on, this is just a rape joke, I hope you get raped eventually so you know the difference between a rape joke and a real rape. I go back to the issue of fundamentalism. Sometimes when we look at fundamentalism or radicalism we're looking at who has been killed, how many were killed, how she was killed.

I think one thing we have to look at here, sometimes fundamentalism has already become engrained in our society and our everyday life. Sometimes we don't even notice that fundamentalism is part of our everyday life. Violence against women I would like to cite as an example is one of the most common forms of fundamentalism. We know that violence against women, the cause of violence against women is basically because of we think women are properties of men, properties of the father, whoever. I think that the mere fact that sometimes we don't even question why this is happening I think is also we're trying to eventually contribute to reproducing fundamentalism in our own homes, in the school, as academic, NGOs, as scholars, mothers, fathers.

It is really challenging. It is challenging because every day the women, the home, the family, it is space of democratic practice and same with online spaces. We can use this to counter fundamentalism or counter radicalisation. I think as online spaces, it is likes what we did for Jennifer Louden, we have received a message from Facebook saying that our page actually -- it is about advocacy so supporting her as a transwoman saying that our page is offensive. Several of equal media against it is actually offensive the content of the entire Facebook page is to ask, to demand justice for Jennifer Louden because she was killed. These are all -- this is what we call radical democracy. This is why I don't want to use radical. When you want to use radical, you want to question space. You want to question the status quo. You want to look for spaces. Democratic spaces where you negotiate because I think we have to agree that we can descent, we agree to disagree. If we agree to disagree we question each other, we question, we can negotiate and we can come up with a good negotiation and that's something that women can pursue as a narrative. That's the challenge, how women when she counters the so called status quo again are

put into a very bad situation because that's something that's unacceptable to the status quo.

I think organizing women, making their stories digital, there are a lot of women right now that are trying to also tell their stories through social media, through blogging, digitalizing their stories, this is some form of counter narratives, counter narratives of fundamentalism but I think one thing that we can also solve   not really solve but contribute to addressing fundamentalism in our society is how we as advocates here in this forum can counter it not only for the women but for the entire society.

>> LUAVUT ZAHID: I'm going on to Nighat Dad and she's going to be talking about basically starting with who radicalisation is being done against in Pakistan and then moving on to the groups that are most targeted.

>> NIGHAT DAD: I think I would take it on, the term radicalisation is very subjective and it is   it is based on the context and background if we're talking about a particular region. I feel when it comes to Pakistan it is not only the Taliban or other groups who are using online spaces to radicalize people, to recruit young people to promote hate or target a certain set of people but it is also, you know, how the religious groups who are supposed to be banned groups, they're allowed to promote their narrative and the narrative is   it is in a form where one cannot say that it's radicalisation or fundamentalism or extremism but in a form where it is acceptable for not only the governments but for the larger audience and companies also that allow them to, you know, promote their narrative. Also I feel that in Pakistan the existing mechanisms, how they're used, how they're misused to attack people. For instance, the minorities who already are being attacked in off line spaces, they find that the Internet and online spaces can provide a space to express their freedom of expression and share their opinion. The legislations like blasphemy law is being abused to silence these people. I feel this is the radicalization against the minority in Pakistan -- minority in Pakistan. In the same way, the women that are opinionated, who are -- who share their freedom of expression or celebrate their sexuality, and I would mention a recent case here where social media celebrity who was the first women who were using online space, Facebook, social media platforms to celebrate her sexuality and challenges stereotypes and challenged the clergy and extremism groups in Pakistan. She was -- she used to get a lot of hate, not only from the people used to go and enjoy her videos and entertain themselves but also from the progressive element from Pakistan. Eventually she was killed by her own brother in the name of honor because she was using online space to celebrate her sexuality and to be open and exposing the hypocrisy of society. Radicalisation has different forms and based on the context and I feel that the way that the counter narrative is also very tricky and based on the context that the very few same voices would try to counter these extremism on Internet, especially when it comes to Pakistan, it puts them in danger and there's a lot of self-censorship going on because of how the extremists are so organized and the narrative, it is so celebrated and glorified, but the same voices were already few in number and they're being silenced because of either the monitoring, surveillance by the government or the draconian legislations that already exist.

I feel, you know, as an advocate and organizations working on digital rights across regions need to find that how we can build a counter narrative,

how we can join our voices and hands to deal with these challenges in respective the context in our respective countries.

Thank you.

>> I think when it comes to a counter narrative one of the most important things is engaging with platforms like Facebook and Google and we have to be in these spaces.

Ankhi Das, if you could tell us what you're doing to control or to look at radicalisation, the content, what limitations you face when tackling these things and moreover if you face government pressure to kind of promote radicalized, contained, leave it alone in the case of the cybercrime bill that's in Pakistan that will be enacted, this is a situation that you may find yourself in. What are your thoughts surrounding this issue?

Lih, if you could start?

>> LIH SHIUN GOH: Thank you.

The way we look at content, this is an important discussion here about counter narratives. The platform itself, platforms this that regard, it is tremendous egos for the propagation of positive messaging as well. This is my personal opinion in the sense that right knew we tend to over focus on a small group of bad actors with a small part of content and that gets sensationalized a bit. What we're trying to do, we're not experts on extremism and counter terrorism, what we want to do is work better with platforms, with other NGOs, community groups, to help promote the   this is not necessarily counter terrorism, this could be things about focusing on things about the community as a whole, what they agree on, positive common areas to focus on. For instance, tolerance, empathy, love, relationships, and this is also independent of religion, sexuality. For instance in Australia there is a working party to fight against narratives of white supremism and we provide a platform and work with them and they have great social influences and spreads the message on that. That's important. A challenge we face is always how do you create really, really good content narratives. Nowadays it is one hour, two hours, everybody, it is bite sized pieces, some of the learnings it I have seen, for instance in the U.K., they really focus on the content, my content, it needs to be about one minute to two minutes long, it can't be more than 5 minutes, it doesn't capture the attention of the audience. In terms of the process, it is also a process where you need constant engagement, you look at what YouTube creators   you look at what YouTube creators are doing now. That's the same thing you have to think about, you constantly engage the use out there, not only use but it could be a middle age man or women or a young fresh person, they want to get more information, how do you create the kind of content that they can engage in and also respond to. Right, it's about creating new means, putting up reassuring videos to issues like that so that in some sense from at least a government it policy, I'm not alone in in fight, I have been working very closely with many.

In that sense, you think about it in Malaysia, there is a lot of Islam activities going on around counter terrorism, a challenge we face is finding good NGOs to work with to kind of create the content. We worked with some NGOs, and the common challenge we find is how to get   how do we get Malaysia people to set up to create this content. There will be a lot of questions on this. I want to leave people with it is something that we as a community, something we can do and actors can do what you need to do. For us, we create

the platforms and will provide connections for creators to work with NGOs to create content.

>> LUAVUT ZAHID: Thank you so much.

Ankhi Das, if you could shoot out the answers to the same questions, please.

>> ANKHI DAS: The same issue that Jac had.

I want to talk about a couple of things.

One, of course, want preventive side, in terms of how do you make sure that there is an open platform. Obviously different types of content that are posted on the platform. One important thing to understand is that there are standards strictly on Facebook that strictly prohibit obligation and dissemination of the risk content. Our community of users flag various types of various content routinely and they're reviewed and taken down if found to be in violation of the standards, community standards and international standards.

We have 24/7 teams working 24/7 and also having various kinds of language capabilities to make sure that this is addressed expeditiously to take down those things expeditiously. That's one part of the action. In terms of counter narrative, it is important to understand that on the points which jack talked about, there is a phenomenon, there is a social reality and phenomena of this affection and therefore, you know, if you see the way recruitment is happening across the world, the reasonable why it is a global phenomenon is because of the lure of being a part of an alternative community and alternative problem solving effort with different youth groups in different countries that are attracted.

In terms of looking at what types of counter narrative really works, we commissioned a research with a group in Europe. In the first case, research which they came out with, they found that narratives which are fuzzy and it is a marketing, it has to be a marketing, it has to be a marketing campaign which is those are the types of counter narrative, when taking on radicalisation which works best. They have used Facebooks API and looked at a variety of pages where there are different young people that are intervening on radical on pages promoting radical content and challenging some of the notions which will be put out over there. Through those -- through the kind of analysis which demonstrate that, it was felt that they were able to create some kind of a prototype in terms of what is the type of content which goes viral very quickly in terms of challenging some of this radicalized content that's being put online. A lot was is related it content and of course there were people challenging that. That happened in France in the week of the various attacks as well as a huge amount in the U.K. as well, people engaging in the conversations on the public pages and challenging that kind of radical conversation. In addition to that, in terms of the developing counter narrative we launched a peer to peer challenge across universities in 50 countries and 5,000 students participated and out of the entries, including a person from Afghanistan, a group from Afghanistan, it was in terms of creating counter narrative marketing materials and narratives which have been found on the Internet, which are found most effective in terms of dealing with encountering the radical hate speech and radical communities and these around the world, there is an event being planned in D.C. and the recognition, it is a big way of looking at what kind of speech and hopefully it is what happens in DC and there is an awareness,

that you have -- that there is a possibility of using Internet -- the worldwide web as a platform for taking on a lot of these bad things which are happening and maybe it will provide as a model or an example to a lot of people to organize themselves. We hope to run the peer to peer challenge on an annual basis and encourage more such sufficient ran position on the platform. I encourage people to look at this particular Facebook page, online civil courage. It is it is an effort, it is a page which has been set up by the center for history of radicalisation and political violence and others and a German NGO and essentially they are talking and creating public narratives and campaigns that take on radicalisation. What we're seeing is just causes, different types of causes that have created campaigns on Facebook.

We're seeing a lot of the strategic think tanks working in the area and are now working with community groups with locals to find out what is the right way in terms of shaping a communication message to make sure that there is voice to alternative narratives out there. That's what we're seeing happening. We have been as a company as a company we have been partnering with these kinds of groups that do that work.

I think broadly speaking globally there is a supply side challenge. You know, there has been a lot of work that's just happened in the area of families with women right points and there are groups that are really cutting it out for the longest time and creating these communities. When it comes to countering CPE, it is a new -- in terms of the Internet world, it is a new phenomenon and there is a supply side challenge. All of us have to think about who are these groups that are working in these areas, how can they be encouraged and self-mobilize themselves in terms of creating these and being it issue in the communities and the IGF framework and we're happy to see this time at the IGF and a proposal has even gone through for the Mexico meeting, it is the first time that there is a workshop that's discussing country radicalisation on the Internet. Clearly the more there is a spotlight and global attention, there is a need for these kinds of corrections and these kinds of groups, they need to get involved in this kind of a global dialogue and I think it will be helpful for all.

>> LUAVUT ZAHID: We're going to start the question and answer session now. We're short on time. We'll make it a bit quick.

We have a question through the live feed which I'll start with. This is Chester Soong on the topic of online extremism and radicalisation would speakers on the panel consider the social divide and how it contributes to the radicalisation of one's countries or citizens? If so, what would you suggest to improve the situation? Should I repeat the question? On the topic of online

Extremism and radicalisation would speakers on the panel consider the social divide and how it contributes to the radicalisation of one's countries or citizens? If so, what would you suggest to improve the situation? Should I repeat. Very quickly, I think -- I think there is one sector but it is not the only sector, there are many reasons for radicalisation and we have to be careful not to over generalize the sectors and how people refer to extremism ideology. There is one thought about how radicalisation of people go online to find information but it is important to recognize that when people go online people have networks -- to have a pot active network a positive network, they have to -- some could be more dangerous, that regard

in terms of social divide, access to information, how to continue to have the access of information, Internet, and making sure that we provide when they go online the right platforms. They're accessible in the information and so that they can know who they can talk to and get access to the spectrum of these organizations.

     I agree with the point which my friend from Google has made. I think we should avoid risks of over generalization. I think this entire point is that affection and the lure of issues raised by lack of economic opportunity is a very -- it is a narrative out there. There are various factors of radicalisation and a part of that, a very big part of that, it is as Jac said, correctly said, different types as he said, different types of fundamentalism and different types of fundamentalism, that's all important to contribute to practice. To isolate and to look at it around lack of economic opportunity is an oversimplification and there are different countries who are trying to tackle it in different ways. In terms of economic growth, jobs, et cetera, but if you were to survey all of the countries in the world and look at countries which have low incomes like low income families and figure out how many of them have a problem and why some do and why some don't, I think there is a combination of factors which is more than just lack of economic opportunity.

     >> LUAVUT ZAHID: With this, I would like to open the floor for questions. Does anyone have any?

     >> AUDIENCE: I have two questions, and this is probably a background, but looking at a had country with extremism and digital rights issues that it raises in terms of proposals that have been out for the last few years particularly from the U.S. administration and from the European Union as well, there are various proposals we have seen and elsewhere, I would like to hear the responses, one is on the issue half -- we have been concerned that some efforts that people, that the ideas are fantastic and people are being encouraged to remove content and is there a reduction and I'm curious if you have seen a reduction in the requests coming from platforms because -- from the platforms because we have seen that in relation to Isis content it is legitimate that governments are requesting or asking for stuff to be taken on, particularly from academic working on different issues and other issues that are known, and then the policy positioning, providing the algorithm and the content that's still out   this is part of the legislation, the White House, it is part of some -- the E.U., other governments are asking on that. Maybe two questions, one is are you seeing a reduction or change in mass shutdowns based on the mass take down requests, based on requests that you have   and secondly, in this case, what's the policy positioning that you have on algorithmic modification of content or even algorithmic you a toy flagging, there was a story that are Rutgers carried a few weeks ago that companies are having teams algorithmically flag content, not just for viewing or for complete suspension.

     >> LUAVUT ZAHID: Ankhi, if you could answer that?

     >> ANKHI DAS: In terms of the mass demands that you're talking about are you referencing to law enforcement agencies in vary yes, sir parts of the world -- in various parts of the world. In terms of the capacity of law enforcement agencies, it is getting more sophisticated so the mass demands which one would see earlier, that's reduced quite a lot. I think a lot of that's happened because of the kind of advocacy work which the Human Rights

community and Civil Society has done and there is a push back and it is not -- but there is the transparency report also and the way that every six months these reports are being put out and there is a discrepancy between the amounts demanded and those complied with it leads to a degree of self-discipline on the parts ever agencies to make sure that frivolous demands, demands that do not satisfy the requirement of that type of demand being made, that kind of self-discipline has come in.

In terms of -- in terms of what platforms are doing, in terms of take down, reviewing, definitely the tools, the sophistication of the tools, it is kind of developing a lot more in terms of what language capacity, a lot of this material, there is a deep language element to it which we cannot ignore. Those competencies are being bill of indictment up a lot in terms of   in terms of looking at that content when it is flagged almost immediately because earlier a lot of language capabilities were not there, I can speak from our side but we're building up more capability in Arabic and other languages, et cetera, where a lot of this radicalized speech is happening and that's helping in making sure that the volume is addressed.

>> On the policy side quickly as well, this is difficult in a way that -- in a situation before this, to control speeches, right, that should be   it the speech, it could cause immediate harm, but then because our worry about okay, probably the speech, it may not be in the immediate but as time goes by bit by bit the harder incrementally, right, goals and so that there is some tendency to think that -- to prevent this from the start, we should limit that speech that maybe -- if we allow this for another five years, two years, violence may occur. But to allow something like that, I think it is going to be very problematic and scary. In the end the term like hate speech, for example in our last constitution draft they actually have these words like hate speech in one of the sections, the media, they shouldn't -- they shouldn't allow hate speech to be presented on that platform and if they're not doing this then their rights would be   but then the implication of the hate speech in that context, it is very big and it can be anything. It is not like filtering, it was a speech that properly leads to radicalisation but introduces something of how does -- how will the technology provide more context, provide more commonality, for example I don't know if it is possible once you share something, some support, a statement that's suppose something and then immediately under that link it is provided under the statement against that link. Just a question, I think it is a question to allow the ability to sensor the radical fundamentalism comment.

Thank you.

>> AUDIENCE: I have a question and also on the algorithm. We know that this is important in creating communication and also in my creating legal, the communications, from different parties, and as we know that recently Facebook just changed the algorithm that's easier to see your friends and family's posts rather than other pages. And then you stop the NGO groups that constantly have some focus on particular social issues and translate information to people who like their pages.

What is the motivation of this kind of change? A lot of NGO groups are concerned about this issue, how the information can be seen more on Facebook.

>> ANKHI DAS: That's a fair question. A question that we receive from not only different groups but also from publishers and I'm happy to answer

that question. The whole philosophy of Facebook is to make sure that we're helping build stronger connection between friends and families. We're a mission driven country, going back to that core mission, the algorithm was revised in a way so that people can see more content which is posted by their friends or from their family. Like people that are part of their daily lives as opposed to pages. What this does for any publisher for any publisher group or for any cause group, a publisher on Facebook, it is to make sure that their organic content is of a higher quality, their news feed is of a higher quality so that it is shared among friends and family. If your content is really compelling and shared by me with my other friends the priority of that content appearing in that particular feed appearing in other peoples' news feed in Facebook is very high. What it does, it lifts the quality across the board. The main question is this content compelling enough for people to be sharing it amongst each other and that's getting a higher quality score and that happens determining how people are viewing content. That's a philosophy behind it. Publishers have to work harder to make their content more compelling.

>> I would like to.

Could back to this topic on counter narratives getting too much attention. Just yesterday there was a new study released from the U.K. that search engines and radicalisation, the role in radicalisation, it is very, very strong. Just every month 500 words on returned Islamist material. This may be one of the first studies that shows a role of search engines in radicalisation. It is the optimization. The role of the intermediary, it should be challenged much more.

>> Do you want to take that? I think -- let's start with the principle of what search engines are like. The search engines are   what they do, there is a mirror as to what are the worries out there, it reflects that's out there that's on the Internet and for people -- I think -- I agree, it is dangerous for the content to be out there.

It might -- it may sound defensive to say this but it is also very dangerous to think about the fact that you can use search engines to block out. It is only reflecting, it doesn't mean that you remove the content, and you may turn people down to   it is much harder for it to do the counter narrative work.

In terms of the ranking and things like that.

That's where -- that's where we do our job to train people and tell people how do you make your website, for instance be more relevant to the people searching for relevant content.

For instance, I recently -- I had made changes. If the websites, they're more optimized and we -- we access how good they are. How the optimized websites are, the ranking is better from such things. It is not -- it is not an push of removing content online. That's the dangerous thing to talk about. Let's think about how to put in more good content on it line and making sure that they -- they're in a great place such that people can find the content easily. So we do it, we have what we call a Google for nonprofit content. Nonprofits can apply to be on a program and they use advertising to target.

>> AUDIENCE: I have one question, you know, there is always a terror to another and a freedom fighter to another one. Just here right now, we talk about ISIS but let's not forget about others and that kind of organization.

My question is if we're going to ban all of the hate speech and this radicalization and terrorism term, we know about the true content and definition of it based on the multicultural definition. Maybe we'll have a   the radicalization, for example, ass in Mexico, they're using a lot of social media campaign, anything that campaigns to publicize their work and liberation fund.

>> LUAVUT ZAHID: I'll interrupt here. We have little time left. If we can quickly get the questions from the floor and very quickly try to answer them. Could you just --

>> AUDIENCE: I have a question and comment. First, I'm feeling confused about what we're referring to as radicalisation. The way I see it, at least the international documents are pretty straight with their definition of radicalisation when looking at religion, right, but the discussions are also now being expanded to nationalism which is true with social issues and that's a serious discussion for us to have about how we define radicalization and what particular aspect ever radicalization, whether it is a religion or not is something we have to talk about.

I'm going to ask you the other question, I had a larger point. the other question is that international documents that are looking at this aspect of religion being used to shut down freedom of expression are not really looking at digital spaces. The primary document in this regard is the action plan. The action plan completely says nothing about women, says nothing about the digital spaces. If you're looking at finding a way to advocate on this, we have to deaf live engage on the action process and the plan and the processes associated with that.

Secondly, the special Rapporteur and free.

Do of religion came out with a report at some point in time last year in the March session if I'm not wrong. He doesn't talk about digital spaces. These would be really important for us to engage with if we want the solution. To get that solution we have to be clear on whether we're talking about religion or not.

>> AUDIENCE: I'm from Korea. The Holy Grail of the intermediary library relies on the intermediate being   that information not be held liable, liable for users, third party contents but when they're filtering or moderating contents, they cannot -- they cannot request the liability under the intermediary liability principals, when you talk about the radicalisation or censoring or filtering this dangerous or information or hate speech we should keep in mind that in my free speech for all, there is a case   a case in Korea that certain -- certain Facebook posting was taken down or the persons were suspended for dubious   it was not even hate speech or it was for   it was not hate speech. It was taken down according to Facebook community standard. When you ask Facebook, why the posting was taken down and they just said that it was a mistake.

I think -- now Facebook, Google, they're censoring and filtering, the information was turned on and they should provide those posters the right to appeal to the contents that are taken down and the people that got their account suspended. I'm wondering whether you have any plans to recognize those rights.

>> By now we all recognize the social media and traditional Internet forum YouTube and search engines to do not contribute to help solve the problem because I think we use those tools that shape the conversation and

shapes the culture coming out of that and the Internet is a louder space and those tools are rewarding it the loudest comments and more polarized comments. This is a similar problem that the communities are trying to solve and bring new tools building consensus, here in Taiwan we have other tools that a new platform is trying to make   to reward those comments, the highest agreement across different opinion groups. I think if we as an Internet, community, there is a radicalization that's a problem that needs to be addressed. The real counter narrative relies in the tool that we have to build, experiment with and to have a new way of conversation happening online.

    Would the panelists please comment on that here and that need here, what could be a solution to this problem. Thank you.

    >> LUAVUT ZAHID: I'm sorry. We have no time for the questions.

    >> Very briefly, somebody mentioned international documents, there is one, it is called Sustainable Development Goals. We're all working towards those. They refer to the need for education, equal access to education including for girls and women to bring them up to the standards that their male colleagues enjoy, which have to work through those and include education programs where they're missing the education for toleration, for toleration of other opposing views. Those things need to be included in curriculum in schools from an early age and maybe NGOs, grass root groups fled to bring these things to the attention of your governments, ministries, and ask them if they actually want to apply these international commitments that their governments have signed.

    >> LUAVUT ZAHID: That's a good comment actually. Thank you for providing that. If you could take up the question about the definition of radicalization? We discussed this yesterday. I think it would be a good thing if you can elaborate on this as well. Very briefly and quickly if possible, please.

    >> I don't know the answer. Personally for me, as families, we put meanings, right? We create meanings to every word that we want to see. As I started my presentation, radical for me has a positive meaning. Radical is trying to question things, questioning the status quo. Because we connected with ISIS and extremism, radicalisation now, it has a different meaning. If you look at the little R, radicalisation, it both addresses positive and negative radicalisation. I think that something has to be defined not only by the speakers here but actually I share the same sentiment, are we going to use radicalisation? Going to use another word? If we're going to define radicalisation maybe we also have to put in context the different experiences and context not only of those in the online, offline spaces and of other marginalized groups who have been victimized by the negative radicalisation, we can continue to discuss this, maybe not just here but also in the next IGF to really have a continuing discussion on what's radicalisation and how online space has used radicalisation in its negative sense.

    >> LUAVUT ZAHID: I'll then move on to the remainder of the questions, seems like most of our inquiries were actually targeting Facebook and Google which is telling if anything. If you want to take it up, I know Ankh, you wanted to say something?

    >> ANKHI DAS: I think the point, the question was asked is if there is abuse in terms of file take down. In terms of a profile take down, there is abuse process, the information is there and in the help center. The space is provided for. We did billions of pieces of content that is reported and

reviewed and then it is the developing it, it is the developing capacity which has been addressed. We do   we make some mistakes and apologize when we make that mistake and you have that process.

>> LUAVUT ZAHID: You wants to take the last question, Lih?

>> LIH SHIUN GOH: What else can be done, it is interesting, I work with NGOs in Malaysia on this and they realize that this online platform is one avenue and it is important to go in the communities themselves, they do a lot of offline engagements and we're supporting them in that regard and you have to get to people that are not necessarily online but can be radicalized in different ways, the Internet is one platform but if we're serious on working against -- working to counter this, it you have to think about it in various modalities, not just in the digital one. It is very easy to think about digital because we just   it is closer to us but it is a lot more work in the communities, in the villages.

>> LUAVUT ZAHID: Thank you. With that, I have to end the session. I think we're taking up people's time. Thank you for being here with us. I would like to thank all of our panelists for their input.

Please go have lunch now.

***

***