newstarget.com

Jack Dorsey admits 'biggest mistake' was creating authoritarian censorship toolbox

9-12 minutes

Jack Dorsey admits 'biggest

mistake' was creating authoritarian censorship toolbox

Having had his little tête-à-tête with the current boss of Twitter – over Child abuse protection – the former boss of Twitter, Jack Dorsey, took to Twitter tonight to address a number of issues, including his take on The Twitter Files (which he appears to address as if he was an outsider) and his 'biggest mistake' as well.

(Article by Tyler Durden republished from ZeroHedge.com)

As a reminder, the current boss of Twitter had this to say recently about Dorsey's role in the past:

Absolutely! The real CEO was the head of "Trust & Safety".

— Elon Musk (@elonmusk) December 9, 2022

Jack Dorsey titled the blog post ['A native internet protocol for](A native internet protocol for)

[social media' (emphasis ours):](#)

There's a lot of conversation around the [#TwitterFiles](#). Here's my take, and thoughts on **how to fix the issues identified.**

I'll start with the principles I've come to believe…based on everything I've learned and experienced through my past actions as a Twitter co-founder and lead:

1. Social media must be resilient to corporate and government

control.

2. Only the original author may remove content they produce.

3. Moderation is best implemented by algorithmic choice.

The Twitter when I led it and the Twitter of today do not meet any of these principles. This is my fault alone, as I completely gave up pushing for them when an activist entered our stock in 2020. I no longer had hope of

achieving any of it as a public company with no defense mechanisms (lack of dual-class shares being a key one). I planned my exit at that moment knowing I was no longer right for the company.

The biggest mistake I made was continuing to invest in building *tools for us to manage* the public conversation, versus building *tools for the

people using Twitter to easily manage it for themselves.

This burdened the company with too much power, and opened us to significant outside pressure (such as advertising budgets).

I generally think companies have become far too powerful, and that became completely clear to me with our suspension of Trump's account. As I've said before, we did the right thing for the

public company business at the time, but the wrong thing for the internet and society. Much more about this here:

> I do not celebrate or feel pride in our having to ban [@realDonaldTrump](#) from Twitter, or how we got here. After a clear warning we'd take this action, we made a decision with the best information we had based on threats to physical safety both on and off Twitter. Was this correct?

— jack (@jack) [January 14, 2021](#)

I continue to believe there was no ill intent or hidden agendas, and everyone acted according to the best information we had at the time. Of course mistakes were made. But if we had focused more on tools for the people using the service rather than tools for us, and moved much faster towards absolute transparency, we probably

wouldn't be in this situation of needing a fresh reset (which I am supportive of). Again, I own all of this and our actions, and all I can do is work to make it right.

Back to the principles. **Of course governments want to shape and control the public conversation, and will use every method at their disposal to do so,** including the media. And the power a corporation wields to do the

same is only growing. **It's critical that the people have tools to resist this, and that those tools are ultimately owned by the people.** Allowing a government or a few corporations to own the public conversation is a path towards centralized control.

I'm a strong believer that any content produced by someone for the internet should be permanent until the original

author chooses to delete it. It should be always available and addressable. **Content takedowns and suspensions should not be possible.** Doing so complicates important context, learning, and enforcement of illegal activity. There are significant issues with this stance of course, but starting with this principle will allow for far better solutions than we have today. The internet is

trending towards a world were storage is "free" and infinite, which places all the actual value on how to discover and see content.

Which brings me to the last principle: moderation. **I don't believe a centralized system can do content moderation globally. It can only be** [done through ranking and relevance algorithms](#)**, the more localized the better.** But instead of a company or government

building and controlling these solely, people should be able to build and choose from algorithms that best match their criteria, or not have to use any at all. A "follow" action should always deliver every bit of content from the corresponding account, and the algorithms should be able to comb through everything else through a relevance lens that an individual determines. There's a default "G-rated"

algorithm, and then there's everything else one can imagine.

The only way I know of to truly live up to these 3 principles is a free and open protocol for social media, that is not owned by a single company or group of companies, and is resilient to corporate and government influence. The problem today is that we have companies who own both the protocol and

discovery of content. Which ultimately puts one person in charge of what's available and seen, or not. This is by definition a single point of failure, no matter how great the person, and over time will fracture the public conversation, and may lead to more control by governments and corporations around the world.

I believe many companies can build a phenomenal business

off an open protocol. For proof, look at both the web and email. The biggest problem with these models however is that the discovery mechanisms are far too proprietary and fixed instead of open or extendable. Companies can build many profitable services that complement rather than lock down how we access this massive collection of conversation. There is no need to own or host it themselves.

Many of you won't trust this solution just because it's me stating it. I get it, but that's exactly the point. Trusting any one individual with this comes with compromises, not to mention being way too heavy a burden for the individual. It has to be something akin to what bitcoin has shown to be possible. If you want proof of this, get out of the US and European bubble of the bitcoin price fluctuations and learn

how real people are using it for censorship resistance in Africa and Central/South America.

I do still wish for Twitter, and every company, to become uncomfortably transparent in all their actions, and I wish I forced more of that years ago. **I do believe absolute transparency builds trust.** As for the files, I wish they were released Wikileaks-style, with many more eyes and interpretations to consider. And

along with that, commitments of transparency for present and future actions. I'm hopeful all of this will happen. There's nothing to hide…only a lot to learn from. **The current attacks on my former colleagues could be dangerous and doesn't solve anything. If you want to blame, direct it at me and my actions, or lack thereof.**

As far as the free and open social media protocol goes,

there are many competing projects: [@bluesky](#) is one with the [AT Protocol](#), Mastodon another, Matrix yet another… and there will be many more. One will have a chance at becoming a standard like HTTP or SMTP. This isn't about a "decentralized Twitter." This is a focused and urgent push for a foundational core technology standard to **make social media a native part of the internet**. I believe this is

critical both to Twitter's future, and the public conversation's ability to truly serve the people, which helps hold governments and corporations accountable. And hopefully makes it all a lot more fun and informative again.

????

To accelerate open internet and protocol work, I'm going to open a new category of [#startsmall](#) grants: "open internet development." It will

start with a focus of giving cash and equity grants to engineering teams working on social media and private communication protocols, bitcoin, and a web-only mobile OS. I'll [make some grants](#) next week, starting with $1mm/yr to [Signal](#). Please let me know other great candidates for this money.

*   *   *

As you might imagine, Dorsey's holier-than-thou views

prompted some pushback on social media…

> I agree users should be in charge of their own algorithms and a few other things. It's a bit late for these epiphanies, sadly.
>
> — (((clevecarole))) (@Clevecarole) [December 13, 2022](#)

> If you knew how to fix it, why didnt you when you had the chance ?

— Iain (@iain3000) [December 13, 2022](#)

Too little to late.

— Omnimatty (@omnimattyc) [December 13, 2022](#)

[@jack](#) You caved and history will remember you as a coward. That is all.

— CryptoJbot (@CryptoJbot) [December 13, 2022](#)

You hired people that thought alike and then gave them free reign to do as they wished.

They banned and suspended on a whim for wrong speak.

— Tyrone Jackson (@TyroneBJackson) December 13, 2022

This is pretty weak. I'd just accept the responsibility that Twitter was being run by a cult of middle managers who had personal opinions and vendettas against certain accounts. In addition, you allowed child exploitation, for that you should apologize.

— Chef Andrew Gruel (@ChefGruel) [December 13, 2022](#)

I read it, it doesn't really make any sense.

Summary: We did the right thing but it was the wrong thing. It was simultaneously not wrong at the time but clearly wrong at the time. I was the CEO but I was a nobody. There was nothing I could do but I had total power.

— Lastdance ??

(@Lastdance_LL) December 13, 2022

Read more at: ZeroHedge.com

Submit a correction >>