

2024

Are Free Speech, a Free Press, and Civic Discourse Essential to Human Flourishing?

Myroslava Gongadze

Raymond Ku

Dan Moulthrop

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/ijel>

Recommended Citation

Gongadze, Myroslava; Ku, Raymond; and Moulthrop, Dan (2024) "Are Free Speech, a Free Press, and Civic Discourse Essential to Human Flourishing?," *The International Journal of Ethical Leadership*: Vol. 11, Article 19.

Available at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/ijel/vol11/iss1/19>

This Symposium is brought to you for free and open access by the Cross Disciplinary Publications at Case Western Reserve University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in The International Journal of Ethical Leadership by an authorized administrator of Case Western Reserve University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

Are Free Speech, a Free Press, and Civic Discourse Essential to Human Flourishing?

2023 Inamori Ethics Prize Symposium

September 22, 2023

Myroslava Gongadze

Eastern Europe Chief for Voice of America and
the 2023 Inamori Ethics Prize recipient

Dan Moulthrop

CEO of the City Club of Cleveland, one of the nation's
great free speech forums

Professor Raymond Ku

an internationally recognized scholar who writes on legal
issues impacting individual liberty, creativity, and technology

WARD: Good afternoon, honored guests. I am Joy Ward, interim Provost and Executive Vice President of Case Western Reserve University. It is my pleasure to welcome you to the 2023 Inamori Ethics Prize Academic Symposium. Joining me on stage today are Myroslava Gongadze, the Eastern Europe Chief for Voice of America and the 2023 Inamori Ethics Prize recipient. I also want to point out that her two daughters are in the audience. Nana and Salome, if you wouldn't mind standing, we would love to greet you.

I also have Shannon French, the Inamori Professor in Ethics and director of the Inamori International Center for Ethics and Excellence. Also in the panel is Professor Raymond Ku, who is an internationally recognized scholar who writes on legal issues impacting individual liberty, creativity, and technology. And also we have Dan Moulthrop, the CEO of the City Club of Cleveland, one of the nation's great free speech forums. Please join me in welcoming all our guests and panelists.

We are here because of the vision and generosity of Dr. Inamori and the Inamori Foundation, whose generous endowment created the Inamori International Center for Ethics and Excellence at Case Western Reserve University, along with the annual Inamori Ethics Prize. We hope you were able to join us last night for the presentation of the 2023 Inamori Ethics Prize to Myroslava Gongadze. I would like to again acknowledge community

partners who have made these events possible. Your good guidance, your donations, and especially your translations from English to Ukrainian and between Japanese and English have been so very helpful and important. You will find a complete list of these benefactors in your program. In addition to our Case Western Reserve students, we are delighted with today to have students from our local high schools, including Shaker Heights High School. Thank you all for being a part of the event.

Your generation is very important to us, and we're glad that you are here with us. We want to get into our conversation as quickly as possible, but first let me briefly tell you a bit about our panelists, beginning with our 2023 Inamori Ethics Prize honoree, Ms. Myroslava Gongadze. Myroslava is a renowned journalist and human rights advocate. Born in Ukraine, Myroslava attended the Ivan Franko National University of Lviv and earned a master's degree in civic law. With an insatiable appetite for knowledge and a strong desire to find the truth, she was ultimately led to a career in journalism. Her name has since been synonymous with one of the most high-profile cases in Ukraine's history, the tragic death of her husband, investigative journalist Georgiy Gongadze. It is still unclear who ordered the killing, but ex-president Leonid Kuchma and his administration have long been implicated in the murder. Myroslava's response to this tragedy was not one of defeat, but rather a call to action. She sought justice for her husband and the rule of law in Ukraine by filing a complaint with the European Court of Human Rights, setting a precedent for countless others to seek justice. Her demands for transparency set into motion a series of events that later grew into the 2000 Orange Revolution, ultimately leading to free and fair elections in Ukraine.

Today, Myroslava is the first Eastern Europe Chief at Voice of America, which is widely considered to be the most trusted news source in Ukraine. There, she leads regional coverage while reporting on the Russian invasion in her homeland. Her courage and dedication to the truth have inspired generations of journalists, activists, and changemakers. We are thrilled and most honored to have Ms. Gongadze with us here today. Joining her on our panel today are two other distinguished guests: Dan Moulthrop, CEO of the City Club of Cleveland, and Case Western Reserve University's own Professor Raymond Ku. Dan Moulthrop is CEO of the City Club of Cleveland, one of the nation's great free speech forums. Founded in 1912, the City Club convenes more than one hundred programs every year on just about every issue and topic of importance in Northeast Ohio. He

previously served as a public high school English teacher before becoming the award-winning host of *Sound of Ideas* as part of the team at Ideastream Public Media. Professor Raymond Ku is the John Homer Kapp Professor of Law. An internationally recognized scholar, Professor Ku writes on legal issues impacting individual liberty, creativity, and technology. His areas of expertise include constitutional law, cyber law, privacy, and copyright. You can read more about our panelists in our online program. Now I look forward to hearing this conversation, and I hope all of you will take this opportunity to listen and to engage with our panelists. At this time I turn the program over to Dr. Shannon French, the Inamori Professor in Ethics who will moderate today's panel discussion entitled, "Are Free Speech, a Free Press and Civic Discourse Essential to Human Flourishing?" Thank you, and I'll have you take it away.

FRENCH: Thank you so much, Provost Ward. It's a pleasure to be with you all today this afternoon for such an important discussion, and we're going to begin with me exercising the moderator's privilege to ask a few questions, but all of you get a chance as well. Do you see the microphones in the center aisle? Those will be opened up partway into our event so that you can line up and ask a question yourselves, if you would like, of any or all of our panelists. But before I even launch my first question, we have a delightful surprise that we want to share with our esteemed guest that she is not aware of and that is—for those of you were at the ceremony last night, you heard there were many political commendations that were sent to honor Myroslava and the winning of this award. Well there was one more that we are going to share with you right now. It's a nice little piece of paper that says, "Dear Mrs. Gongadze, congratulations on your recent achievement. Your hard work and perseverance have led you to this moment, and it is my wish that these principles continue to guide you in your endeavors yet to come. I wish you the very best and look forward to seeing you wherever the future takes you. Sincerely, President Joe Biden."

Congratulations. So, with that, [laughs] I will now not give you any time to absorb that, but launch right into a question. I'm cool like that. [Laughs] I'll at least let her look at it for one second.

GONGADZE: Oh my God.

FRENCH: Oh, and we'll get that framed for you, if you like. [Laughs]

GONGADZE: I'll tell you the story about President Biden later. [Laughs]

FRENCH: [Laughs] So, Myroslava, and I'm going to be informal and call our guests by their first names so—they let me do that. [Laughs] Myroslava, in your excellent talk last night at the ceremony, you spoke about the importance of the pursuit of truth. We know that journalism has always been about exposing facts even when, or maybe especially when, they're hard to hear. That's the reason why the motto of *The Washington Post*, for example, is "Democracy dies in darkness." But today, people seem to have a greater ability than ever to avoid news that they don't like and to dismiss facts as fake. What can journalists like yourself do to help guide people back to confronting facts and trusting honest reporting?

GONGADZE: Thank you, Shannon. I think you should sit because I feel bad that you're standing; we'll have a long conversation. Thank you, everyone, for coming, and this is a simple but difficult question because, true, in the last, I would say twenty years, we see the trend where social media becomes a media instead of traditional media. The traditional media are dying. But let's see in history what traditional media were doing to our society. They were basically taking information, sifting it, looking for the facts, analyzing, making sure that the information that they are receiving are correct, and only then they were publishing the news. What we have now, the traditional media are dying, and we are getting information from social media, so anyone can say whatever they want and that pollutes the informational sphere with different sorts of impressions, assumptions, not-facts, disinformation, and so on, and this has become a problem for our society because if you don't have facts, you cannot make educated decisions. If you don't make educated decisions and are making your decisions on your assumptions, then you cannot basically, let's say, elect your officials, who would be representing you—on a factual note, not on whatever they think about or are trying to pretend to be, and that's the threat for our democracy, and we are clearly in the last couple of years seeing this trend, not only in the United States, but around the world. So we, as journalists, many of us, we have to have principles, and we have to obey the principles. It's very important for us to check our own sources and help the public—you in some way understand what is fact—what is true and what is not true. You as a public—it's not only my responsibility as a journalist to give you facts. Your responsibility as a society is to look at them, analyze them, use your higher brain. Don't make decisions from your emotions, think about it, only then check your sources—don't trust

me, look at other sources, make sure that you actually find those who you can trust, and only then make your own decision. So basically it's not only my job—it's all our job to actually withhold the facts, withhold the truths, and make those educated decisions.

FRENCH: Thank you so much, and I think many of us appreciate this kind of guidance in trying to seek out the truth, because it has gotten harder, and I'd like to continue on that theme. Dan, you've worked passionately for years to try to harness social media for civic good and generally resist attempts overall to undermine civic virtues. You cofounded the Civic Comments for that reason, and certainly you continue to push people to engage with real experts and have civil but fact-based discussions at the City Club of Cleveland and elsewhere. So my question to you is: How hopeful are you that it's possible to resist the kind of erosion that we're talking about, the kind of erosion of healthy civic discourse that people are concerned for?

MOULTHROP: Thank you very much, Shannon, and thanks also to the Inamori Foundation for inviting us and for the gift that started all of this. I need to say first, Myroslava, it is an absolute honor to share a stage with you. I'm more than a little intimidated. I try to take a long view with some of these sorts of things because it's very easy to take a look at what's happening right now, in this moment, and see all the signs that democracy is crumbling. But when you look through history, there have been countless moments when inventions and innovations have disrupted the way that discourse happens. The printing press produced pamphlets, and now suddenly everybody's walking around with Thomas Payne in their pocket, and that changes everything, right? And then people are and, quite famously, it's not as if our Founding Fathers were particularly civil to one another—they were lying to one another's face and going behind one another's backs and publishing things anonymously to try to take one another down at times.

FRENCH: They might as well have been on Twitter... [Laughs] Or X, or whatever.

MOULTHROP: Yes! And so I think that we have seen versions of this, iterations of this. I'm not going to say that we've seen this before—we've seen versions and iterations of disinformation and misinformation campaigns in the past, and the Republic has endured, somehow. It hasn't always endured well, but it has continued, and so—and I'm speaking of course only about American democracy right now—this centuries-long experiment that we've

been engaged in has had a remarkable staying power and a really surprising staying power. So you asked if I am hopeful. I am hopeful. I continue to be hopeful because there are enough well-meaning people in this democracy who continue to insist on civility and insist on engagement with facts and insist on confronting those who would traffic in misinformation and disinformation. But it doesn't happen on its own, it only happens because those of us in civil society who have a platform, whether it's a college campus and an event like this, or our platform at the City Club, or the media enterprise, insist on the truth and continue to insist on the truth and continue to insist on robust engagement. And I think that the same is true in other democracies around the world and in other places where democracy might still take hold. There are always well-meaning people dissenting, as you were, and your husband was many years ago, laying the groundwork for democracy and a commitment to truth to prevail.

GONGADZE: Can I add a few words?

FRENCH: Yes, please.

GONGADZE: About social media and the information revolution that we are leading through right now, so basically you're right. I mean, in the early last century we had the Industrial Revolution and basically right now we have the information revolution. However, what was important back then, when the lawmakers came and they regulated monopolies, right? And I think it's very important right now to actually start, I mean it's already there, the discourse is there to talk about regulating social media. I spent a whole year at Harvard in media class. We were trying to find a way to do this. It's almost impossible. It's very, very difficult, but I think to save our democracy, we have to find a way. Because now it's a question, are social media, media, or are they a social platform. What is this, why are they spreading news, they're spreading disinformation. There has to be a way to regulate. We have five big internet moguls in the world right now, and it's not serving us well. In some ways it does, however we have to be very vigilant and start really doing something about these monopolies.

FRENCH: You've given a perfect transition for me to come over to you, Ray, because as we are hearing both the urgency and the importance of these issues right now in the democracy in the US, but also in other democracies. I wanted to ask you, Ray, so you're a leading international legal scholar, and you work at that intersection of liberty and creativity and technology. Can you please help us understand why it is so important to preserve free speech

and freedom of the press, and is it in fact easier or harder to do that in this high-tech era when anyone can jump online and share their ideas and their perspectives with strangers? Where do you fall in this conversation?

KU: I think frankly we're all on the same page.

KU: Thank you Shannon, and thank you Inamori Foundation. I want to follow Dan along those lines. These types of events and their ability to recognize someone as special as yourself are fundamental not just to an academic institution but to a thriving democracy. I want to emphasize to those of you that aren't aware, I mean Dan said he was a little intimidated. I am actually intimidated by both, but you are a historic hero, right. You and your family have taken steps, made sacrifices, that will be remembered as fundamental to the changes of your nation. And so if you hadn't, I would really like you all to join me in applauding.

KU: And you're in the odd position of being a journalist but also the story. That's very difficult, right? And her example is a very fundamentally important example for us around the globe because right now journalists, they're very much at risk not just in terms of careers but physically, emotionally at being put in harm around the world. And our ability to access information and get that reporting is going to be hindered and undermined by the continued kind of fear that's being put into and instilled in journalists. Dan is on the journalist side, who's been fantastic, and when he was on the *Sound of Ideas* as one of my favorite questioners at the time, and so I'm odd, I'm the academic, right? Initially I began my career as not the observer and the people who convey information like these two wonderful people, but as the attorney that would defend them and give them the right to do what they do, and now I write about the bigger picture questions. The internet, right, and what has it done. One, as Dan pointed out, the printing press was disruptive in a way that most of us could not have imagined, right? And it started with the Bible. and not Thomas Payne, which revolutionized so many things in the Western world. Television! Edwin R. Murrow, one of my favorite older journalists at one point said that, look at television and you could see it either as a bunch of tubes and glowing lights in a box for entertainment, or it could be a tool that helps educate and liberate the world. And the internet is exactly in that same position. It is an amazing tool, and the question is how it is put to use. And how it's put to use by people like those on stage is phenomenal. It spreads information at the speed of light, and it's very difficult for it to be censored, though not impossible.

But I do think that what we're all suggesting is that there's also a question of accountability on a network that is very much one that promotes anonymity can thrive. How do you hold the bad actors accountable? Journalism as a profession has ethics and standards that make it a profession. How many sources should you get, how do you verify these sources, you know, your opinion, my opinion, and some commentators—which is a much more, I think, a fundamental threat to us these days—don't have those same ethical and professional standards. So how do we convey that? When newspaper editors and television studio executives used to allow that sifting, they would allow their professionals to make that determination and filter that to us. There is no real filter on the internet. We are the filters, and we have also, in a system in which American public education has been fundamentally undermined in the last fifty years, so it is much harder for our population to make those judgments on their own. But I think the question of how do we impose and continue to enforce responsibility and accountability is important. As Myroslava pointed out, there are a handful of major internet companies, and they live in a legal world that is the best of all worlds for them. They are entitled to absolutely unlimited free speech, and they are also given the kind of immunity from their actual editorial decision-making or their ability to push people off of their platforms that no newspaper or broadcaster ever enjoyed before. And so it's that ability to kind of say, well I have no role, but I have complete power. That is something that I think we will need to be addressing going forward, and that's in the United States, let alone in countries where, you know, a simple sign on screen or a filter can fundamentally alter the information people get.

FRENCH: Continuing with this theme in a way, and thinking about how media and whether it's social or otherwise, can connect us or divide us, I actually would like to hear from all three of you, and I'll frame it slightly differently for each of you, but about how people do or don't care in this context. So first of all to you, Myroslava, obviously in the wake of Russia's brutal and illegal invasion of Ukraine, it brought attention to the war. But you then also hear people talking about things like attention fatigue or donor fatigue or they don't want to hear the same story or that even attention spans have gotten shorter as time has gone on. First of all, I'm just wondering: Do you have those concerns, Does that seem like a trend, and What can we, including everyone in the audience, do to resist that kind of tendency? Are we goldfish?

GONGADZE: It's natural for people to get tired of the same bad news, and obviously you would try to find something positive, and I do see fatigue. However, I do see as well, a lot of media, journalists, who come to Ukraine to tell the story, and they are risking their lives. And many of them, I mentioned during the speech yesterday, one of my classmates from Harvard was the first casualty of the war, and I felt even responsible for it. Not because he was killed in Ukraine but as well as, during our classes, we basically had a writing class together, and we read each other's stories. He was one of the most perceptive people, and he would always give me comments and recommendations. We kind of instilled in our classmates this understanding or urgency of Ukraine, and then when the war started, he decided to go. And again as you mentioned before, there's seventeen different numbers because some journalists died. One journalist died when her building was under rocket attack, and she died when she was sleeping at home. That happened as well, but what I was trying to say is that I am really appreciative for people who go there and tell you those stories from different angles, and it's very important. For years and years and years, and my brothers and sisters in diaspora would support me on that. We could not bring attention to Ukraine enough. People didn't understand what Ukraine is, they didn't want to listen to it. They would call Ukraine, Russia, and I mean, everyone of us had that experience, and I was trying to bring journalists to Ukraine. I was telling them, don't cover Ukraine from Moscow. That's where every Bureau of international news was. Don't do "parachute coverage," as we call it, when the journalist just jumps in the situation, spends three days, becomes a specialist, and gets out, and then they are forever knowledgeable in Ukrainian affairs. So that happened a lot as well, but now it's with the war unfortunately, but I see more and more journalists coming into the country and trying to understand it better and cover it and understand the story, so I really, really appreciate those people who are risking their lives to do their job. I mean again, it would be natural, but I honestly, in the end of the day I don't want that much attention to Ukraine. I want peace in the country. And it would be better to have the peace and tell about positive stories, but we have what we have. I kind of understand both sides. I understand the fatigue, but I appreciate any intention that you pay to this crisis.

FRENCH: That really hit me—that thought that in a sense you'd actually love for Ukraine to be less newsworthy at the moment because the peace would be lovely. Dan, what about in your work? Have you noticed

a decline or a rise in caring about global events versus regional? Do you get a sense that maybe things like climate change or things that do seem impossible to address at merely a regional level are getting people to think more globally? Or they're closing in?

MOULTHROP: I would say—you know the local issues and the regional issues are certainly what drive people first and foremost, those are their highest priority.

FRENCH: Gotcha.

MOULTHROP: But when they feel a connection, and when the story is told that they feel that they have a part to play in, that's when they show up. I remember when I first got to City Club in 2013, and we were hosting Ambassador Ford who had just left his post in Syria at the very beginning of that conflict. And I was thinking, oh my god, this is huge, huge! And the audience was quite small, there were maybe sixty people there, and most of them were from the Syrian immigrant community. And I felt that it was really important—that somehow we'd failed to adequately explain why this matters and why it not just matters sort of generally, but should matter to all of us. When Wendy Sherman, the former Deputy Secretary of State spoke at the City Club earlier this year, she gave a really impassioned defense of the State Department's commitment to democracy everywhere, and really explained very well why it's in all of our interests that democracy thrive wherever it can take root, and when it's under attack—the attack on Ukraine, on the democracy, and the autonomy of Ukraine—is an attack on the very notion of democracy, and it's an attack on our democracy. And I think that's not a stretch, that's the way the world works. If we don't stand for democracy, we will watch it fall. Here as well. So it is a struggle to make the case to invite people into caring about things that seem so far away, but it's our job.

FRENCH: Well, and the idea of putting a human face on things that can feel far away and abstract seems, again, very powerful to me. That the notion that when you have met somebody, as we have met you Myroslava, and when you have spoken to people and gotten the combination of the context that you just gave, that this is a threat to us whether we feel it as a direct peril or not, it is. And also then experiencing it through the eyes of someone who's lived it. Somehow that combination is what's needed. It's very powerful. You know, Ray, we also hear a lot about how because everyone has a cell phone or something similar, in some ways we're more connected than we ever have been. So I can see through the eyes of someone very far away because they

can show me. So it isn't just a description, I'm seeing someone uncover a war crime or experience something firsthand. And in the pandemic, we all learned to Zoom and connect across worlds in real time. Do you find that this opens up people's minds to more points of view? Or I think my concern, the flip of that, would be that people can also curate that experience so that yes, they could see through different people's eyes, but they actively seek out only those who look at just what they want to see.

KU: Alright, so, so many questions and wonderful ideas have been brought up by this panel and Dr French. Well, one, most people will tell you, and psychiatrists and psychologists will tell you, that seeking out information that's just the information we want is just human nature. [Laughs]

FRENCH: [Laughs] Darn our human nature.

KU: And that's part of the decision-making biases that we are susceptible to. Now, the internet has certainly made that a lot easier and not really necessarily in getting the information as much as connecting people who share that same worldview. That is the benefit of it. It shows the world how many people genuinely care about the truth, the facts, that there is an empirical world. Yet at the same time, it's connecting and making people feel comfortable that they can live in a world of alternative facts and live in a world of propaganda.

I do think that more than the internet, the camera—and many of you in this room will not remember what actual film cameras or the original video cameras look like in terms of size—but cameras have fundamentally changed the progress of revolution, as well as social change and justice since, I'll use something from my lifetime, when people filmed Rodney King's beating. The idea of police abuse against the African American community was something people talked about, but until people actually witness it, it doesn't for many people become real. So, it is potentially easy to hide in your little bubble. It becomes harder when there are things that people can point to and say no, what you think and what you're saying is happening isn't actually supported by the facts. Now, the danger of course, is we now know we can generate a lot of images too.

Now, it's funny, so when the movie *Forrest Gump* came out, so some of you may know this film, that was how I knew I was going to be an academic because my question was I saw you can put Tom Hanks into a video that looks like he's shaking hands with the former president. What happens when technology makes that even clearer? Part of that is legal accountability, and in

this world of free speech, we think of free speech as something that shouldn't be regulated, but as Myroslava began with, even—I believe it's Chief Justice Rehnquist—argued that in the regulation of free speech and the marketplace of ideas, you have to make sure that the marketplace isn't corrupt and that the world of free speech is not tainted and polluted. We used to do that through a series of professional norms and journalistic norms, but also litigation. If you lie, see the Dominion Defamation lawsuit, there are ways to be held accountable, and that discouraged the most significant lies. So now, I think that we need to see more of that.

MOULTHROP: I would agree with you that we need to see more of it. Sometimes, I wonder if disinformation is the price we pay for freedom of speech. The problem with the litigation solution that you're suggesting is there just aren't enough lawyers or courtrooms. What's happening with disinformation and misinformation right now is the equivalent of a denial of service attack on a website. There is so much that you can't possibly focus on the one person or this one actor who disappears, evaporates, and is, by the way, in some other jurisdiction, may or may not be a state actor. There's nothing you can do.

FRENCH: And will reappear under another name.

MOULTHROP: And will reappear under another name.

KU: That's why the license that's been given to social media platforms, or more broadly internet service providers, is important. In the past, the role they played, today is the role that other media gatekeepers played. The way that newspaper editors, the role they play, the way that television studios and executives dealt with this, and yet the internet wants to be treated like, or if you're Facebook or X, you want to be treated as if you're the telephone company, but you're not.

MOULTHROP: I'm not convinced that we have the regulatory apparatus to grapple with a problem of this scope and size.

FRENCH: Gentlemen, I'm going to pause only for one second.

GONGADZE: I believe in addition to regulation that we have to do, I don't know how but we have to. Media literacy is one of the other ways we have to start doing more widely in schools, starting from basically elementary schools. Because kids these days are starting their access to internet from like six years old, five years old. So, I think it's like math or any other important subject. It has to be implemented in school curriculum, and that would help.

We need to learn how to consume in the environment that we are living in. It's very difficult to battle it because that's the technology development, but we have to then find a way to learn how to better be better at it.

FRENCH: I agree. By the way there's a beautiful baby in the back, and I'm pretty sure they just posted on Instagram. So it starts at birth now. Now it is time, we have an icon of courage up here, and I'm asking for a lot less courage from those of you to come up to our microphone and ask a question. I'm talking to y'all. Get up.

KU: If I can get a word in while they're gathering. There is a model, right? And the model is the intellectual property world. When the internet began, everyone thought any liability would be a problem. So even saying, okay, if Dan ran X on your system, there is a just a essentially a blatantly defamatory, false set of information being conveyed. In the past if I told you that, you'd have a responsibility. Now, we don't because of section 230 of the Communications Decency Act. We got rid of that kind of rule for intellectual property for copyright. Other countries have that same kind of view rule, where if you are given notice and you don't act, you can be held responsible, and that's important. The internet has not died because people have pursued copyright infringement. Many of us, as copyright users, are probably not as happy that we couldn't download music or as many videos as we wanted, but that whole ecosystem still exists, and I don't think that speech is any weaker.

FRENCH: I like the parallel that we've been speaking about how maybe democracy isn't as fragile as we fear sometimes, and maybe these systems are not as fragile, and we must demand of them what we need to keep the democracy going. It's all interconnected. Alright, sir, in the white shirt, you're first.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thanks. Myroslava, I was wondering what it's like back home. Could you talk a little bit about what it's like to be under attack by a superpower?

GONGADZE: I mean, I spent ten days every two months there. I currently reside in Warsaw. But obviously I'm very in tune with what's going on in the country, and it's a strange world. Because, on one hand, when everything is okay, when you don't hear sirens, and there's no rocket falling on your head, it's a very comfortable life. People go to restaurants. They are smiling in the street with street music. It's strange because I remember in May, I was there for ten days. I had not slept one night peacefully because you have to go to

shelter every night because of the rocket attacks, and you have to work. So Ukrainians have to adapt to always be ready for the rocket attacks. You have to have a little bag with your documents and all the necessities, because if you would have to run to the shelter in the middle of the street, you have to be ready for this and sit in the shelter for what can be one, two, three, four, and five hours. It destroys life. I call this torture by sleep deprivation for the whole nation. It's like the society is still functioning, but it's very tiring, and people live in this situation for, we know how long. So the Ukrainians are very resilient, and sometimes you watch it from the outside. It's just mind-boggling how, if the rocket hits the building, a few days after that, everything is clean. They would come and clean everything because people are coping this way. People don't control the sky, but they control what they can do about their lives, and they go and do whatever they can to clean their surroundings, and make sure that they can have a normality in their life. But there's no normality. There's nowhere to hide. They're attacking everywhere. Ukraine is asking and begging for protection of the sky from the beginning of the war. And yes, if not for those patriots that the United States gave, I'm afraid that half of Ukraine would be destroyed. Because they are deliberately going after infrastructure, cultural institutions, and schools. I've been too many Ukrainian destroyed schools. Kids cannot go to schools. They don't have shelters to go to school during normal school time. It's so many layers of these issues. But the resilience is mind boggling. We are in an eve of Ukrainian bravery, but sometimes we have to understand that people are brave because they cannot stop fighting. Because if they would stop fighting, they would be killed. It's fantastic that they are so brave and they are so courageous, but sometimes that courage comes from, no they don't have other ways to survive. So that's how it is done.

FRENCH: And they shouldn't have to be that courageous. That's a point well made. We're going to alternate between the two microphones, so back here. First person at the mic in the back.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Good afternoon everyone. Hello Myroslava. I'm Rasheed Watley, and I found out about this event an hour ago, and I rushed here. I went to all the Ukrainian festivals that have happened locally. One of them—there was a discoteka—so I love Ukrainian music. I was wondering have you heard of any of the local Ukrainian attractions, like there's Ukrainian Village, and there's a Ukrainian Cultural Garden. Because I spent a lot of time at those events and those places.

GONGADZE: I know the Ukrainian Community is included very well. Right after this, I'm going to the Ukrainian Museum. Tomorrow, I'm going to the Ukrainian School. I've been here many times. The Ukrainian Community is fantastic here, strong, and I've been to many events here, so I'm very proud of the Ukrainian Community here, thank you.

FRENCH: Yes, our immigrant populations make our city stronger. Sakthi, go ahead.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you, and as Dr. French mentioned, my name is Sakthi, and I'm a senior here at Case. A question I have for all three of you is relating to press freedom around the world. Across the world, we've seen increasing attacks on press freedoms, on civil liberties. My parents are from India, and I've seen it there, and occasionally, I see it here too. So my question is What can we, as citizens, do to protect press freedoms and civil liberties and How can we put pressure on our governments to make sure that they protect these civil liberties?

FRENCH: What a wonderful question. Which of you would like to take that first?

GONGADZE: We had a chance to talk with senior students.

FRENCH: So, Dan or Ray, you want to give some advice?

MOULTHROP: I'm glad you asked the question. It's a really important question and one we should all ask ourselves. I mean it's important to support journalism first and foremost, and that means not just reading the journalism, but actually paying for it and ensuring that those organizations, whether it's Voice of America or your local public media station or some new nonprofit organization that you've come to rely on for the work that they do actually get your support and are financially sustainable. Then I think it's important for us to call out those who would repress journalists or who claim that the mainstream media is the enemy. That has become a talking point, and it's a way to win voters, and it's unacceptable. I think we need to be really clear about that and we need to find allies in both parties who are willing to stand by our sides in making that point and making that case.

KU: I had a professor who was also First Amendment attorney with the ACLU, who said that free speech requires courage. I didn't agree with him at the time, and I don't agree with him now. Free speech should not require courage. Speaking truth to power and being revolutionary requires courage. I think the rest of us have a role in supporting those people who are willing to

do that. Most of us are free riders. We don't go and make our cars, we don't go and farm our food, we're relying on somebody else to do that, and hopefully our ability to support it is less costly for us. The same with journalism. What partly Dan is suggesting is we have to recognize when we are free riding that yeah, I have to contribute back. I have to support NPR. Yeah, I could get news for free and Google news, but I'm going to pay for a subscription or two because that matters. And I think I'll end with a hopeful note here. I think in part because of the internet, what we're seeing is the ability and the power of those that refuse to free ride, that are willing to make the contributions, like donations from the Inamoris. This is something that you can invest in that helps all of us. As the world gets bigger and bigger, the people who are willing to pick up that slack are going to be a larger and larger group, and it's just how to encourage them, promote them, protect them, and hopefully grow that body that recognizes the importance of all of this.

MOULTHROP: One last thing: there's an organization called the Committee to Protect Journalists that works internationally, and if you're looking for a place to put a donation specifically around that issue and the kind of work that that Myroslava does and her colleagues do, that's really important.

GONGADZE: There are a lot of press freedom organizations who help Ukrainian journalists as well as who are right now suffering a lot. Many journalists had to become soldiers. Many journalists changed their focus of their coverage, specially investigative journalists. They were investigating corruption, now they are investigating Russian war crimes. So they need support and help as well. But for the individual, I think being an active citizen is most important thing, and if you see something happening, tell it and speak out, and we will all be better from it.

FRENCH: Wonderful. Back mic.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Hello, Myroslava. I resonated with your story over the last two days about being an avid seeker of truth. I was born in the Eastern Ukrainian town of Kramatorsk, and over the past twenty-two years, my life has been a constant search for truth on my family, my heritage, and the life of Ukrainians there. Over the course of your career, how has your perspective on your work changed from being a seeker of truth to being a leader and the acquisition of knowledge both domestically with the demographic divide in Ukraine and globally in a room full of Americans who don't know what living in a war is like?

GONGADZE: Wow, this is a huge question. I don't know how to—I mean first of all my condolences to the city you were born in, because I mean Kramatorsk is under real siege, and it's a huge problem there. Where are your parents right now?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: So I was adopted. My dad left for Russia before I was born, and my mother died in 2015.

GONGADZE: Oh, I'm so sorry for your loss. You know it's not—I mean I didn't seek being someone. I'm just doing my job. I'm just doing my work as best as I can, and that's what happened when you try to put all your efforts into something you believe in, and I don't know how this changes my perception. I sometimes feel that I'm living the movie *Groundhog Day*. That's my life. Because every time, especially in Ukraine, that's all the time, because it's a revolution, hope, stagnation, disillusion, revolution, hope, stagnation. I'm listening to the people in power, and they are saying the same thing all the time, and just like, I'm getting tired, that's what I can tell you. Tired of the same thing and not seeing enough change that I would like to see in the world. But at the same time, I keep positive because at least I know what I can do as I just said that everyone of us has some responsibility and some control over something. So I have control over my decisions, over my work and help others to understand, and I'm doing what I can in this situation. If I can contribute, that's great, and I'm happy every time when people come to me and say: thank you, you help me to better understand something, or to make some better decisions, or so on. So that's my answer to your question.

FRENCH: You know, I found it very striking when you were speaking with some of our students earlier, and you pointed out that it's a calling. I think that's clear. Now we are almost out of time, so I'm going to call this the lightning round, so forgive me, extremely short, can you shorten your question in your mind to make it— So front microphone, real quick.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: This is to Professor Ku. How would we learn and better understand laws on local, national, and international levels to better get it instead of a more or less vague, boiled-down version of it with all the confusing clauses that are ignored.

FRENCH: Yeah, the rules are so different in Europe than they are here, and everywhere else. Go ahead, Ray

KU: No, that's absolutely right. I mean, you know, if you're one of the large internet companies, you're trying to deal with all these different regulatory

regimes. I couldn't quite hear your question, so if I'm heading off the wrong direction, please let me know. In the first, when we began in the nineties, people thought that it wasn't possible, that you couldn't be Google and survive globally. We know that's wrong, and it's wrong because in various places around the world, Google's willing to kind of live with the cultural norms and the legal norms there. So the question is Should the United States remain the kind of Wild West and the unregulated anarchy that it is? Or can we bring some order to it as well? Now, in terms of learning it, we need civic education and history from kindergarten on. I am always amazed and astounded at how little Americans know about their own law let alone their own history.

FRENCH: Here—super quick.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you so much for being here. I know Ukraine is scheduled to have presidential elections next year and presidential elections in the middle of a war are hard enough, and war and free speech have rarely gone very well together. Are you hopeful that we will have a good and honest discussion of debate next year, and how do you think war and freedom of the press will play into the outcome of the results next year?

GONGADZE: First of all, it's not yet a done deal. The election is not called. Yes, they are supposed to be right, you're right. However there are a lot of restrictions right now, and there are a lot of discussions in the civil society community and the election watchdogs about this possibility of this election. If the election were to happen, there are some requirements that have to be met. It would depend on the situation on the ground right now. There are discussions to have an election, there are a lot of voices saying we cannot afford it, not only from perspective of the funds but from the perspective of opening political discussion because the country has to be united in one front, and so far it was. We see a lot of restrictions of the free press right now in Ukraine because of the war, the martial law, and the martial law has to be lifted to have elections. I don't want to assume that it is, but there are requirements that have to be met before we can talk about possible elections. In today's Atlanta Council there is a good article from one of the directors of IFES (International Foundation for Electoral Systems), an election observer group. They're working in Ukraine, and he actually wrote about the issue and those requirements. In the last two months I've had so many discussions on this front about it, so we will see how this will play out.

FRENCH: OK—super quick.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: D. C. Watt from the London School of Economics defined British governance in the twentieth century as oligocratic, not democratic. In other words, a large mass of people have access to power, very few exercise it. I think about World War II, FDR, grandmother's cousin, never really had the majority support of the American public, contrary to what people think. But he had a critical mass of support, and in order to win this global war for good ideas, all we need is a critical mass. We don't need everyone to understand or support actively, just enough people, so I think that's a way of looking at this hopefully.

FRENCH: I appreciate you giving us that bit of hope, that's lovely, and I think we'll take our final question because it's been pointed out to me, we're actually slightly overtime, my bad. Go ahead.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: How can we introduce media literacy in education while some political segments are using misinformation for their interests?

FRENCH: Oof, yes, is there a danger in bringing in media literacy, that it will be skewed to one or the other political extremes.

MOULTHROP: Public education is a battleground right now, and you either jump in and try to make a difference and lift your voice, as some very brave teachers and superintendents and librarians are doing right now, or you let the other side dictate the terms, and then we find our public education system falls even into greater disrepair because people who want to teach because they believe in truth choose not to because it's no longer a venue that supports truth. So I think we just have to keep waging the battle.

FRENCH: Well I agree with that. I don't know about you, but has an hour ever gone faster? Please join me in thanking our amazing panelists!