YOU NEEDED TO BE THERE IN PERSON TO SEE THE SUPER COOL ANIMATIONS IN THIS SLIDESHOW!!!!!!!
The Problem

- There are many different political opinions but people in this country don’t really talk to each other
- Websites like Facebook and Twitter are full of stupid comments so they don’t help people have a real conversation
- This problem is getting worse all the time so there is a need for something new
The Solution

• Create a website that lets people find other people with similar or different views and have conversations with them asynchronously or synchronously

• Allow searching by political opinions, religious views and so on

• Don’t force users to enter private information such as their email address
Risks That We’re Worried About

- Scalability. Will this be able to support 300 million users.
- Usability. People won’t use it unless it’s really simple and you don’t have to enter lots of information to get started.
- SQLite is designed for tables with many columns not for storing large amounts of text.
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a rip-off of ...

http://civilgood.org/info/
Alternate Narratives on MSNBC and Fox

Percent of stories with tone

Romney on MSNBC

- 71 stories
- 3% positive

Obama on Fox

- 46 stories
- 6% positive

Date Range: August 27 - October 21, 2012

PEW RESEARCH CENTER'S PROJECT FOR EXCELLENCE IN JOURNALISM
Polarization of political blog

Polarization of retweets
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Conversation [Debate] with DogmaMan98

Topic: Abortion - General

Chronological  Just Him  Just Me  Pick & choose...

Him

Source
The Myth of Collateral Damage
by John Q. Columnist
Cited by: 524  Rating: 7.3  Link

Regarding war, then, how do you reconcile civilian casualties? Or casualties even of POWs who are on your side, who could get killed in bombing raids. How about drones that attack the wrong target and kill civilians, some of whom might even oppose the war? At what point is it OK to kill innocent people?

Yesterday

Source
The National Review, Feb., 2012
A No-Win Situation in the Situation Room
by Jane Q. Contributor
Cited by: 29  Rating: 6.5  Link

It's never OK to kill innocent people, but sometimes that is inevitable as you try for the overall good result. I think that as long as very good care is taken to prevent civilian losses, then you cannot fault a commander or soldier who means well but makes an accidental mistake.

This morning

On the other hand if the casualty was due to negligence, then I think a court-martial is in order. Like in this article I read recently.

Me

This morning

Alright, here's one contradiction. First you said that it was clear-cut. But then you agreed that there are exceptions, for war, even if innocent life is lost: the ends justify the means.

So if it's regretful but acceptable to kill a child as collateral damage in a well-planned bombing raid, why is it not acceptable to kill a child if he is going to be born with Down's syndrome, to an impoverished couple who doesn't want him, can't feed or clothe him, etc.? Isn't that also killing for the greater good, just like in war?

Source
... But if you have the moral high ground, and you're fighting for self-preservation, or if you have to sacrifice some human life for the overall good, then you're allowed to kill. Or in self-defense.

I think it's wrong for a human to take the life of another innocent human. Pretty much as simple as that.

Monday

Tuesday AM

I see where you're going, but there are two big differences that might help explain. One is that a country at war is automatically accepting risk, and losing innocence, implicitly by the actions of their government.

The other is that there are few if any alternatives in war, but with a fetus there is always the option that
Risks

• Social risks
  – Overwhelmed by ranting and trolling
  – Doesn't attract interest
  – Matching ineffective
  – No impact on external public discourse

• Technical risks
  – Anonymity failure
Rant reduction

Before you begin...
Some research shows striking differences between liberals and conservatives in which aspects of morality they consider important.

Consider the following 6 “aspects” of morality:
- Care (attention to suffering/harm)
- Fairness (equitable rewards/proportionality)
- Liberty (resisting domination)
- Loyalty (being a team player)
- Authority (sensitivity to hierarchy/rank)
- Sanctity (purity/cleanliness)

It was found that the more liberal you were, the more you valued the first three aspects of morality, and the less you valued the last three.

Conservatives tend to value all of these aspects of morality more or less equally.

Learn more about this research led by Jonathan Haidt.

Before you begin...
Do you believe you think rationally?

MBA students at MIT’s Sloan School of Management were asked which magazine subscription they’d prefer.

1) Web subscription only, for $59
2) Print subscription only, for $125
3) Print plus web subscription, for $125

Half of the students were given all 3 options, and half were given only options (1) and (3). What do you think these smart students chose?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All 3 options</th>
<th>Just 2 options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Web only: $59</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print only: $125</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web+Print: $125</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The presence of an extra, poor-value option that nobody chose radically influenced the results!

Read about this and other fascinating experiments in Dan Ariely’s book, Predictably Irrational.

Educating a Member to improve conversation quality/effectiveness

Priming a Member just prior to conversation
Rate your Conversation

Conversation [Debate] with DogmaMan98

Topic: Abortion - General

Rating

Conversation Overall
- Awful
- Okay
- Fantastic

Confidence in Rating
- None
- Emphatic

Ratings for DogmaMan98
- Brevity
- Persuasiveness
- Civility
- Language Skills
- Listening Skills
- Open-mindedness
- Ability to create enjoyable discussion
- Response timeliness
- Accuracy of claimed knowledge
- Accuracy of claimed Opinions/Facts
- Sources cited
- Overall

DogmaMan98 was pretty polite
You feel fairly strongly about this
Enter optional comments

Object...

General comments (optional)

Return later
Submit
Rewards

![Image of Leaderboards page showing participants rankings and overall ratings.](image-url)
- It may be hard
- It may not make anyone rich
- Can we afford not to try?

purple peeples
project proposals: suggestions

Daniel Jackson & Jonathan Edwards

For now, all rights reserved. Daniel Jackson, 2012.
focus your content
Omit needless words. Omit needless words.
-- Strunk and White

is it...
surprising?
important?
relevant?
polish your style
Edward Tufte, *The Cognitive Style of PowerPoint*
some typographic thoughts

avoid clutter
› birdshot bullets
› whole sentences

vary things
› intermingle graphical & textual
› avoid repeating structure

but be consistent
› in typeface, size & spacing
› use templates!
tell a story
from Duarte, resonate
-- Ernest Hemingway, reportedly