whether fraudulent or not. "YouTube is a platform built on the principals of free expression—we will never be the arbiter of which content is true or false, good or bad," Grove maintains.

Yet he remains optimistic. "Technology will continue to do a lot to bring order to the chaos of information on the web, he says. "Aggregating the news judgment of users and of news professionals is one way to cut through diverse amounts of information and create credible streams of content. But there are many other ways, too . . . The world is too complex, and our sources of information too diverse and varied, for there to be just one stream of credible information developed by algorithms and aggregation."

In the meantime, the flood of unmediated information posted on YouTube continues unabated. At the same time, a new and even more social media-based American presidential campaign is shifting into gear. Even George Allen has re-entered the fray, announcing in early 2011—via email and Web video, ironically—that he intends to get his old job back. Although Allen made no mention of "macaca," the YouTube Effect still looms large. "The central question," the *New York Times* noted, "will be how much the 'macaca' matter weighs on Mr. Allen's reputation in the minds of Virginia voters."

7.

Twitter: News No Longer Breaks, It Tweets

On January 14, 2009, the first report of the miraculous rescue of 155 passengers from a US Airways jet floating in the Hudson River provided the ultimate evidence—if indeed any was still needed by then—that emerging social media were not only supplementing but in some cases actually supplanting legacy media in both reporting and distributing news. Twitter, the short messaging service or "microblogging" platform launched for public use just two and a half years earlier, had beaten the rest of the world's media to the sensational story that an airplane had gone down in the water shortly after takeoff. Despite the fact that an international wire service, a leading national newspaper and the news divisions of several broadcast networks all had their worldwide headquarters nearby—in fact almost literally opposite the crash site—a Twitter user named Janis Krums was first on the scene. Krums quickly tweeted news of the crash ("There's a plane in the Hudson. I'm on a ferry going to pick up the people. Crazy") and posted a photo of its passengers huddled on a wing just moments after the aircraft plunged

into the river—and well before anyone from the legacy news media arrived on the scene.

Krums, who was a passenger on a nearby ferry, took a picture with his iPhone and posted it instantly on the photo-sharing TwitPic.com site before getting off the boat to help the plane's passengers reach safety. As he did so, thousands of followers replied to Krums' Twitter account to congratulate him on his scoop and thousands more—including representatives of the legacy media he had beaten to the story—created links to the remarkable image. The photo spread around the social media world so rapidly—tens of thousands of people in the next four hours—that the heavy traffic soon crashed the site.

When it comes to breaking news—from heroism on the Hudson to calamity in California and from terror in Mumbai to protest in Tunis—Twitter now often leads the pack. Early adopters of the service learned about the service's news utility soon after its debut, but it took the "Miracle on the Hudson" to bring it fully to the attention of the rest of the world and give new meaning to the young company's brash claim that "Twitter is the best way to discover what's new in your world."

What many had previously dismissed as an insignificant messaging service had suddenly morphed into one of the most important mass communications systems in the world—and to the surprise of its creators, was transformed into a leading source of breaking news. Now simultaneously collaborating *and* competing with legacy media, Twitter is

at the edge of the blurry frontiers separating news and entertainment, professionals and amateurs, and, perhaps most importantly, opinion and fact.

If you're still unclear about Twitter's phenomenal growth, importance and meaning, here's some background: the free social networking service enables anyone to post short messages known as tweets, 140 characters in length, to groups of self-designated followers. Tweets can be sent from and received by many different digital devices, ranging from desktop and laptop computers to smartphones and just plain cell phones. Tweeting is a much like instant or text messaging, but instead of one-to-one communication, it is one-to-many.

Twitter started in 2006 as a side project of Odeo, a podcasting site co-founded by Evan Williams. Williams had made an earlier fortune by creating Blogger, one of the first and most facile blogging tools, and then selling it to Google. Although Odeo had received millions of investment dollars, Williams was admittedly unexcited by its involvement in podcasts and asked everyone working there for new ideas. One day, while sitting on a children's slide at a park eating Mexican food, an engineer named Jack Dorsey showed his colleagues at Odeo a cool new way to use text messages to send status updates.

Since then Twitter has grown to become what the *New York Times* termed "one of the rare but fabled Web companies with a growth rate that resembles the shape of a hockey stick." The number of people signing up to use it increased

exponentially; in 2009, for example, Twitter ballooned from 5 million to 71 million registered users. By September of the next year, it claimed 145 million users, and two months later another 30 million people had registered—a 20 percent increase. Executives estimated the service was adding more than 300,000 new users every day. By 2011 there were more than 200 million registered accounts—half of them so-called active users, many of whom log in daily.

Twitter.com soon became the third most trafficked social networking site in the world, surpassing MySpace with nearly 96 million unique visitors, according to data from comScore Inc. Both still trailed Facebook, which passed MySpace in early 2008 to take the top spot among social media and grew to 598 million unique visitors by August 2010. (Microsoft's Windows Live Profile, which integrates with the company's web-based email and other services, was second with more than 140 million visitors.)

As of October 2011, Twitter's 100 million active users were sending more than 200 million messages every day. These tweets form the basis of Twitter's real-time information network. Each can also connect to deeper context and embedded media such as photos or videos. But even if you don't tweet, you can still access many other voices freely offering news and information about a wide range of topics of interest.

Based in San Francisco, Twitter is now used by people in nearly every country in the world, and comes in seventeen language versions, including English, French, German, Italian, Japanese, Spanish, Chinese, and Hindi. Seventy percent of its traffic comes from outside the United States. With its astonishing user growth, Twitter is poised to join Google and Facebook as one of the Internet's next hugely important independent companies. Although its annual revenue has yet to exceed 100 million dollars, it is projected to surpass one billion dollars by 2016. The company has already become so popular and ubiquitous that it is valued at between eight and ten billion dollars.

Despite its success to date, Twitter is still nowhere near fulfilling its true potential. Although its valuation is certainly not justifiable based on revenues, investors highly value its social services and data about users—and there is much, much more to come. Of people who use the Internet, nearly one of five use Twitter, according to a recent survey by Pew Research Center. Facebook, on the other hand, is used by 96 percent of all Americans. These figures make Twitter's valuation sensible, as Felix Salmon pointed out on his Reuters blog, noting, "If Twitter is 20% the size of Facebook, and Facebook is worth $50 billion, then Twitter can be worth $10 billion, no?"

Any way you slice it, clearly Twitter is quickly becoming central to how people communicate—it's a "key part of the new social architecture," as Salmon says. "Twitter serves a very important purpose in the lives of the people who have adopted it, and it's likely to serve the same purpose for ever more people as its user base grows and people start feeling left out if they're not on it . . . priority number one for the

company is to become an indispensable service for millions of people around the world." If that happens, Twitter will turn out to be one of the most important and valuable companies in the world.

While initially leery, legacy news media and their reporters soon learned to adopt and adapt to Twitter. Its speed and brevity are now regarded as among the best ways to break news, not only to the digitally savvy but also through them to the world at large. Dorsey, Williams and co-founder Biz Stone never envisioned Twitter as a source of breaking news, but it quickly became one, as short bursts of text coupled with links to images of disasters provided by ordinary citizens began to spread virally. One pioneer, Portland's *Oregonian* newspaper, presciently began using the service as far back as 2007, when Twitter had just 500,000 users, posting its own links and aggregating other tweets about flooding and road closures during heavy storms then in central Oregon. With legacy media steadily downsizing and shutting bureaus, Twitter came to be viewed as an alternative source of timely, useful news when and where other media were not yet—or no longer—on the scene.

Speed vs. Accuracy

Although being first to report the news is obviously important, reporting it accurately has long been viewed as even more so. The rise of social media, however, has raised new questions about such "old media" values as the balance and interplay between speed and accuracy. Some analysts, such as Twitter's in-house media strategist Robin Sloan, believe there are both good and bad things about how rapidly news is transmitted on Twitter. "There's no doubt greater speed has a cost," Sloan admits. "But the truth of matter is that we can't slow it down. The news metabolism is speeding up, and social media is now the collective heartbeat we all have. It must be part of the conversation. So there's no real question whether to engage in it or not."

Six months after news of the "miracle on the Hudson" broke on Twitter, another event—the sudden death of pop icon Michael Jackson—brought these issues into even sharper focus and revealed Twitter's speed to be a double-edged sword. In a post on his Technologizer site, headlined "Twitter: The Fastest Way to Get Informed. Or Misinformed," former *PC World* editor in chief Harry McCracken blogged about how he had followed news of Jackson's demise both on television and on Twitter. "When I happened to turn on the TV, MSNBC was still speaking of Jackson having gone into cardiac arrest," McCracken noted. "The (correct) consensus on Twitter was that he had passed away. Impressive proof of Twitter's speed and old media's lethargy, no?"

Yes . . . and no. Like many, McCracken spent most of the rest of the day, once "television caught up with the tweets," watching network coverage of Jackson's death. But when he checked back in with Twitter, the mourning included another dead celebrity, actor Jeff Goldblum. "The sad news had broken that he had fallen to his death while filming a movie in New Zealand," McCracken said.

There was one small problem, however—Goldblum was still alive. The reports of his death, like those regarding Mark Twain more than a century earlier, had been greatly exaggerated. The story of Goldblum's passing was "a hoax created with a tool for creating fake stories about famous people," McCracken wrote. "It took me about 90 seconds of Googling to learn that." Nevertheless the false reports of Goldblum's death spread rapidly throughout cyberspace. As Twain once noted, "A lie can travel halfway around the world while the truth is just putting on its shoes."

Fact-Checking . . . After the Fact

What lessons can be learned from the Jeff Goldblum hoax and others like it? "Part of the reason why information travels quickly on Twitter is that it's not fact-checked. Or more precisely, it's fact-checked after the fact, when people realize the original tweets were wrong," McCracken explained. McCracken also offered some useful cautions and tips for checking the credibility of reports found on Twitter, "If a single person you know and trust tweets something that sounds unlikely, it's more likely to be true than if 500 random strangers tweet it," he said. "But check it anyway." In addition, "If a huge story breaks on Twitter, give the 'old' Web ten minutes to catch up. If neither CNN.com, NYTimes.com, or MSNBC.com has any mention, Twitter probably got it wrong."

McCracken sees a social solution to Twitter's trust issue. "Twitter, or Twitter-like services, will eventually go a

Interview with Twitter Co-Founder Biz Stone

Stone offers his thoughts on the rapid evolution of the service, as well as the topic of emerging media, trust, and journalism.

ROC: What is Twitter? How would you describe it? Is it a social network?

BS: Twitter is a 24-hour feed of everyone in the world; a soundtrack to our universal film; the Zeitgeist to news on wires. Twitter is social media, but NOT a social network—it's a place where you can zoom in and out on trends and emergent topics. When you think of the entire ecosystem as an organism, that's when it begins to get really interesting. . . .

Twitter is about the idea of an organic approach to communication. We come at it indirectly, organically. Twitter messages only go to an opt-in community, which makes it easier to engage in open conversation. Of course, when a news event happens, we want more engagement. At other times, you can turn it off, as the settings allow user control.

ROC: What are Twitter's uses for journalists?

BS: The news applications surprised us. We noticed in prototypes early on, though, that things like earthquakes led to Twitter updates. The first Twitter report of the ground shaking during tremors in California, for example, came nine minutes before the first Associated Press alert. So we knew early on that a shared event such as an earthquake would lead people to look at Twitter for news almost without thinking.

ROC: Are there advantages to Twitter beyond speed, beyond simply being first with breaking news?

BS: Well, during the earthquake I'm referring to, there was a lot of depth of reporting as well—3,600 separate updates on Twitter, which is the equivalent of a fifty thousand word book in terms of content size. And I'm confident that had the quake been worse, the next step would be in journalists using it to find human-interest stories. (Incidentally, we might also have seen social collaboration activated via the service to help people!)

It's also interesting that Verizon's voice network broke down during the quake, but Twitter's service didn't, because our packet switching technology is more reliable than telephones. But in the end, it's not about technology—it's about the idea of connecting in groups more quickly and efficiently.

ROC: What are some ways journalists are using Twitter?

BS: We were also surprised at how quickly and expertly news organizations—places like the *New York Times*, CNN and so on—began to use Twitter. They just jumped in and impressed us with how they engaged, and their hybrid approach. Reuters, for example, began watching Twitter for trends, and found it worked. We gave help, support, and even our API (application programming interface) to the Reuters Lab people. Then CNN began using us to access information, and to find and create stories. Rick Sanchez at CNN, for example, used both Facebook and Twitter to get real time feedback. . . . And the *Los Angeles Times* took the Twitter feed about the wildfires and put it on their home page.

Another good example is the story of the Twitter user who blogged just one word—"Arrested"—and had the story of his detention splashed instantly to the world's attention, thus leading to his quick release.

ROC: Is Twitter also useful in search?

BS: We are involved on a macro level in documenting events. If you go to search.twitter.com you can discover and cover trends in detail every minute. You could call it "search," but it's really not. "Search" on Twitter is more about filtering results before they hit the Internet—so it's more a kind of filter than actual search.

ROC: Can social media such as Twitter help solve journalism's trust and credibility problem?

BS: We think that social media is largely comparable to the traditional approach, in that credibility is key. In the future, social media tools will help the news media know such things as the location of the person reporting. We will be able to provide a social graph of our users. . . . Can we then triangulate about their credibility via algorithm? We can certainly begin to get very sophisticated on credibility with new tools, and combine that with journalists leveraging open systems such as ours to find and vet crowd sources, story leads, etc.

Looking ahead, I see more sophisticated tools to deal with this issue. A credibility algorithm may be possible one day. Maybe it is even now, as rudimentary as it would still be. Our election feed, for example, was a smart feed. As we go forward and learn more about open systems, we can filter better and thus get more credibility. But filtering is how we get there . . . so one should not rely on social media alone.

long way towards solving this by figuring out how to weight the contributions of the most reliable members the heaviest," he forecasts. "So random people believing everything they hear don't spread falsehoods quite as fast." McCracken concluded with a warning: "Imperfect though Twitter may be, I love it. But I consider it a source of news leads, not news." In other words, trust . . . but verify!

Michael Jackson's death opened another window on how a media system in transition between old and new now handles news reporting and distribution. Writing on the *Tech Crunch* blog the day after the demise of the King of Pop, in a post headlined, "Mainstream Media Still Has Eyes Wide Shut," Robin Wauters decried the fact that few of the mainstream media "dared admit that blogs and Twitter had simply been quicker with spreading the facts than they were." Instead, they claimed it was "old media stalwarts that did the heavy lifting."

The assertion caused Wauters to laugh aloud. "Chest-beating over old media doing the 'heavy lifting' for blogs and Twitter, and being faster in reporting information than those new media when it was exactly the other way around is beyond ridiculous," he wrote. "To me, this whole thing just proves that mainstream media are justifiably freaking out with their eyes wide shut to what's happening instead of learning and adapting to the new age of journalism."

In this new media world, "News no longer breaks, it tweets," as digital analyst and researcher Brian Solis noted in a post on the paidcontent.org site, entitled "The Information

Divide Between Traditional And New Media." In the current era of the real-time web, Solis said, information travels faster than the mainstream media can report it. "Human networks" like Twitter function as virtual news networks, and in the process defeat traditional media in the race to be first.

"We no longer find information; it finds us," Solis observed, since social media "dramatically reduces the time between an event and collective awareness." Trusted messages on Twitter are rapidly re-tweeted by others; their news becomes increasingly prominent and pervasive. The gap between a jet falling in a river and the journalistic reporting of it almost immediately "fills with tweets, updates, and posts as the crowd-powered socialization of information steps in to fill the void."

As Janis Krums demonstrated at the "Miracle on the Hudson," information now moves "with or without the legacy media . . . with far greater speed, reach, impact and resonance," Solis noted. An information chasm has opened between the social media and their mainstream counterparts. Slowed by the time they take "to discern, document, fact check, and publish material information," legacy media loses the race to be first as reporting on social media speeds ahead, "whether or not it is completely or only partially based on facts."

In an effort to narrow the divide, the legacy media increasingly neglects its obligation to discern, document, and fact check. One case in point: In March 2010, as part of a class experiment, a criminal law professor at Georgetown University Law Center named Peter Tague informed his students that U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice John Roberts was in poor health and planned to retire soon. Tague did not reveal his source and asked his students to keep the news confidential.

Midway through class, Tague explained he had made up the story. He hoped to illustrate an important point to the lawyers-in-training: even if you receive information from a credible source such as a law professor, it can still be inaccurate. The lesson seemed clear—trusted news and information should be based on multiple sources.

It's an important lesson for all, of course, but especially for journalists. Proof came just half an hour later, when the RadarOnline site reported as fact the rumors of Roberts' pending resignation. The gossip site had picked up a Twitter alert sent by one of Tague's students and promptly posted an "exclusive" speculating on Roberts' health. Later, instead of retracting that report as erroneous, Radar falsely reported that Roberts had changed his mind. In the meantime, Fox News and other legacy outlets broadcast the original, fictitious story.

It no longer even takes a prank, a tweet, and a gossip site to spread false information, however. In January 2011, for example, when Congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords was shot in the head in Tucson, Arizona, several trusted legacy outlets, including CNN, NPR, and the *New York Times*, raced to report news of her death. Although she was in critical condition, Giffords was still very much alive. In today's

transitional new media world, sometimes even multiple and supposedly credible sources are no longer believable. . . .

This push and pull between speed and accuracy merely reiterates an age-old tension in news, pitting the urge to get it first against the need to get it right. "The prolonged cycle of journalism and reporting, while slower than the human algorithm that powers the now Web, is still unrivaled, however, by its dedication to discovering, verifying, and reporting truth and fact," says Brian Solis. But in "the race towards veracity, the checks and balances of new media systematically reduce error and filter hearsay and speculation . . . long-standing sources are now slowly losing favor as a destination for revelation."

Since both speed and accuracy are crucial in news reporting, separating truth from rumor and fact from fiction remains essential for maintaining trust. New media such as Twitter offer their own differing forms of checks and balances, which although imperfect, still help reduce error and filter hearsay and speculation. Inaccurate reports such as the deaths of Goldblum and Giffords or the resignation of Roberts crop up periodically; they are soon corrected by the "wisdom of the crowd."

"The scale is so enormous—you can't possibly read 100 million tweets per day!" says Twitter's Robin Sloan. "The puzzle, and our biggest challenge, is how to organize it all, how to separate signal from noise to find the good stuff. So absolutely we need filters—plural."

Sloan believes that although machine learning and recommender systems powered by algorithms will play an important role in filtering news in the future, human-powered verification will remain primary. "There will not be just one kind of filter but independent, smart, individual voices are very effective. And many of them already on Twitter *are* journalists already," he points out. "Ultimately, we put more trust in humans.

"Brains and human voices are the most important filters," says Sloan. "A computer can't figure it all out! No algorithm is perfect, and no instant filter shortcuts like that will become available. Anyway, the human voice is inherently more trustworthy."

Sloan also feels that legacy media brands still have a role to play, broadly speaking, in the trust equation. "The imprimatur of the *New York Times*, for example, is still quite valuable," he points out. "But even they still have to win authority. The brand power that used to be, say, Walter Cronkite—those days are gone for good—and that's good."

Curation will also play an increasing role in the filtering process in the future, says Sloan. "Big brands will need to go higher up the news food chain and ask themselves what they do that an individual voice acting as a filter cannot do."

Can they, for example, have a broad scope and global footprint, such as *The Economist* magazine has succeeded in creating? Can they establish a presence on new devices and then sell commodities? Can they learn to think not just about the news per se but more about actual products they can build, such as apps and so on?

"Anyone can filter and create news," says Sloan. "Not everyone can create products. Eventually, individuals operating in a vertical content space will become micro brands—and they will beat any more generalized brand competing one to one in that space. In the end, people prize human voices. Twitter is a conversational medium that needs a human voice—even for brands."

Sloan also sees a coming need for the "democratization of correction practices" as well as of reporting and distributing news. "We used to just hear about the news, but now we are all producing and sharing it, now we all have the experience of journalism," he says. "If Twitter and other social media are opening up the process of journalism, we need to show more of process, and not pretend to know it all. Instead let's present our news, share it, ask questions and get feedback. And if we make a mistake, we need to correct it."

Analyst Brian Solis makes a similar point. "We are all in this together, all practicing journalism now in a real-time competition for mindshare, connectedness and earned relevance," he says. "Information is no longer an isolated or individual experience; instead we are connected based on common interests, networked online collaboration and social media." As a recent survey by the Pew Research Center's Internet & American Life Project and the Project for Excellence in Journalism shows, we have become a nation whose relationship to news is becoming "portable, personalized and participatory."

This ability to plug in to social networks "and the

invaluable relationships that define them is where the transformation begins and the journey unfolds," Solis concludes, echoing Robin Sloan. "In the end, we earn the attention, relationships, and audiences we deserve." A new, collaborative journalistic hybrid is beginning to "open new doors to relevance," Solis says. "Connecting to stories and people that propel information beyond the reach of any one network at the speed of the now web."

And Twitter is more "now" than any other media on the web—at least for now! Like the media world that spawned it, Twitter is still rapidly changing. Its creators didn't originally plan for it to become a platform. Evan Williams says, "We launched Twitter sort of as a Model T—it was very basic, but was popular, and it got people excited." Yet it has become one of the simplest, easiest, and most efficient forms of mass publishing ever invented, and Williams says he is still exploring its full ramifications along with the rest of us. Twitter has "lowered the barriers to publishing almost as far as they can go," as Williams told a crowd at a Web 2.0 Summit in November 2010. As a result there are "more voices and more ways to find the truth, then the truth will be available to more people," he believes. "I think this is what the Internet empowers [but] society has not fully realized what this means."

While at the center of this explosion of voices, Twitter is of course just one of many tools of media empowerment. As Web pioneer Dave Winer has noted, the Internet itself is the most powerful tool—not the specific services that run on

top of it, such as Twitter and Facebook, which he compares to brands like NBC. These new media brands have become powerful because so many people use them in real-time networked communication.

Along with YouTube, Facebook and a plethora of other new social media, Twitter provides us with a fire hose of news and information—some quite meaningful but a lot that is not. It's up to us to figure out how to sort through it all. Trend-filtering and curation tools such as Storify, built by former AP correspondent Burt Herman), Curated.by (a website) and other new services now enable us to pull various threads and fragments of information and conversation together to begin to make sense of them.

As industry analyst Ken Doctor has observed, news is everywhere now; it comes to us in different forms and different ways, and clearly Twitter is among them. At its best, during events such as the recent uprisings in Tunisia and Egypt, Twitter allows for the true crowdsourcing of journalism—a powerful tool for the pursuit of truth. Some legacy media firms have figured out how to use Twitter and other tools to take advantage of this transformation of the news industry, but most still have not.

The Twitter News Network
Although Twitter remains fundamentally about communication, it is becoming less conversational and more like a networked news organization. The most notable changes include its interactive aspects and embeddable media

elements, such as videos, photos, and photo streams. Previously the only components of a tweet had been the text and the link; now we're seeing a shift from text-and-link toward text-and-image, away from conversation and toward news and information.

"Twitter, like blogging did before it, puts the tools of publishing in anyone's hands. And yes, that means the information flowing through the network is not always accurate—hoaxes are a routine part of the stream—but it also means that there are thousands more eyeballs and brains studying those reports than there would be at any mainstream media outlet," as Mathew Ingram noted on the GigaOm site. "The 'people formerly known as the audience' have the tools to become part of the media now, and that is changing our society in ways that we are only beginning to appreciate."

Today's Twitter, "as compared to the Twitter.com of yesterday, is much more about information that's meaningful and contextual and impactful," Megan Garber wrote on the Nieman Journalism Lab site. "Which is to say, it's much more about journalism."

Arizona State University journalism professor Dan Gillmor agrees, saying journalists should view Twitter as a "collective intelligence system" that provides early warnings about trends, people and news. Journalists, he says, should "follow people who point them to things they should know about" and then direct questions back to them to do better reporting. Gillmor recommends setting up keyword searches and understanding "hashtags," Twitter-speak for a group

of tweets about the same subject or event, indicated by a # sign and topic word (such as "#occupywallstreet.")

"We go to legacy newsrooms often," Robin Sloan told me. "It's noteworthy that when I look around, Twitter is open on lots of desktops. I find it interesting and meaningful that journalists of all types find that using Twitter is close to the type of work they've always known—helping them keep track of broad, distributed network of sources, for example.

"On the other hand, Twitter has also transformed the way journalists think about their work," Sloan contends. "Now they get news ambiently, if you will. And there is a large place for professional journalists in Twitter. In a sense, it makes them more valuable than ever as they curate and filter and then present information back to us."

Brian Solis once referred to Twitter as TNN, the Twitter News Network, since "it consistently beat traditional media in the race to report relevant news and trends." Company co-founder Biz Stone, it turns out, sees the future much the same way. In November 2010 Stone told the Reuters wire service he is eager to find a way to harness the vast quantities of information shared on Twitter to create a news network. Such a network, Stone said, would not necessarily be run by Twitter itself but could be in partnership with several legacy news organizations such as Reuters. "From the very beginning this has seemed almost as if it's a news wire coming from everywhere around the world," he told Reuters Television at a technology event. "I think a Twitter News Service would be something that would be very open

and shared with many different news organizations around the world."

"The train to the future is moving down tracks, and there are plenty of people onboard with no interest in news and information. So it's especially important for those who do care about it to get on that train and push their values," concludes Twitter's media strategist Robin Sloan. "Everything is changing so rapidly now that the future will make the current transition look like a picnic. It won't end with Twitter. So legacy media can't just 'learn Twitter' and be done with it. The key is curiosity—to successfully navigate through it, you must remain curious."