RADICAL **INLCUSION**

RADICAL
INCLUSION

What the Post-9/11 World Should
Have Taught Us About Leadership

MARTIN DEMPSEY

Former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

and

ORI BRAFMAN

New York Times Bestselling Author

Missionday

DEDICATION

MARTIN DEMPSEY: I dedicate this book to those who showed me the real meaning of leadership. My grandparents, who had the courage to leave their home in Ireland with the simple hope of making a better life in the land of opportunity that is America. My parents, who sacrificed absolutely everything for their five children. My wife and lifelong partner, Deanie, who has always been the real leader in the Dempsey family. My three children—Chris, Megan, and Caity—who encouraged me to pursue a career of service and who then joined me in that life. My protégés, who were in a very special way also my mentors. I've been blessed to learn from the best and now hope to share the knowledge with you.

ORI BRAFMAN: I dedicate this book to my parents, Tsilla and Hagay, and my brother Rom—all of whom have shown me unwavering acceptance throughout my life—and to all those who have taught me important lessons about inclusion, from the deserts of El Paso to Black Rock City and from the halls of UC Berkeley's Peace and Conflict Studies department to the tiny office of Vegan Action.

CONTENTS

PART 4: IN INCLUSION WE TRUST

PREFACE

Often the best things result from the most unexpected collaborations. Based on this belief—a belief at the very core of this book—we set out to examine today's leadership environment and to share some insights about how to navigate it. We concluded that a forty-one-year-old UC Berkeley professor and a forty-one-year-veteran U.S. Army general have very little in common except a deep and unwavering belief that most of the hard problems we face in our businesses, in our local communities, at the national level, and internationally can be solved with better leadership. Along the way, we learned that listening to each other was the first and most important step in our journey and that including diverse perspectives always produced surprising and valuable leadership insights. Ultimately we arrived at a message and how we would deliver it, a task that felt both more difficult and more important with the passage of time.

We feel a genuine urgency about our message. Few would dispute our assertion that the world began to change dramatically in 2001, but we have found the character and pace of change since 2001 more remarkable than we expected: challenges to the predictable and familiar "order of things" in business, government, international relations, and even our sense

of national identity; increasing religious extremism; the emergence of global peer competitors; the proliferation of technology, and—since about 2010—ubiquitous access to data and information for virtually everybody, all the time, everywhere. Status quo companies, militaries, countries—those that for a very long time enjoyed unchallenged power—are now palpably fearful that their power is eroding. Their instinct is to exert control. It's the wrong instinct.

•   •   •

Although the world has changed, the way we think about leadership hasn't kept pace. Often the result is suboptimal objectives decided upon too late, measured with the wrong metrics, and implemented with overconfidence by a workforce that is not sufficiently empowered to deliver them.

This book challenges us to refresh our thinking about leadership. It's not that the things we've always done as leaders won't work anymore. In fact, we will suggest that some of them should be reinforced. But we'll also suggest that there are several emerging leadership principles and instincts that are gaining in importance and that demand careful thought and serious consideration—that is, if we want our leadership to match the times and meet their challenges.

To be sure, this book was written during a period of considerable political disagreement about our country's future, especially about how much selectivity to exert about who belongs within and who is excluded outside our borders and our communities. But this book is not a commentary on political leadership. While we'd like to think that it has something to offer to those who have been elected to lead the country through the most pressing issues of our time, we believe that it will most strongly resonate among organizational leaders, especially those

facing industry, market, and cultural transformations. This book is an exploration of what happens when there's a mutation in the very core DNA of an organization.

Whether it's being a member of a family, attending a school, or serving our country, belonging to a community or a cause bigger than ourselves is core to our very humanity in three specific ways: belonging shapes our identity, it provides our sense of security, and it creates the order we need to survive.

We develop our identity based on the communities we join ("I'm a dad," "I'm an American," "I'm a soldier"). Being part of a community, in turn, provides us with security—when a parent sacrifices everything for their kids, when a teammate stays late to help a coworker finish a project, and in a thousand other ways, being a part of a community means that there are others who are committed to our success. Finally, in being a part of a community, we can expect our fellow members to abide by a certain set of rules, making our day-to-day existence predictable and thus productive.

Part of the very contract of belonging, though, is exclusion. We cluster ourselves in neighborhoods, hold tryouts for sports teams, and require exams for certain schools, thereby creating a sense of belonging among those who make the cut. Soldiers will often do anything——even against their own interests—to help a fellow combatant. This bond is so strong that we have a name for it: brothers in arms. You are brothers because you've both gone through boot camp, you both wear the same uniform, you both fight for the same country.

But what happens when there's a simple change in a company's organizational structure, or even a country's? Rather than being selective—or having any barriers to entry at all—what happens when a community is open for *anyone* to join?

We'll begin by looking at the forces knocking down organizational fences and checkpoints. We'll explore how selectivity—

border control, if you will—comes at an economic cost that may or may not make sense.

What are the costs of control? Clearly, there's a measurable economic price to keeping a sentry at the gate. But in exerting control, we may be paying a more serious but harder to measure cost: the ability to accurately view reality.

Indeed, it has become a cliché to say that we live in a complex, unpredictable, and rapidly changing world—so cliché, in fact, that we fail to appreciate how profoundly people are affected by it.

In 1798 John Adams declared that "facts are stubborn things." Today, we argue, facts are vulnerable. Emerging technology is making facts increasingly vulnerable, and all of us will soon have trouble discerning what is actually true. Simply put, we're about to enter an age where facts will no longer be reliable. The information we think is 100 percent accurate may be flawed, and even our best attempt to find the truth may fall short.

In a 2004 book, Ralph Keyes used the term "post-truth" to describe an emerging period in our history where the "borders blur between truth and lies, honesty and dishonesty, fiction and nonfiction."

We build on that observation and explore what the world will look like when, to gain understanding of the reality around us, there is no longer a debate of facts but rather a competition of narratives. As competing narratives vie to present a picture of the world, we will have a harder time determining what's real and accurate.

Welcome to the era of the *digital echo*, where information passes from individual to individual more quickly but in the process often becomes distorted.

We will explain the phenomenon of the digital echo in great detail, but it is important to note from the start that it is a neutral force. It can inform, misinform, educate, entertain, inspire the

human spirit to great acts of compassion, or unleash mankind's darkest instincts. It can inspire the generosity of the "ice bucket challenge" or the hatred of the ISIS terrorist ideology. It presents both a leadership challenge and a leadership opportunity.

One thing is clear about the digital echo: it creates the need for inclusion.

In this new world, we need to leverage inclusion to gain better information about the world around us and to effectively communicate our message.

In order to help you accomplish these two imperatives, we provide concrete leadership tools to create an environment of inclusion:

1. Belonging isn't optional: give them memories. We will argue that the first step in building a team is developing in its members a sense of belonging. Consider the alternative: if leaders don't make those who follow feel a sense of belonging, someone or something else will. And the ubiquitous presence of the digital echo makes this not only possible but likely.

2. Connect effort with meaning: make it matter. We will show that persuading members of the team that their contributions matter is crucial to team success. We all want to believe we make a difference. Leaders help their followers understand what that takes.

3. Think about what you're not thinking about: learn to imagine. We will encourage leaders to develop mindfulness, awareness, and imagination through a lifelong commitment to learning. We believe and will convince all who aspire to lead that imagination is a learned attribute.

4. Prevent decision paralysis: develop a bias for action. We will demonstrate that, when presented with a problem, leaders

must look for what they can do in the moment. They must avoid information paralysis. They must act to change the environment and to learn, and then act again, in a deliberate pattern of persistent learning and proactive leadership.

5. Collaborate at every level of the organization: co-create context. We will discuss how the most effective leaders harvest knowledge and empower the organization from bottom to top. We will show the benefits of concentrating the "what" while distributing the "how."

6. Expand the circle: relinquish control to build and sustain power. We will assert in the strongest terms that finding optimal, enduring, affordable solutions to complex problems requires leaders to reconsider and rebalance their understanding of the relationship among leadership, power, and control.

The leadership instincts are ***listen, amplify, include.***

Neither the principles nor the instincts are an à la carte menu. Effective leaders must understand and practice all of them.

We've titled our book *Radical Inclusion* because we believe that the traditional relationship among leadership, power, and control has changed. Solving our problems by leading with an emphasis on exclusion, jealously husbanding power, and aspiring to greater control is producing suboptimal, fragile, and costly outcomes.

The alternative is to rebalance the relationship among leadership, power, and control with an emphasis on inclusion, to selectively and purposefully relinquish control to enhance power, to define success less in terms of power and control and more in the ability, in order to achieve optimal, enduring, and affordable outcomes.

Counterintuitive? Perhaps. But as the digital echo spreads, as complex issues multiply, as uncertainty increases, as technology

exponentially changes, and as risk rises, it seems reasonable that we should seek to lead by sharing our challenges rather than owning them outright.

That said, this book's proposition about leadership is not that we ought to surrender our hard-earned power because possessing it is becoming a liability. Rather, it is that we must develop an instinct for seeking opportunities to share control in order to preserve and even enhance the power we possess.

Ours is a pragmatic proposal. We advocate sharing control in problem solving not because we wish to become somehow more egalitarian but because we want to solve problems effectively and efficiently, and we want them so stay solved!

Finally, we chose the adjective "radical" to describe the kind of inclusion we advocate because it speaks to the extremes we encounter as leaders in the world today. It is our belief that concentrations of power and exclusivity will continue to form but cannot endure in a world that sees all, a world in which technology levels all, a numbingly fast-paced world of rising expectations, glaring disparities, and declining trust.

If we're right about that, about the environment in which the affairs of business, industry, international relations, and national security must be managed, then only the leader who can harness the power inherent in inclusion will make lasting progress and achieve enduring success.

PART 1

THE OPERATING

ENVIRONMENT

CHAPTER 1: **THE DIGITAL ECHO**

The Fog of War Descends on Berkeley

Berkeley police Sergeant Sabrina Reich wore a clear and focused expression when we talked to her in the basement of Sproul Hall on the UC Berkeley campus.

The sergeant's voice nonetheless shifted as she told us, "In the entire history of the campus, what happened is unprecedented. We didn't expect something like *this*."

By "unprecedented" the sergeant meant Molotov cocktails, damaged property, and masked perpetrators who were either right-wing extremists, paid agitators, or anarchists out of control. In the blink of an eye Berkeley had turned into a war zone; dozens of civilians took to the streets and engaged in full-on armed conflict.

What was most alarming was that the violence seemed to emerge out of nowhere. The police were taken so completely by surprise that they simply stood by and watched. The shockwaves from the day's events reached all the way to the White House, escalating tensions between the federal government and the State of California.

And no one saw it coming. Wednesday, February 1, 2017, started out as a glorious Bay Area day. Over the previous month, after years of severe drought, California had finally been getting the drenching it so desperately needed. This week offered a respite from the rain. As temperatures rose in the afternoon, UC Berkeley students basked in glimpses of sunshine as they lounged on the steps of Sproul Hall.

Unlike the manicured, palm-lined drives of Stanford, its archrival an hour to the south, Cal has a decidedly gritty feel to it. It's an urban campus where you're as likely to run across a drum circle as you are to be caught up in a political debate. The guy in front of you in line for coffee could be a hippie, or he could be a Nobel laureate (Cal has reserved parking spots for Nobel Prize recipients)—or he could be both.

While the tech start-ups and venture capitalists may get more attention, it's impossible to understand Silicon Valley without understanding what's happening at Berkeley.

We often think of the transformational innovation coming from San Jose, Cupertino, and Mountain View, all home to the massive tech companies. Likewise, in Menlo Park and Palo Alto venture capital funds deploy billions of dollars. But Berkeley is the epicenter of social imagination—the place where the conscience of Silicon Valley originates.

It was on the Sproul Hall steps that Mario Savio stood to lead the free speech movement, and he walked through the administration building's doors for the very first sit-ins just forty years ago. This is where protest movements from civil right to animal rights were launched.

Berkeley is no stranger to diversity of speech, and the campus is no stranger to controversial voices. At the peak of the AIDS epidemic, for instance, Professor Peter Duesberg gave a talk claiming that HIV wasn't caused by a virus but was instead the product of drugs and a party lifestyle. Protesters objected to

the presentation, predicting that it would impact HIV policy—and indeed, South Africa went on to base its policies on Duesberg's theories.

For decades the campus has prided itself on being accepting of an eclectic cast of characters, from religious protesters to antinuclear activists to proud nudists. So tolerant are the campus and community of a variety of speech that local businesses sometimes sponsor protesters, paying them to display ads on the backs of their picket signs. When outspoken conservative activist Milo Yiannopoulos announced that Berkeley would be his final stop on the year-long tour he had dubbed an "all-out war on social justice," while you couldn't have expected the student body to be thrilled, you wouldn't have expected an actual war.

At one university on the tour, his appearance led to the resignation of the chancellor; at another appearance the protests grew so tense that a bystander was shot in the abdomen. Fearing similar outcomes, other universities preemptively canceled Yiannopoulos's appearances.

On the day of his appearance at Berkeley, tensions were running high. Student anxiety over Yiannopoulos's speech wasn't necessarily about the views he might express. Various campus groups worried that he might do something like call out undocumented students, as rumors to that effect had been swirling on social media—and were validated by an open letter sent to Berkeley students on February 1 by the university's Office of Student Affairs.

University officials feared violent clashes among protesters. The University of California Police Department stepped in, requiring the Berkeley College Republicans to raise $10,000 to cover the costs of security—which initially seemed to pay off, as the evening started with a peaceful protest and dance party against the rainbow-illuminated backdrop of the administration building.

Here's where things took a turn.

According to one version of events, reported by national media and believed by those in our nation's capital inclined to think the worst of Berkeley, at 5:39 p.m. student protesters began moving to block the venue entrance, and twenty-one minutes later Milo was evacuated. At 6:03 p.m. students shot fireworks at the building, and over the next ten minutes the protesters broke fences and windows. In response, police fired rubber bullets and tear gas into the crowd. Things only escalated from there, as protesters broke the windows of the student building and threw Molotov cocktails erupting in flames that lit up Sproul Plaza.

The next day the White House escalated the situation further with a thinly veiled threat: if Berkeley couldn't keep student violence from erupting over speech, perhaps the university wasn't deserving of federal funds.

Politics aside, you can see the origin of the concern: how could a campus that prides itself on tolerance condone vandalism and violent behavior by its students? Indeed, playing Monday-morning quarterback, you might think that the university should have exerted more control, hiring more police officers and vetting student groups to prevent the chaos that ensued.

But something didn't add up. When we dug a little deeper, we found that the administration, the media, and virtually everyone else following the story had gotten it completely wrong.

The problem with the students-are-to-blame version of events is that the student organizers of the protest were residents of a co-op that abided by nonviolent ideologies.

Think about that for a moment. These are students with majors like development studies and environmental science who toss around phrases like "community spirit" and "global consciousness." Sure, they might be guilty of smoking pot, but they aren't the Molotov-cocktail-throwing type.

In fact, knowing that the protests might create tensions,

the organizers actually went to great effort to underscore their nonviolent intentions. "We are not here to engage in physical confrontation," they wrote on the flyer they distributed to draw a crowd. "We will protect each other," they continued, "to ensure our democratic right to protest and our safety."

The event invitation even included safety tips for attendees, a number to dial in case of medical emergency, and instructions on how to spot the trained legal observers who would be present to document potential provocateurs and any incidents that might occur.

The student body was organized and ready to carry out its peaceful protest, as had so many others outside Sproul Hall over the decades.

But somehow everything went wrong. The violence intensified so rapidly that no one saw it coming. And no one knew exactly who or what was behind it. Even Sergeant Reich couldn't explain it.

People who have been to battle know that the most dangerous attacks don't announce their arrival. The most lethal attack is the one that catches us by surprise.

The military describes such blindness to impending attack as the "fog of war": the myriad things you may not know about your adversary—their location, numbers, capabilities, and goals.

But think about this: what if the fog not only denied you access to the facts but actually convinced you of the validity of erroneous data? From a business perspective, imagine not merely being unsure about the number of your customers but being certain of an *incorrect* number. It's under this condition— of believing wrong information—that the most difficult issues emerge and take us by surprise.

There is always some fog present, and organizations try to diffuse it as best they can.

The military uses on-the-ground scouts, communications intercepts, high-resolution satellites, and night-vision technology

to track and assess the enemy. Businesses analyze market trends to identify and outmaneuver the competition. But what if the information you see deceives rather than informs you? The real danger in battle and in business "wars" is that you may be convinced you have a clear picture when you don't actually understand what you're seeing.

That's exactly what happened in Berkeley. Without anyone realizing it, the fog of war enveloped the campus. The attack wasn't at all what it appeared to be. This brings us back to our conversation with Sergeant Reich.

She, along with the rest of her police force, is dedicated to protecting the campus and the community. But in order to protect against an attack, you need to know who's waging it.

This fundamental question—who incited the Berkeley violence—has ramifications far beyond the Berkeley police or even the city itself. As Reich and her colleagues tried to make sense of what was happening during the protests, operatives from both political parties on the national level were composing their own narratives about what was going on.

When violence breaks out at a protest, fingers naturally point at the organizers themselves. But as we have noted, these particular organizers were of the nonviolent type. Gandhi could've learned a thing or two from them about organizing peacefully. Even if we're to believe that the culprits were the student organizers, who regardless of their co-op lives *did* turn violent, why would they target, of all the buildings on campus, the *student* building, the one that houses all the student clubs (which—wait for it—skew heavily progressive)?

It would be out of character for them to do so, they had no motive for targeting that part of campus, and they had no history of such behavior. Either something completely unexpected happened that morphed these peace-loving liberals into hyper-aggressive militants or there's more to the story.

That's exactly what Reich thought when she looked at the events. Something just didn't make sense. But if the student organizers didn't cause the violence, who did?

"We believe," Sergeant Reich told us, "that these were paid anarchists." If it sounds like a wild conspiracy theory, it is.

There is no evidence that anyone was paid, and no one knows anything about who these so-called anarchists might even be. But here's a Berkeley police sergeant admitting that this is her leading theory. At this point the only thing we can be certain of is that the fog of war lay thick on the city of Berkeley, drifting to cover everyone nationwide who was trying to make heads or tails of the situation.

But if paid anarchists were responsible for the Berkeley violence, who paid them? One narrative holds that the anarchists were paid by one of the far-left extremist groups behind the riot, Refuse Fascism, said to have received $50,000 from a group backed by socialist billionaire George Soros. The theory was that "anti-fascists" started several fires, smashed windows and ATMs, looted downtown stores, attacked cars, and assaulted dozens of Milo Yiannopoulos fans.

Why, though, would a left-leaning organization (and a respectable funder) hire thugs to vandalize arguably the most progressive university in the country?

This is where yet a third theory of events enters the picture. Under this theory, the anarchists weren't paid by the Left. Rather, Yiannopoulos and Breitbart were in cahoots with the agitators, laying the groundwork for a White House crackdown on liberal universities and their federal funding.

In a blog post about why the protests turned violent, Berkeley professors drew a connection among Yiannopoulos, Steve Bannon, and President Donald Trump, suggesting that the violence could have been coordinated to support the president's call during his campaign to revoke federal funding for UC Berkeley.

And thus we have three competing accounts, each troubling in its own right.

Were Berkeley students out of control?

Did communists pay agitators to vandalize the campus?

Or did conservatives and affiliated media stage a coordinated information operations campaign?

At least two of these theories had to be wrong, and one of them had to be right. Right? Maybe not. What if the police, the university professors, the government, and the media reported the events *as they saw them* but were *all* mistaken?

In trying to figure out who the perpetrators were that night, we discover a global trend and a battle being waged right under our noses but unrecognized by even the most careful of observers.

Uncle Shoe Store

At a family Christmas party, Ori found himself in a conversation with an uncle who's a professor of philosophy, specializing in language and epistemology. The two were talking about fake news and how in the near future the trend might affect our ability to discern the truth. Halfway through the conversation, they were joined by another uncle, a physical therapist who runs a specialty shoe store for athletes. This uncle is one of the top experts in the country on running shoes and even holds a patent on a machine that tests a shoe's stability to gauge its appropriateness for a given runner.

The conversation—as tends to happen at family events—turned to global affairs. Uncle Shoe Store mentioned that he'd read about a Harvard professor who demonstrated that climate change science is wrong. "I mean, look around," he continued. "It's not hot this winter in San Francisco."

Of course, Uncle Philosopher is at the opposite end of the

political spectrum, so Ori bit his tongue and sat back to watch the fireworks. Instead of engaging in an argument, Uncle Philosopher asked Uncle Shoe Store how he had reached his conclusions.

Uncle Shoe Store said that he had read the information online, and that a number of his friends—all successful business owners—had read and agreed with the same materials. Uncle Philosopher tried to ask about the multitude of peer-reviewed journal articles backing climate change, but Uncle Shoe Store put little stock in them.

Just as Ori kept his mouth shut at Christmas, we're not going to weigh in on climate change. For a moment, though, let's view Uncle Shoe Store from the perspective of someone who believes in climate change.

We need to recognize that Uncle Shoe Store isn't simply spouting unfounded beliefs. He is actually being rational— reading up on climate change in his favorite publications, seeing what the people he trusts on social media say, etc., and coming to a rational (albeit debatable) conclusion. He's in no way irrational. He's reached a conclusion based on both the data in front of him and the so-called wisdom of the crowd. In other words, not only does he find the data compelling, but he's verifying it via a statistically established methodology. He's just not necessarily aware that the crowd whose wisdom he's tapping may be decidedly biased.

As much as we might feel superior to someone who holds an alternative view of scientific data, we *all* are soon going to suffer the same fate. What Uncle Shoe Store didn't account for as he gathered information and formed judgments was the digital echo. He wasn't alone.

There soon will come a time when, despite using all the resources available to us, we will simply not be able to tell what is actually true. This, as we'll soon see, is what happened at the Berkeley protest. Let's look at two other examples.

First, consider a recent hoax in which, with the aid of bots, the Twitterverse was convinced that a Louisiana chemical plant had gone up in flames—local news even reported on the fire. They eventually got the facts right when they sent a reporter to the scene, but what happens when local news gets replaced by distributed networks?

In other words, what will happen when *anyone* can produce a news story? In a case like this false fire, social media might have two versions of the same story. One would say there was no fire—showing a video of the unburned site—and then there would be another narrative, with photos purporting to show the explosion and its victims.

Now, what does that mean for a future allegation of, say, the use of chemical weapons in Syria? Or of some kind of warfare engaged in by the U.S. government? Will the public be able to discern what is actually real?

In the second example, mal intent wasn't even a factor. On December 27, 2016 (two days after the family Christmas party), a protester threw some firecrackers at a government building in Bangkok. This triggered a Facebook alert for an "explosion" (based on an unnamed "trusted third party"), and users proceeded to mark themselves "safe." The Facebook alert linked to a news story that referenced BBC "breaking news" footage of an explosion in Bangkok . . . that had happened a year earlier. News outlets saw the BBC logo and, in their rush to cover what appeared to be a major breaking story, overlooked the date on the video and hastily posted their own stories about the explosion.[1]

Of course, the error was quickly discovered and the Facebook alert was taken down. In the old days, newspapers wouldn't even have had time to take the story to print, television news

---

1*"Facebook Safety Check Creates False Alarm in Bangkok," BBC.com, December 28, 2016, www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-38448140.*

outlets that covered it would have run a correction, and that would have been that. But with news traveling at the speed of links and clicks, news of the "explosion" spread around the globe within minutes—and continued to spread even after Facebook corrected its error. And so, if you Googled "December 27, 2016, bombing in Thailand," there was a good chance that your top search result would be a story based on inaccurate data.

It's not always accurate to call instances like these "fake news." They can occur without any intentional deception. An inaccurate news story—even an accidentally inaccurate one—creates a "digital echo," and though the original source may be corrected, the echo—reverberating across distributed networks—endures forever.

What Really Happened in Berkeley (We Think)

Recall that we had three competing narratives about who was responsible for the violence and vandalism at Berkeley. Our first narrative blamed the students, our second blamed anarchists paid by conservative institutions, and our third blamed the same anarchists—but had them paid by the far Left.

Unsatisfied with the UC Berkeley Police's explanation, Ori continued to dig. He talked to a student who used to work for U.S. intelligence but got no answers. He asked other faculty, but they were equally perplexed. Ultimately he remembered that one of his students had written a paper on anarchist structures and turned to him for insight.

The student didn't want to talk on the phone, so Ori met him at a dive restaurant near campus.

"So, do you have any info? Which narrative is correct?"

"None of them," the student said. "They're all wrong."

And so we present narrative four, as told by Ori's student.

Anarchists did indeed attend the protest. They smashed the windows of Amazon and bank outlets within the student center to express their dissatisfaction with the economic divide. They weren't paid by anyone—and in fact were so wary of being found out that they didn't even communicate via social media.

At some point during the night, a heat lamp fell down and caught fire. There were no Molotov cocktails. These kids didn't know how to make one.

But when the media reported that firebombs had been thrown, the UC Police thought the campus was actually under paramilitary attack. Instead of making arrests, they retreated in the face of what they believed to be a superior force. The situation therefore wasn't contained and continued to spiral out of control. In other words, the digital echo affected real-time police action, which allowed the situation to escalate.

We underscore that no law enforcement individuals acted negligently. Just like Uncle Shoe Store, they responded in a rational manner to the information presented to them. That information originated from unreliable sources but was quickly amplified by being retweeted, reposted, and repeated, to the point where it appeared legitimate.

They fell victim to the digital echo. It could happen to any of us.

In a world where verifying facts is becoming increasingly difficult, inclusion is imperative. It gives us sources as close to the ground or the action as possible, providing our best chance of getting at the truth.

Despite our best efforts, there will still be times when truth cannot be reliably distinguished from fiction. In the absence of verifiable truth, competing narratives will vie for allegiance. When we are forced to compete in a battle of narratives, inclusion is still our best weapon: only by leveraging a diversity of voices can we create a winning narrative.

CHAPTER 2: **THE POWER OF NARRATIVE**

McDonald's vs. McVegan

To begin our investigation, we remain on Sproul Plaza but go back in time.

Twenty-two years before the Milo Yiannopoulos protests, in 1995, Ori was pulling a metal wagon along Sproul, the very spot where the agitators—whoever they were—would wage their attack. Ori normally walks with a hurried stride, but you wouldn't have guessed it from his pace that day, which was nearly a crawl.

His load was heavy: two folding chairs, a card table, twenty stacks of pamphlets bound with thick blue rubber bands, and a dozen or so signs affixed to cardboard backing, all balanced atop a red wagon that had started its life as toy for kids. Now, having been donated to the cause, it was covered in political stickers. The wagon's front left and rear right wheels wobbled under the weight of its cargo. *Tadamtumtruph, tadamtumtruph, tadamtumtruph*, they groaned as they rolled over the smallest bumps in the concrete.