

It has been seven years since I last set foot in Sweden. In April 2002, on a whim, I went to my travel agent and enquired about the price of a ticket to Stockholm. There was no real reason at this point. If anything, I was fascinated by the leadership of this country online, because Sweden really was showing the way when it came to the internet. It follows on from the music industry, which has exported incredibly successfully. One of my colleagues used to dress up as Agnetha from ABBA, right up till the mid-2000s, in a tribute band in New Zealand. As a matter of fact, the entertainment at Miss New Zealand last year was another ABBA tribute band, with really bad accents (they sounded German). They got a bit of a shock when I got up—I judge the contest each year and, as a matter of fact, I judged Nya Fröken Sverige last year—and said a few words in Swedish. In fact, one of the first things I said in 2002 was: ‘Is there an ABBA theme store here?’

I have always admired Swedish design—I had a toy Volvo 164E from when I was about five years old—and I still have my 1978 brochure from the same car company with the 242GT on the cover.

That same day, after I enquired, I received an email from Chris Macrae, the branding author and mathematician. Chris was inviting me to Medinge, a town near Arboga, where Thomas Gad and Anette Rosencreutz have a villa. He said there was a gathering of branding professionals, and wanted me to include my views and give a presentation.

Background: consulting, fonts, media, Lucire, social media, books, politics—how I am always ahead of the curve by a few years.

I took that as a sign that I should come. How often do you get the invitation *after* you enquire about the air tickets?

And I have come to admire Sweden even more since being here twice in 2002 and 2003. I’ve travelled to some of the smaller towns and met the people.

On my first day here I was told by Stefan Engeseth, my dear friend and colleague in Stockholm who was instrumental in getting me here on this tour, about the concept of *jantelagen*. You will be surprised to know that the identical concept exists in New Zealand and in Australia, called the *tall poppy*

syndrome. You could say I feel at home here.

And one day, Stefan and I went to visit a friend of his, who had Monica Zetterlund’s *Monicas Bästa* on her CD player. That’s all it took: since then I’ve learned some Swedish, but I can only converse in your language if you happened to say to me, ‘Åh, ni fantastiska män,’ or ‘Innan jag är riktigt vaken, står han lutad över sängen, säger, “Hej!”’

I see Sweden as far more than the land of Absolut, Saab, H&M, Ikea, Electrolux and others. What is impressive about here and a country like India is I believe you both are poised to be this century’s leaders.

I know conventional thinking talks about China or Brazil, and while both have their merits, I am not sure if either have what it takes in the 2010s.

Red China holds a great deal of contradictions and while it is now the world’s largest exporter in terms of value, things are by no means lost for smaller countries that have to compete. While there is much to admire about China—Red or otherwise—it falls short on the idea of social responsibility. And I think this is where those who predict that this is the Chinese century go wrong.

Don’t get me wrong: I am proud of my heritage—I was born in Hong Kong and I speak Cantonese—but I am *so* proud I do not believe it is necessary to hide our ingenuity or quell opposition. While Beijing does that, of course people are suspicious about Chinese intentions when it comes to, for example, Volvo and Saab. We know that it has no intention of saving jobs at Trollhättan.

My point is that the way these major economies behave—the US, Red China, Russia—is so out of kilter with what consumers expect in this world. How Swedish companies behave is, in fact, a lot closer. And that is where you will find success.

A few years ago, the BBC TV show *Top Gear* tested a Swedish car, the Koenigsegg CCX. The feedback was that if there was an extra spoiler on the back of the car, it would sort out its stability problems. Within months, Christian von Koenigsegg, whom I had the privilege to chat to in 2003 when I was last here, the spoiler had been added. There were fewer levels to go through, and it showed how quickly you can respond to criticism. While Koenigsegg sells to the very rich, it does not behave in an élitist way. It has that genuine, transparent feel about it,

which is actually what consumers want.

Sweden is a country of ideas and you communicate at the level of ideas. Do not lose that. You work independently and innovatively, qualities that I think you share with New Zealand. And I would like to think that, with the internet, we see more collaborations between our countries.

Eleanor Roosevelt once said, ‘Great minds discuss ideas. Average minds discuss events. Small minds discuss people.’

I know you have shows like *Fame Factory* here, but, by and large, when I look at, say, your political campaigns—I was here one time during the voting for the EMU—you function at the ideas level, the first group.

The issue is the humility that you have, and humility means that you don’t shout from the rooftops how great you are. Maybe you don’t need to. I am not here to demand that you change a national behaviour. I am here to suggest that you look at championing something that I think we all believe in: your humanism.

Humanism is superior to technocracy because it speaks to people and it respects people. Nothing is hidden in jargon.

When I look at recent Swedish corporate communications, there is a lot about your environmental record. This comes from the humanistic angle. Of course we all care about the environment, but few countries have been able to get their act together in the way that you have. There are genuine examples that Vattenfall has demonstrated with electric cars, or the city of Lund with its preference for bicycles over cars.

In many ways, this is the Swedish decade, because the world has finally caught up with the humanistic message. Or, at least, people find it appealing. We give the environment lip service but few of us know what to do about it. Sweden paints the image of a country that is walking the talk, and the humanistic bent of many of your companies and organizations allows you to hold your head up high.

Questioning capitalism

It is no secret that for the last 20 years, there has been a greater questioning of the capitalist system. Over the course of 2008, more than one person has raised the subject of the fictional Gordon Gecko character, a shady trader on Wall Street. Gecko exemplified excess and greed, the sort of qualities that every-

day people balk at.

Or are they? When Michael Lewis wrote his book, *Liar's Poker*, revealing some of the illogical, rhetoric-based decision-making on Wall Street, he expected he could turn students away from being traders. Instead, he began receiving mail from American students wanting to know if he had more tips to trick the system.

If one is the superpower, one has a responsibility to lead morally, ethically and transparently, and with the US's failure to do so, of course there was a shift away. It was no surprise that Barack Obama was elected in the US at the end of 2008. It is one of the many changes that scream: the system does not work. We need a new one.

But the answer is not China, at least not in its current form. Traditional Chinese values are based on an exchange of duties and are, in fact, far closer to Swedish values. However, what is being seen there is not very Chinese, with the top-down mentality and the same conspiratorial nature when it comes to finance.

And what is the opposite of technocracy? It is *humanism*.

This, in its most basic form, means putting people first. That individuals are stakeholders who should be treated with respect. That their needs are recognized and served. People want to develop their qualities and who they are, whether they are inside or outside the organization.

Individuals are being mobilized like never before, and not just in politics, but as economic players. No brand can survive today by being top-down: at best, brand owners are stewards who try to manage the perceptions of their brands held by audience members.

The difference between here and India is that there is a government-coordinated nation branding campaign there. It's just that it is less well known than the Swedish image at the moment. If you go to India, there is a saying in Hindi that translates to, 'Guest is god.' It is part of the culture to treat people respectfully. This is entirely in line with the ideas of corporate citizenship.

In Sweden, companies promote the national image individually, with no formal nation branding campaign taking place. However, it might not need one since each firm has been, consciously or unconsciously, promoting one.

These two countries might be more representative of this coming decade.

Consumer democratization

We all know branding has been a traditionally top-down idea. It is where the organization has a strategy, and it wants to communicate that internally and then externally. That would form an image of what the organization is about in the minds of consumers.

But things are changing. Ever since the 1990s, everyday people have far greater control over others' brands. It was easy for us to create emails criticizing a certain brand. And some of those emails have forced companies to make public apologies.

Today, with Facebook groups and blogs, consumers are even more powerful than before. This suggests very quickly that we are not in control of our brands in the traditional sense and our audience has mastered communications' channels that feel more genuine, more transparent than the mainstream media. We need to be as transparent if we are to counter the negatives.

We also have a generation of consumers with a built-in BS detector. They know when a message is inauthentic, because they have been raised in a media-savvy world.

Therefore, you have to *engage* with consumers because they expect it.

The brand manager is no longer someone who comes up with a top-down strategy. The brand manager is someone who is working in the crowd, liaising with people and helping steer them, through building a relationship with them, to what the desired perception should be. The brand manager cannot expect (and has never been able to expect) unanimity in the brand image, and can at best hope that (s)he has set the groundwork on the basic, fundamental idea of the brand's vision. The brand manager cannot expect the strategy to remain fixed, because it evolves with the crowd and with time. At best, the brand manager is a steward, maybe a guardian, but not a dictator.

What you cannot plan for is change, and having a fixed idea of what the brand is can no longer work. If one accepts change as part of the equation, then it's little wonder the brand manager has to be part of it, among the crowd, to understand what that change is.

Dr Christian Grönroos, who has worked in Finland for many years, is the man who talked about the notion of relationship marketing. If I had to distil

decades of Dr Grönroos's work, it would be to say that relationship marketing is about marketing that is based on relationship building. This was the sort of theory that I went through business school with, and it is valid.

In *One*, branding is about being one with the customer, essentially being *on the same side* as the customer.

A great example is Linux, which is a collaborative operating system for computers. While Linus Torvalds works in Finland, I think we can guess from his name where his roots are. Linux has taken on the Microsoft monopoly. If you ever talk to computer geeks, enjoys the sort of brand loyalty among the *initiés* that Windows never could. I would say it parallels that of Apple. But there is no top-down brand strategy here: it moves together with the public.

The lessons are the same regardless of whether you run a firm here that serves only your neighbourhood or something as big as Dell: remove as many steps as possible between the customer and the decision-maker at the company.

Brands today are like this. Successful brands are those that invite collaboration on defining them. Consumers expect transparency and openness: they want to know what is going on behind the scenes. They want to know that the brand cares about the same things that they do.

And this is why Sweden has a massive advantage. You are already doing this. You are already practising these values because they are in line with the consensus approach you have in business. What has changed since 2002 is that you can use this approach not just internally, but externally as well.

Social media

I know we have two audiences here: one that wants to know how to start in social media and another that is very advanced, and is live-Tweeting this event.

But let me reiterate just how we got here. We have talked about how big countries like China are not good at transparency. They work in secrecy and that's why there's doubt about their brands and why there's suspicion about what Geely might do with Volvo. We have talked about how Swedish companies' social responsibility is an asset. We have talked about how individuals have become powerful against corporations.

Regardless of the technology available, social media is about engagement and using the crowd to help build the brand image. The only way to do that is to accept that brands are no longer top-down and that any one of us who wants our audience's support must be seen to be one with the audience.

Social media is not a one-way channel. If you use it as a one-way channel, you will not get any more resonance from your audience than with your current media channels. In that case, you should not even use it.

It is not about control. If you fail to engage, then you are out of kilter with the way brands are today. People expect brands to engage, not to control.

People resist the top-down mentality and we can no longer expect the audience to have a unified image of our brands.

It is a lot easier to share the non-confidential elements of a company strategy online via Facebook and Twitter to fans and followers than risk having a hate group made. Supporters of your brand not only become people who you can create a relationship with, but they can become your communications' channel as well. By gaining that consensus with them, they become your allies. They are your brand partners.

The lessons are the same regardless of whether you run a firm here that serves only your neighbourhood or something as big as Dell: remove as many steps as possible between the customer and the decision-maker at the company.

This again begs the question of: how do you know what your audience wants if you are not there, interacting with them?

Once upon a time, that interaction came from someone working on the shop floor. The proprietor of the business understood his customer's demands and worked accordingly. Today, businesses are bigger and more widespread in many cases. Surveys might not always give accurate results, especially if the sample is small. They might also give skewed results from either people who love the brand or hate the brand, but not people in between.

This is where the technology comes in. It makes sense to blog because blogs are one of the windows that people have in interacting with the firm. Or Facebook, where you have another

window. Or Twitter. You meet your clients where they are.

And this is the crux of my mayoral campaign.

On a blog, posing questions for dialogue could be a great way to encourage crowd participation, and audiences might even do some of your communication for you. On Facebook, with a claimed 300 million people, with probably 100 million inactives, it is very similar, with people adopting brands as part of a personal badge, showing their friends that they are "fans" of certain things. Consumers are now proud to tell others what they buy.

Twitter is an amazing opportunity to bridge the gap between the company and the audience. It is like the brand itself. No one might care about your bottom line but they might care about some of the processes at your workplace. They might care that they can Tweet (which means message) the boss of the company through this medium. They might care to see that there are real human beings behind the company's walls, giving them an insight into what makes your business different. Sweden is good at this, and it is a grand advantage that large American companies with many layers of management will not be able to do. Chinese companies, because of their state ownership on the mainland, will find it even more difficult. Everything has to be approved not just by the provincial politicians, but by Beijing as well.

So far I have said that small companies can succeed on Twitter and Facebook and have an advantage over the larger ones. Remember that the definition of branding is the ways in which the organization communicates, symbolizes and differentiates itself to all of its audiences. Differentiation is the most important here, because that is what separates one company from another.

In the case of the small company, it is easier for everyone to understand what differentiates it. Where the founder is still running the company, then it is likely that the founder's personality is that differentiating factor. And who better to write on Facebook or Tweet than the founder, maybe as the main person, so (s)he can understand what customers want, or as a supporter, who comes in once every week to say something?

In a large company, there are strategies, too. A large company needs to give the person in charge of social media a

lot of trust. The person needs to be very responsive. (S)he also needs to understand the brand. However, it also needs to set out what can be communicated and what can't. Obviously, private information cannot be.

A traditional company can get into the social media world simply by being traditional: in Facebook, or Twitter, its messages should be in line with the image of its brand. Tweet less regularly, and avoid colloquial language. Just as you don't want your lawyer talking in slang, a law firm should never Tweet in slang. If you are one with your consumer, you should understand that the law firm needs to be the intellectual, official part of their conscience.

How many of you know about Google Wave?

Programs such as Google Wave might be more useful than they currently appear, for the same reason. Right now, Google is marketing Wave as a project-collaboration tool, where you can chat to people in real time. Now, what about a marketing tool, where you collect followers in to your Wave account like you would for a Facebook fan page or a Twitter account? Instead of a project collaboration, you have a brand collaboration, discussing marketing projects and other things that you do.

It is the voyeuristic aspect that could appeal. Secondly, there is an "advantage" aspect: giving an audience member "insider knowledge" with which (s)he feels privileged.

When we set up a blog for *Lucire*, a fashion magazine I own, we did not want to do a news blog, because others were already doing it. While we still have news items, we put in, occasionally, behind-the-scenes stories. People might find out how a shoot was done, for example. So when they buy the magazine, they have that insider knowledge, making them feel like part of an exclusive club. They tell other friends about their "membership", even if they stay silent and let people who visit their Facebook page or their blog see that they have some affiliation with your brand.

Democracy in action

There is evidence that Barack Obama won the presidency because he was on Twitter and engaging with people. Certainly a lot of people put Obama logos on their websites to show that as

their “badge”. And with my mayoral campaign, I have decided to put a lot of these ideas into play: the idea of working with my voters, to let them know I am one with them; and to be transparent and explain just how my free wifi plan will create new businesses and creative and tech industry clusters. We have a 1½ per cent increase in unemployment over the last year in Wellington, and none of my opponents seem to care. Well, someone needs to.

Using technology in politics is not unprecedented.

In February 2009, the New Zealand Government intended to put out a Copyright Act amendment called s. 92A. There was also a s. 92C that was problematic.

It would put the onus on ISPs to shut down internet users if there was a suspicion of illegal downloading. You can see how this misses the whole idea of due process. No one should have something taken away from them based on finger-pointing. There should be some form of trial and evidence.

American lobby groups, who are losing money, argue that situations such as video rental shops closing are due to piracy. What they seem to ignore is that the purchase of *legal* DVDs is now easier and cheaper than it's ever been.

But no matter: the opposition to the law was fair and justified.

A few netizens, meeting at Foocamp in New Zealand, talked about what was happening. Brenda Wallace, probably one of the smartest people out there who has an admirable no-BS attitude, is credited by one of my sources as coming up with the idea of blacking out your avatar on Twitter and Facebook. I believe it might have come from a failed attempt by the All Blacks, our rugby team, to do the same. However, this movement struck a chord with the community, because we were all appalled by the idea of false accusations by faceless foreign corporations impacting what we do in daily life.

It was suggested on the Sunday, and soon after, people began blacking out their avatars. The movement really caught on when Stephen Fry, the English actor and author, blacked out his avatar. A young guy in Ireland decided that they needed a blackout movement there, too. It became global very quickly and by the Wednesday, an animation, entitled *Copyright Kangaroo Court*, was created and circulated.

The Creative Freedom Foundation

gained more members in that period than the existing creative artists' groups. It can probably claim to represent more artists in New Zealand than similar groups.

By the Friday, the Prime Minister was questioned about s. 92A on *Sunrise*, a morning news show, and soon after, he had to announce that the law was not going to be enacted. It was, instead, going to be reviewed, and that is where we stand today.

Make it easy to protest and people will join you.

Democracy worked and it highlighted the power of this segment. People banded together to such an extent that a government has no choice but to back down.

The Government could have avoided embarrassment altogether if it had listened, if it had been “one” with the citizens. And that's the lesson I took from the blackout: you would be stupid to ignore what young people are thinking. They indeed represent tomorrow, so if we don't provide them a city which they are proud of, we will lose the brightest talents, maybe to countries like yours.

So this goes a lot further than one election in October, a few weeks after your General Election on my birthday. This goes to the heart of New Zealand's place in the world as an world-class, leading country. We don't want to lose our talent, and we want to create more jobs in a decade where some experts say no more jobs can be created. If there is one more thing that I want to impart, it is this: we have to think of the long term, whether we are talking about a city or a company. How relevant we are depends on how well we know the people who vote us in or buy our goods and services. And this decade, the only way to do that is to abandon any notion of élitism and embrace the ideas of partnership and relationship.

The mayoral campaign

I want to talk about a few of my ideas, without sounding too much like I am campaigning, since none of you are likely to be on the electoral roll for Wellington. (However, if you move there, you can escape this winter.)

I took what I knew in branding and applied it to politics. What do we know? We know (a) there is a democratization that has happened thanks to technology. We have to accept that this applies even more strongly in a democ-

racy. (b) We know that people wear their affiliation to brands proudly, which means a Facebook fan page had to be done.

Ten years ago, Wally Olins wrote a book called *Trading Identities*, based on observations he made that companies were looking more like nation states and the opposite was becoming more apparent. Those lessons still apply to some extent today: companies talk about *corporate citizenship*, and the concept remains relevant when it comes to running a firm and getting the most from your employees. This helps creativity in the firm, and each person can develop his or her qualities—ideas raised by Nicholas Ind in his book *Branding Governance*.

But what about *real* citizenship in a democracy? We want everyone to be able to do their best in a city, or, for that matter, in a country. This is what I take from John F. Kennedy meant when he said, ‘Ask not what your country can do for you. Ask what you can do for your country.’ This was not JFK demanding that people all enter public service: it was a reminder that everyone has something to contribute, and that in a perfect system we can all self-actualize and realize who we are.

So that means the next mayor will have to be someone who understands that the power no longer resides in élites, but in someone who comes from their own world. Wellington already suffers enough from malaise: with some exceptions, all that the same—again, die-hard council “experience” has given the city is a place that ignores the massive potential and talent of the people who live there. Wellington succeeds not because of city policy, but in spite of it. The fact that Peter Jackson and his team have made wonderful films there, and the fact that high-tech companies have done well exporting their technologies, is due to sheer bloodymindedness and stubbornness. I had to ask myself: why work against it? Why is the city not bringing this to the fore?

Why, indeed, should we keep voting the same people who have learned the same convention and expect a different result? As Einstein might say, this is insane.

How do you know what people want? By talking to them. By being *one* with them. In fact, by getting rid of the word *them*. I am just like every other Wellingtonian in that I want to be a good citizen: someone who can live to

my full potential. I am one of us.

What my city has is such innovative thinking and a wireless internet infrastructure that is closed to the general public, until you pay. So the first step is opening that up so that it is free. It is something another city, Dunedin, is trialling, and we have the World Cup rugby in 2011 where this is going to be a necessity for our tourism industry.

I talk about building a creative cluster in Wellington because we all know industry clusters—like the one you have in the south for automobile engineering—produce world-class innovations that benefit the cities, region and country. (Let's leave the discussion on the mess that American automakers have got you in to for another occasion.)

I know these things because I live and breathe Wellington almost every day of the year, and hear from my fellow citizens that these are important to us. Over the last three years I've listened. You might say this goes back even further. Meanwhile, I notice that none of my opponents realize that these issues are important because they have failed to engage. They have either looked at Wellington too narrowly or they are concentrating too much on the élite friends and big business people who do not have our city's interests at heart. The policies I have heard so far are about getting rid of trolley bus wires or paving certain streets. None of these are what mainstream Wellington is thinking.

I built a blog and putting issues there for people to provide feedback on. On September 25, 2009, I announced my intention to stand, by putting it out on Twitter and the news-wires. In both these cases I got a lot of feedback, and a lot of re-Tweets. I recognized that in 2009–10, we have far more people on social networking sites than we did in 2007, and, in fact, those who are there form a very influential and powerful group of people. If we accept that most are 18–45 years old, then that is 38 per cent of the Wellington electorate—38 per cent that get ignored every election by mayoral candidates.

My ideas are simple, but the benefits are more jobs, because another thing my opponents are too scared to talk about is that our unemployment has risen by 1½ per cent over the last year. How are they going to fix it? I want to decrease unemployment by building on a technology sector that's growing and

giving these businesses the right environment to create national champions and clusters.

I have promised a transparent administration. I know these words get bandied about a lot, but since I have lived them for most of the last decade, I am able to prove it. That means creating a city blog—the current campaign one is a prototype to what can come next. All city meetings and public notices will be put on it. People can see for themselves what the majority opinions are, if we allow registered ratepayers and citizens to comment—with their real names, of course.

I will give you an example of how outmoded the current system is. We need some no-parking stripes painted on our street. All my neighbours agree with this. We were sent letters by the council announcing this could go ahead, but that it would be advertised as a public notice in the local newspaper.

This may be bad for a mayoral candidate to say but I very, very seldom have read those public notices. It should really be online, so we comment when we like at our convenience. Democracy is not about creating bureaucracy.

In other cases, we might demand that citizens go attend council meetings, probably at times when people can't even get off work. Or deals are done behind closed doors—a practice that I want to end. If the deals are worthy enough anyway, what is wrong with letting the public know?

By the time October 9 comes by, I'll have an even keener idea of what Wellingtonians want from their mayor. If I happen to win, then I'll deliver what we've worked on together—as opposed to some *Diktat* that has come from an élite or a corporate backer. Wellington, like Stockholm, is a very fair-minded society and I believe we would balk at knowing there are hidden agenda.

After October 9, the way I see the city working is this: (a) citizens should be able to reach their mayor in media they are comfortable with. That means Twitter and Facebook as well as conventional means. I want to stay connected. I do not want to repeat what the American president has done and disappear from Twitter for months after the 2008 election.

(b) I want meetings and policies to be placed online for ready feedback, again in a form that people are familiar with. This will work on mobile devices as well as conventional web browsers.

(c) In terms of groups lobbying for city finance, they have the ability to put their cases online as well, so that people can judge how their rates are going to be spent.

Open government is key as well as lean processes. Cities need to provide value to their stake-holders.

I want to start a whole movement for the nation. We can use social media for Sweden. At the moment, the Opposition does not have a high-profile leader. One way around that is to let electors, especially the young ones, know what they mean. If their ideas resonate and if they can show that they are one with the people, then they stand a far better chance of getting elected on September 19. Barack Obama did this by *engaging* and being perceived as being one with the people, even if it was not himself doing the Tweeting. People saw, or believed, that he was one of them—and that he was doing this for a long time before election day. His people had been Tweeting and building up a following on Twitter for a long time before; in my case, I have been doing it since 2007, which is when I really hatched my plan to run for mayor. There was no way I could have started a few months out from the campaign. I needed to build this up because I am not known as a politician.

In New Zealand, I want to be the first and change the way even our national politics run. Maybe I can help the world, too, because if we can find a way for democracy to work, it can continue being a viable system. The alternative is not a pleasant one to bear.

The future

These principles apply regardless of whether Facebooks survive the decade. I argue that they might not. Why? Facebook is not "one" with its users. It often argues that it is the fourth largest country in the world. If that is the case, then it is a dictatorship, forcing changes on people whether they like it or not. Even when you set your privacy settings one way, it will find another way to circumvent it.

Its CEO, Mark Zuckerberg, does not understand that if he continues acting this way, Facebook will die. Right now, everyone predicting the death of Facebook has been wrong. And no wonder Zuckerberg has become more arrogant about his site.

He is too young to remember that 10 years ago, the biggest search engine in the world was AltaVista. Where is it

now? I wonder if Zuckerberg has even heard of it.

As the price of running a site like Facebook drops, it is inevitable that someone with one-tenth of the budget can create an equivalent site. AltaVista collapsed as the leading search engine not just because Google was simple, but because Google could deliver the search for a lower price. And the same will happen with Facebook.

Facebook can preserve its standing by being one with its users, but it is doing anything but. Ironical: a social network that is taking the social out of networking.