

I remember the first time I watched this YouTube video. It was one of the first things I did in my Introduction to Information Science course. That course was big on the topics regarding the handling of information. My opinion on the video evolved since then. Before I thought it was a nifty video with a solid point. As for now, while I feel the message of the argument is true, the argument itself is fallible.

The video starts off asking if the viewer knows what information is. He then assumes that the viewer will select a physical representation of information as an answer. How does the speaker know that the viewer isn't pointing to the information (message) being shared and not the actual physical representation of it? He doesn't. He tries to make the viewer assume they do not truly know the definition of information in an attempt to reconstruct our pretenses on the subject matter. That is the first area where I felt the argument was weak.

The speaker then goes on to say, "But you know what happens... We often confuse information with the form it takes." Do we? Again, much of this argument is built off of assumptions.

What I found the most interesting was the fact that the speaker set up a scenario in which we were to show him information, he assumed we pointed at a container of information. However when to show his favorite mug, one of the responses was the gesture of pointing to the mug. I felt like that was too similarly the same thing he just called the viewer out about.

Why is the mug the message, but not me pointing at a newspaper of information where the messages can be seen and selected by finger-point? While I generally agree that information is not the medium, but the message, I believe sometimes these can be hard to separate.

Sometimes I still think of information as art. Art is the medium, the message, and the feeling all used to convey the exact context the artist is trying to communicate. In this context at least, everything can be the message and the message can change depending upon how another one looks at the same compilation. How would the speaker explain these interpreted differences? If we apply the speaker's theory to this situation, the message is whatever the artist intended and the artwork is the medium, not the message. But what if the artist had no intended message? Does that mean that the particular piece holds no information to be delivered and that the medium is not at least significant in itself? It gets quite confusing here.

While it is true, we do spend our lives handling information and giving it form, is there ever a situation when the medium is also the message? If you look at it in terms of information as a process which is what the speaker is hinting at, Michael Buckland explains, this would likely never be the case as it is free to move from conscious to conscious- unrestricted by any medium. Information suddenly becomes this malleable and limitless concept that gets molded into different forms and expressed in different mediums. However, another

The video probably should have expounded more on this concept but fell short in just telling us that information is not pointing the finger.

I think of information as the message and the context to be anything useful that supports the message to make it understandable. This idea helps bring together a lot of the arguments conveyed on what exactly information is.