After nearly 5 1/2 years, today is my last day at Facebook

*** I'm quitting because I can no longer stomach contributing to an organization that is profiting off hate in the US and globally.***

I want to thank all of the people - contractors, interns, and FTE - who I've met here over the years, for helping create a pleasant and mutually respectful workplace. It is clear to me that despite the best efforts of many of us who work here, and outside advocates like Color Of Change, Facebook is choosing to be on the wrong side of history.

As I reflect on my last five years, Facebook's five core values rise to the top of my mind. I'm going to share what I've learned from them, and how the absence of them in the company's approach to hate has eroded my faith in this company's will to remove it from the platform.

Be Bold

Facebook didn't scale to over 2.5 billion users, a third of the world's entire population, by us throwing our hands up when faced with a challenge, saying "it's too hard", and walking away. Quite the opposite: my career at Facebook has been defined by confronting hard problems head on.
Often, I hear people explain how hard it is to do things like remove hate content, stop hate organizing, or etc. To me being bold means seeing something that's hard to do but, knowing it's the right thing to do, rolling up my sleeves, and diving in.
Boldness is not, on the other hand, taking a pass on implementing the recommendations from organized civil rights advocates, eg #StopHateForProfit, and even our own civil rights auditors - as we have done.
Given the lack of willingness, commitment, urgency and transparency around actioning the civil rights audit's recommendations to the best of our ability, I am left wondering if the audit was intended to be a PR deflection strategy.

Focus on Impact

I've learned to pay relentless attention to the results of my work, and that outcomes as measured by fair, honest metrics are what matters.
As everyone should know after the [Myanmar Genocide](https://time.com/5880118/myanmar-rohingya-genocide-facebook-gambia/ [time.com]), ["the looting starts the shooting starts"](https://www.vox.com/recode/2020/6/2/21278405/facebook-mark-zuckerberg-internal-employee-q-a-defend-moderate-trump-looting-shooting-post [vox.com]), [the Kenosha Guard shootings] (https://www.buzzfeednews.com/article/ryanmac/kenosha-militia-facebook-reported-455-times-moderators [buzzfeednews.com]), and countless incidents in between: our work has life and death consequences.

Every day "the looting starts, the shooting starts" stays up is a day that we choose to minimize regulatory risk at the expense of the safety of Black, Indigenous, and people of color.
Violent hate groups and far-right militias are out there, and they're using Facebook to recruit and radicalize people who will go on to commit violent hate crimes. So where's the metric about this? [Our PR response to #StopHateForProfit on this one didn't even engage with the question](https://www.stophateforprofit.org/progress-report [stophateforprofit.org]).

Move Fast

I've been told repeatedly "Facebook moves much faster than {company x}". In my work, moving fast looks like bias to action: when presented with a problem, I execute towards a solution with haste. Sometimes this has meant learning about a bug in a meeting, and fixing it before the meeting is over.
The contrast between that and our approach to hate on platform is astonishing.
Civil society has been engaging with Facebook on issues like whether "white nationalism" is hate content (first reported in 2018, [enforcement is dubious](https://www.npr.org/2020/06/06/871404652/facebook-becomes-key-place-for-extremist-boogaloo-movement-organizers [npr.org])), around preventing illegal discrimination in ads ([still possible as of December](https://www.propublica.org/article/facebook-ads-can-still-discriminate-against-women-and-older-workers-despite-a-civil-rights-settlement [propublica.org])), and [refusing to take good faith steps to reduce hate on platform](https://www.stophateforprofit.org/progress-report [stophateforprofit.org]).
Feedback is supposed to be a gift, yet despite the enormous feedback (and multiple lawsuits, for discriminatory ads) very little action has been taken. In fact, we continue to pass the buck with the Kenosha Guard failure being pinned on contract content moderators, who are underpaid and undersupported in their jobs - both of which are things Facebook could almost instantly fix if it so chose. The actions that have been taken are easy, and could be interpreted as impactful because they make us look good, rather than impactful because they will make substantive change.

Be Open

I've learned to engage honestly and eagerly with folks who want to have conversations with me at work, regardless of role or team.
The lack of openness on Facebook's part when it comes to the matter of hate on platform throws this idea into sharp relief. After it came out that the extreme-right, [racist](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/334964003_Is_Breitbart_Racist_A_Corpus-based_Critical_Discourse_Analysis_of_the_Breitbart_News_Website [researchgate.net]) [Breitbart](https://www.splcenter.org/hatewatch/2017/10/06/breitbart-expos%C3%A9-

confirms-far-right-news-site-platform-white-nationalist-alt-right [splcenter.org]) [gets a pass on our misinformation policies](https://www.theverge.com/2020/8/6/21357663/facebook-removed-strikes-conservative-fact-checking-banned-breitbart [theverge.com]), the company's response was to hide the receipts. [Our dishonesty about the Kenosha shootings is similarly, uh, not very open](https://www.buzzfeednews.com/article/ryanmac/facebook-failed-kenosha [buzzfeednews.com]).

Build Social Value

To this day, the meaning of this value escapes me. I've heard numerous, unsatisfying explanations for how the various things I've worked on here has been building social value. In all my roles across the company, at the end of the day, the decisions have actually come down to business value. What I wish I saw were a serious prioritization of social good even when there isn't an immediately obvious business value to it, or when there may be business harm that comes from it - for instance, removing the sitting president's incitement to violence, which could lead to regulatory action.
It seems that Facebook hasn't found the business value to be had in aggressively pursuing the existing credible strategies to remove hate from the platform - despite pressure from civil society, our own employees, our own consultants, and our own customers via the boycott.
If none of those things can compel us to be bold and move fast on hate, it seems like the only source of pressure that's yet to come to bear is government or regulatory action. While I know many of us groan at the idea of government intervention of any sort, [this is an approach that has seen a marked reduction in hate content on German social media](https://www.cnbc.com/2019/08/02/twitter-users-switch-profiles-to-germany-to-escape-online-hate.html [cnbc.com]).

This is your company now

I know I'm not alone in being upset about Facebook's willingness to profit off of hate. If you feel alone in that, and want someone to chat (about non-confidential things!) with, hit me up on LinkedIn and we can get on the phone. I'm gonna have a lot of free time on my hands for now.

PS: just in case it's not clear, I do assume – as required by policy – best intent of all my coworkers including leadership. It's just, I can't point to facts that substantiate that assumption when looking at our repeated failures to confront the hate and violence occuring and being organized on platform.