

Running Head: THE DANGER OF INVISIBLE ACTORS IN THE FACEBOOK
USER COMMUNITIES

The Danger of Invisible Actors in the Facebook User Community

Joanna L. Smith

IS 212: Values and Communities

Final Paper

June 11, 2018

INTRODUCTION

In the past, citizens and researchers have often depended upon libraries and archives to provide them with factual and accurate information and resources. The credibility of these information institutions lies not only in the credentials of the library and archival staff but also in the core values of the American Library Association and Society of American Archivists that guide the daily operations of information institutions. But in today's digital age, fewer people are opting to obtain information from libraries and archives. Instead, many are searching for information online through privatized search engines and online social media platforms. These online information hubs offer access to information at the touch of one's fingertips, making information search and retrieval fairly easy, convenient and quick. Moreover, many people choose to look to social media platforms, like Facebook, for their news because on Facebook, they are getting their information not just from a journalist, but rather from a community of "Friends". These "Friends" are people that they have personally selected to join their online community, who they most likely trust and with whom they share similar political and moral values.¹ Furthermore, as Facebook's Mission Statement positions itself as a platform for Facebook users to learn what's going on in the world by sharing with other "Friends" in their Facebook user community, Facebook appears to simply be a neutral medium for the Facebook user community of "Friends" to express themselves with one another in an unregulated manner.²

Yet, what many people may not realize is that there are invisible actors infiltrating their Facebook user communities that are biased and political. These actors include Facebook algorithms as well as Facebook Commercial Content Moderators (CCM's) who review content that is flagged as breaking with Facebook's

¹ "Facebook Help Center." Accessed June 9, 2018. https://www.facebook.com/help/1540345696275090/?helpref=hc_fnav.

² "Facebook - Resources." Accessed June 9, 2018. <https://investor.fb.com/resources/default.aspx>.

Community Standards.^{3, 4} These Facebook Community Standards aim to “outline what is or is not allowed on Facebook” in an effort to keep abuse off the Facebook service around the world, and to uphold Facebook’s Community Standards’ principles of “Safety: People need to feel safe in order to build community. We are committed to removing content that encourages real-world harm, including (but not limited to) physical, financial, and emotional injury”, “Voice: Our mission is all about embracing diverse views”, and “Equity: Our community is global and diverse”.⁵ But Facebook even admits that these standards are designed to be comprehensive, saying that in regards to their Voice and Equity principles,

Voice...We err on the side of allowing content, even when some find it objectionable, unless removing that content can prevent a specific harm. Moreover, at times we will allow content that might otherwise violate our standards if we feel that it is newsworthy, significant, or important to the public interest. We do this only after weighing the public interest value of the content against the risk of real-world harm.

Equity...Our policies may seem broad, but that is because we apply them consistently and fairly to a community that transcends regions, cultures, and languages. As a result, our Community Standards can sometimes appear less nuanced than we would like, leading to an outcome that is at odds with their underlying purpose. For that reason, in some cases, and when we are provided with additional context, we make a decision based on the spirit, rather than the letter, of the policy.⁶

Thus, Facebook states that while it seeks to uphold its principles of Safety, Voice and Equity, it may or may not intervene to keep up or take down potentially questionable or harmful content depending on what the content is and if it may be better to keep it up for the greater good. That statement gives Facebook quite a

³Roberts, Sarah T. “Social Media’s Silent Filter.” *The Atlantic*, March 8, 2017.

<https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2017/03/commercial-content-moderation/518796/>.

⁴“Community Standards | Facebook.” Accessed June 9, 2018.

<https://www.facebook.com/communitystandards/>

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ *Ibid.*

generous amount of power to determine what content is suitable to be shown to its users. While Facebook claims to base their policies on input “from community and from experts in fields such as technology and public safety”, they do not give much information about who these specific community members or experts are.⁷ This ultimately allows much room for this content review performed by the Facebook CCM’s and algorithms to reflect the inherent biases of the Facebook Board, of the Facebook designers and engineers building these algorithms, of the Facebook CCM’s who review the content, and of the community and experts in the field that Facebook works with to build and maintain these “Community Standards”. This is concerning especially as Facebook positions itself as a neutral platform upon which to share information. And while Facebook does list this important information on their “Community Standards” webpage, one has to actively seek out the webpage. Consequently, many Facebook users probably do not realize how much power Facebook holds over what information they see and have access to on their Facebook account. While some people may not mind or care, they should. These invisible actors (CCM’s and algorithms) are taking the information that their Facebook user community shares online and selectively deciding which content to keep up or remove to influence the Facebook user communities’ values to align with whatever the Facebook company’s financial or political agenda may be. Furthermore, since these actors are invisible and many of their actions are often unknown and unseen, Facebook’s actions may not be well unregulated.

In this paper, the argument will be made that there is a dire need to take action now to demand that Facebook be more transparent with its policies and processes regarding content review in order to ensure that people are aware of these invisible biased actors lurking in their Facebook user community and of the danger that these invisible actors present to changing the Facebook user community’s values to align with the companies’ political values. Moreover, I will also argue that there are potential solutions that the Facebook user community, the Facebook

⁷ Community Standards | Facebook.” Accessed June 9, 2018.
<https://www.facebook.com/communitystandards/>

company, and the government, can take to lessen the biases inherent in the current Facebook content review process and to rebuild the Facebook user community's trust in Facebook as an information hub.

THE MISSION OF THE FACEBOOK USER COMMUNITY

With the dawning of the digital age and the Internet, many new social media platforms came onto the scene. These social media platforms were often created around the idea of building an online user community, or rather a group of people connecting with other like-minded people online that often shared the same political and ethical values. One of these social media sites was Facebook, which was founded in 2004 as a social network for college students and which was considered the “the buttoned-down Ivy League social network — all cool grays and blues. Real names and university affiliations were required”⁸. Facebook set out to connect people and to build an online community at Harvard, then later at colleges across the United States, and finally across the world connecting anyone with an email account who wanted to create a free profile. Facebook's community-building goal is further reflected in its Mission Statement that reads,

Founded in 2004, Facebook's mission is to give people the power to build community and bring the world closer together. People use Facebook to stay connected with friends and family, to discover what's going on in the world, and to share and express what matters to them.⁹

It appears that Facebook's mission from the beginning has been to connect people, to allow others to discover information, and to share information within their online user community. Thus, Facebook essentially deems itself as both an online community as well as a knowledge center for people to learn and share information.

⁸ Angwin, Julia and Hannes Grassegger. “Facebook's Secret Censorship Rules Protect White Men....” Text/html. ProPublica, June 28, 2017. <https://www.propublica.org/article/facebook-hate-speech-censorship-internal-documents-algorithms>.

⁹ Facebook - Resources.” Accessed June 9, 2018. <https://investor.fb.com/resources/default.aspx>.

CREATING ONE'S FACEBOOK COMMUNITY

When a person joins Facebook, they are told that they should start adding “Friends” to their online user community. In its “Friending” section of the Facebook Help Center webpage, it states

You should send friend requests to friends, family and other people on Facebook you know and trust. You can add a friend by searching for them and sending them a friend request. If they accept, you automatically follow that person, and they automatically follow you — which means that you may see each other's posts in News Feed.¹⁰

As such, Facebook indicates that the user has control over who is a part of their community by selecting with whom they would like to be “Friends”. Additionally, Facebook encourages one to send friend requests to people that one knows and trusts. The fact that Facebook uses the word “trust” seems to connote that the Facebook user communities that people are building are trustworthy. And the fact that the Facebook users have hand-selected who is allowed into their own Facebook user communities indicates that they only allow trusted Friends into their circle to share information. Consequently, if one’s Facebook user community is trustworthy, then the information provided by the community is likely trusted to be accurate and truthful as well. Facebook further increases this sentiment that the information found on Facebook can be trusted because of its Facebook Privacy Checkup feature. Per the “Privacy” section of the Help Center, it claims,

You can use the Privacy Checkup to review and adjust your settings to make sure you're sharing with who you want. To be sure you continue sharing with who you want, we recommend regularly checking the audience for your profile information and posts.¹¹

Therefore, Facebook further implies that all Facebook users have control over who gets to be a part of their personal Facebook communities and thus, who gets to

¹⁰ “Facebook Help Center.” Accessed June 9, 2018.
https://www.facebook.com/help/1540345696275090/?helpref=hc_fnav.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

share information with them and who they get to share information with as well. While Facebook users may think that they have the full power to select who gets to partake in their personal online community, in reality invisible actors are infiltrating and influencing their communities from behind-the-scenes.

FACEBOOK'S INVISIBLE ACTORS

Yet, Facebook conveniently doesn't seem to share that they have invisible actors infiltrating people's online communities. One type of invisible actor on Facebook includes what Sarah T. Roberts terms as Commercial Content Moderation (CCM) workers in her article titled "Social Media's Silent Filter". Per Roberts, In a matter of seconds, following pre-determined company policy, CCM workers make decisions about the appropriateness of images, video, or postings that appear on a given site— material already posted and live on the site, then flagged as inappropriate in some way by members of the user community.¹²

These CCM workers do the hard work of reviewing content flagged as inappropriate according to Facebook's Community Standards by Facebook users. CCM workers then decide if the content should be removed from the Facebook platform. These actors are essentially invisible because Facebook users don't really see their presence on Facebook or see their work unless directly affected by it. But these CCM workers are a part of every Facebook users' community and have access to the information that every user can see and share on Facebook, even though the Facebook users did not add them as "Friends" to their personal Facebook community.

A second type of invisible actors that live in the Facebook user community are the Facebook algorithms and machine-learning systems. Per Roberts, these systems perform some low-level tasks that can be "automated (imperfectly) by processes such as matching against known databases of unwanted content, facial

¹² Roberts, Sarah T. "Social Media's Silent Filter." *The Atlantic*, March 8, 2017. <https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2017/03/commercial-content-moderation/518796/>.

recognition, and ‘skin filters,’ which screen photos or videos for flesh tones and then flag them as pornography”.¹³ Thus, again these algorithms and machine-learning systems have access to the Facebook user community and are reviewing Facebook users’ content and potentially deciding what information to remove or keep up in the community. Additionally, these Facebook algorithms are used to read Facebook users’ profiles and to create categories for which advertisers can market to through the Facebook ad-platform.¹⁴ Thus, these invisible actors have unlimited access to and much control over the Facebook users’ profiles and communities. More so, these invisible actors have this access and control without needing to be added as a “Friend” to any Facebook user’s community.

While these invisible actors appear to be doing beneficial work to keep the Facebook online user community safe and information accurate, the fact that Facebook does not openly mention or explain these invisible actors to the Facebook user community is deceitful. Moreover, the fact that these invisible actors exist points to a larger problem.

WHAT’S THE PROBLEM?

As Facebook’s user base grew, its values appear to have changed a bit. Facebook’s initial mission was to allow the Facebook community of Harvard University students to connect. Moreover, because the students had to have real university accounts, there was a sense of reality to it. You could meet up with the student you were talking to on Facebook in real life. It was not originally a source for world news or advertisements, but a place for Harvard students to have a humane interaction online. There was a sense of trust within the Facebook community at this point.

¹³ Roberts, Sarah T. “Social Media’s Silent Filter.” *The Atlantic*, March 8, 2017. <https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2017/03/commercial-content-moderation/518796/>.
¹⁴ Julia Angwin, Madeleine Varner. “Facebook Enabled Advertisers to Reach ‘Jew Haters.’” *Text/html*. ProPublica, September 14, 2017. <https://www.propublica.org/article/facebook-enabled-advertisers-to-reach-jew-haters>.

But as Facebook began to expand its user base, its values began to shift a little. Facebook began to advertise to users and use their profile data to help advertisers target specific groups of people on Facebook. Facebook appears to have become a bit more concerned with making money than with its original values of community building and maintaining trust. Additionally, as Facebook grew in size and allowed users other than college students to join the platform, more Facebook sub-communities (ranging communities based around age, religion, politics, and more) began to exist on Facebook. These different sub-communities likely had varying values. So, the question arises of how was Facebook expected to serve all of the different values of these sub-communities? Moreover, why should Facebook get to decide what the right values and ethics were? Instead, Facebook has taken the safe road and tried to remain neutral. For the most part Facebook decides not to intervene and let people post freely.¹⁵ However, Facebook has some limits as vaguely noted in its Community Standards¹⁶. Moreover, Facebook has implemented algorithms and CCM workers to find, review and take down what they deem as inappropriate content.

However, the issue and danger here is that in remaining mostly neutral, Facebook is not neutral. In deciding whose message gets to stay up or be taken down, Facebook is making a political statement. Moreover, because Facebook positions itself as a place to discover information, the information it allows to remain posted is due to its political biases, and thus it is politically charged to align with what the Facebook company believes is right and ethical. Furthermore, because these invisible actors are taking down content per vague guidelines decided by the Facebook Community Standards and because these invisible actors carrying out the guidelines are either algorithms and machine-learning systems (that don't have an ethical scale and are biased by the engineers that made them) or humans who have their own biases, it is even more unclear and uncertain about what

¹⁵ Community Standards | Facebook.” Accessed June 9, 2018.
<https://www.facebook.com/communitystandards/>

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

Facebook deems as ethically acceptable to post. Therefore, the information and advertisements that people take from the information hub known as Facebook is biased.

THE DANGERS OF THESE BIASED INVISIBLE ACTORS

As mentioned earlier, Facebook's Mission statement not only claims to help people build a community, but it also claims to allow people "to discover what's going on in the world, and to share and express what matters to them"¹⁷. This wording in Facebook's Mission statement appears to position Facebook as a news source and information hub. While many people may not mind or think this is dangerous, it is. Unlike traditional media companies that must follow certain guidelines or libraries that are expected to comply with the American Library Association core values, Facebook has free range on what it allows users to post. Moreover, it uses these invisible actors like CCM workers and algorithms to watch the Facebook user community and to censor the Facebook user community's posts according to the censorship guidelines of the Facebook leadership. In the article "Facebook's Secret Censorship Rules Protect White Men From Hate Speech But Not Black Children", Julia Angwin and Hannes Grassegger discuss Facebook's censorship rules saying,

Facebook's rules constitute a legal world of their own. They stand in sharp contrast to the United States' First Amendment protections of free speech, which courts have interpreted to allow exactly the sort of speech and writing censored by the company's hate speech algorithm. But they also differ — for example, in permitting postings that deny the Holocaust —from more restrictive European standards.¹⁸

So, for better or for worse, Facebook has the authority to limit free speech as it sees fit. Many may have no issue with this as they fully support Facebook removing any

¹⁷ "Facebook - Resources." Accessed June 9, 2018. <https://investor.fb.com/resources/default.aspx>.

¹⁸ Julia Angwin, Hannes Grassegger. "Facebook's Secret Censorship Rules Protect White Men...." Text/html. ProPublica, June 28, 2017. <https://www.propublica.org/article/facebook-hate-speech-censorship-internal-documents-algorithms>.

content that is incorrect and offensive, such as posts denying the Holocaust. Yet, what these Facebook users may not be considering is that with this power and control, Facebook has the power to sway what information the Facebook user community has access to, especially if they rely upon Facebook and their Facebook Friends to provide them with information. And while content moderators do good work to take down violent or pornographic content, they also take down or leave up content per the orders of their Facebook leadership. Thus, they enact the biases and influence of the Facebook leadership. This in effect influences what information people have access to, and can ultimately affect how a community views a particular political topic or agenda.

While on the one hand Facebook's CCM workers are intervening in the Facebook community by reviewing content and removing posts per the stakeholders' guidelines, on the other hand Facebook algorithms are intervening through data collection and profiling of Facebook users to increase Facebook's power as a hub for advertising information. In the article, "Facebook Enabled Advertisers to Reach 'Jew Haters'", Julia Angwin, Madeleine Varner and Ariana Tobin discuss Facebook's advertising platform, stating, "Like many tech companies, Facebook has long taken a hands-off approach to its advertising business. Unlike traditional media companies that select the audiences they offer advertisers, Facebook generates its ad categories".¹⁹ It does so through its algorithm that "automatically transforms people's declared interests into advertising categories".²⁰ Many people may dismiss this as a potential threat or danger to the Facebook user community, saying that they don't mind Facebook's algorithm using their self-declared Facebook interest because if they are going to see ads on Facebook they might as well be ads for stuff they are interested in. But what these people may not realize is that there is a larger danger to the Facebook user community that results from the profiling created by the algorithm that is used for the target-based Facebook ad-platform.

¹⁹ Julia Angwin, Madeleine Varner. "Facebook Enabled Advertisers to Reach 'Jew Haters.'" Text/html. ProPublica, September 14, 2017. <https://www.propublica.org/article/facebook-enabled-advertisers-to-reach-jew-haters>.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

The danger lies in the fact that the algorithm doesn't know right from wrong. It simply takes the data it finds (regardless of what the data is or if it's morally wrong) and creates possible target groups for advertisers to market to simply based upon all the data available (such as interests listed on a Facebook profile) from different users' profiles. Then, the algorithm places users into these groups it has created based upon the data available on one's Facebook profile page. So, for example, in "Facebook Enabled Advertisers to Reach 'Jew Haters'", Angwin, Varner and Tobin are able to target ads to anti-Semitic groups, citing that they believe the Facebook "ad categories that we spotted were automatically generated because people had listed those anti-Semitic themes on their Facebook profiles as an interest, an employer or a 'field of study'".²¹ Thus, unlike human CCM workers who can decipher what "group" names or "group" bases promote offensive or morally reprehensible categories to most of the Facebook user community, the algorithm simply takes the data and creates "groups" based on it without referring to any moral or truthful compass. This means that anyone who may want to purchase and place an advertisement on Facebook to promote anti-Semitic ideology can target specific Facebook users to potentially build up communities that perpetuate anti-Semitic ideology, and who knows what kind of violent acts may come of this possibility. Moreover, it was not until Angwin, Varner and Tobin contacted Facebook to let them know that they were able to target ads to such anti-Semitic groups as "How to burn Jews", "History of 'why jews ruin the world'", "Hitler did nothing wrong", and "Antysemitizm' the Polish word for anti-Semitism" that Facebook appears to have realized these groups existed and took action to remove them.²² That is concerning that Facebook didn't even realize this was happening under its watch with its algorithm, especially after Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg apparently stated that "there is no place for hate in our community...It's a disgrace that we still need to say that neo-Nazis and white supremacists are wrong — as if

²¹ Julia Angwin, Madeleine Varner. "Facebook Enabled Advertisers to Reach 'Jew Haters.'" Text/html. ProPublica, September 14, 2017. <https://www.propublica.org/article/facebook-enabled-advertisers-to-reach-jew-haters>.

²² *Ibid.*

this is somehow not obvious” in the wake of the violent protests in Charlottesville by right-wing groups that included “self-described Nazis”.²³

Additionally, in regards to examining the Facebook algorithms that are used to review content and to create target ad groups on Facebook, let’s turn to the article “Artificial Intelligence’s White Guy Problem” about the threats of using artificial intelligence and algorithms in digital social media sites and platforms, such as Facebook. The author of the piece, Kate Crawford, states that,

Sexism, racism and other forms of discrimination are being built into the machine-learning algorithms that underlie the technology behind many “intelligent” systems that shape how we are categorized and advertised to.... Algorithms learn by being fed certain images, often chosen by engineers, and the system builds a model of the world based on those images. If a system is trained on photos of people who are overwhelmingly white, it will have a harder time recognizing nonwhite faces.²⁴

Crawford hits home that these algorithms and machine-learning systems contain the biases of its creators, thus these Facebook algorithms are biased. Crawford also states that “Regardless, algorithmic flaws aren’t easily discoverable: How would a woman know to apply for a job she never saw advertised? How might a black community learn that it were being overpoliced by software?”.²⁵ So, what is also concerning about these algorithms is that they often go unnoticed because people don’t know the biases of the algorithms unless they see how the algorithms are actually biasing against them. Thus, Crawford nails it on the head saying, “Histories of discrimination can live on in digital platforms, and if they go unquestioned, they become part of the logic of everyday algorithmic systems”.²⁶

²³ Julia Angwin, Madeleine Varner. “Facebook Enabled Advertisers to Reach ‘Jew Haters.’” Text/html. ProPublica, September 14, 2017. <https://www.propublica.org/article/facebook-enabled-advertisers-to-reach-jew-haters>.

²⁴ Crawford, Kate. “Opinion | Artificial Intelligence’s White Guy Problem.” *The New York Times*, January 20, 2018, sec. Opinion. <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/26/opinion/sunday/artificial-intelligences-white-guy-problem.html>.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ *Ibid.*

SOLUTIONS

So, what can we do? While there is no clear or obvious answer in how to address this problem, there are some possible solutions. First and foremost, we must start with educating people about what is going on. Unless people are aware of what's going on, then the algorithms and CCM workers of Facebook will continue their role as invisible actors and nothing will change. Moreover, in educating people, it seems likely that the Facebook user community may be more inspired to come together to build a coalition to demand change from Facebook to address these problems and to demand change from Facebook to be more transparent with its policies.

One such demand for change that the Facebook user community could ask for is to hire more diverse teams of engineers. In Kate Crawford's article, she states ,

We need to be vigilant about how we design and train these machine-learning systems, or we will see ingrained forms of bias built into the artificial intelligence of the future. Like all technologies before it, artificial intelligence will reflect the values of its creators. So, inclusivity matters — from who designs it to who sits on the company boards and which ethical perspectives are included. Otherwise, we risk constructing machine intelligence that mirrors a narrow and privileged vision of society, with its old, familiar biases and stereotypes. If we look at how systems can be discriminatory now, we will be much better placed to design fairer artificial intelligence. But that requires far more accountability from the tech community.²⁷

Thus, one solution is to hire diverse teams for each employee level at Facebook from the machine-learning system designers to the company boards. In doing so, Facebook will be less likely to create algorithms or machine-learning systems that perpetuate the inherent biases of its creators and that threaten the Facebook

²⁷ Crawford, Kate. "Opinion | Artificial Intelligence's White Guy Problem." *The New York Times*, January 20, 2018, sec. Opinion. <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/26/opinion/sunday/artificial-intelligences-white-guy-problem.html>.

community at large. But Crawford continues on saying that government and public institutions can also help stop this problem, saying,

Governments and public institutions can do their part as well: As they invest in predictive technologies, they need to commit to fairness and due process. While machine-learning technology can offer unexpected insights and new forms of convenience, we must address the current implications for communities that have less power, for those who aren't dominant in elite Silicon Valley circles. Currently the loudest voices debating the potential dangers of superintelligence are affluent white men, and, perhaps for them, the biggest threat is the rise of an artificially intelligent apex predator.

But for those who already face marginalization or bias, the threats are here.²⁸ Crawford suggests that governments and public institutions can help by committing to fairness and due process in using in these algorithms in order to protect the communities with less power, who may already be threatened by these algorithms.

Another way that the government could help is to take action to enforce Facebook to be more transparent about their invisible actors in its Facebook user communities and about their policies. In her piece, “The Latest Data Privacy Debacle”, Zeynep Tufekci discusses the issues of data collection and privacy policies with different online companies. She states that,

There must be strict controls and regulations concerning how all the data about us — not just the obviously sensitive bits — is collected, stored and sold. With the implications of our current data practices unknown, and with future uses of our data unknowable, data storage must move from being the default procedure to a step that is taken only when it is of demonstrable benefit to the user, with explicit consent and with clear warnings about what the company does and does not know.²⁹

²⁸ Crawford, Kate. “Opinion | Artificial Intelligence’s White Guy Problem.” *The New York Times*, January 20, 2018, sec. Opinion. <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/26/opinion/sunday/artificial-intelligences-white-guy-problem.html>.

²⁹ Tufekci, Zeynep. “Opinion | The Latest Data Privacy Debacle.” *The New York Times*, June 8, 2018, sec. Opinion. <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/01/30/opinion/strava-privacy.html>.

The government should enforce Facebook to be more transparent about its invisible actors, what they do, and their policies. In doing so, the Facebook user community will have more knowledge of what information is correct, what information is collected about them, and how this information is used to profile them to advertisers.

For more advice on how we might move forward, let's turn to Anne J. Gilliland's piece titled "Trust Matters". In the piece, Gilliland discusses how archives can increase their trustworthiness. But many of her points may be applicable to actions that Facebook can take too. Gilliland states that archivists, Must continually demonstrate and support our trustworthiness to our various publics by committing to transparency through documentation of all decisions and actions; by exercising personal and institutional reflexivity, compassion and altruism, for example, by speaking up on behalf of those who cannot and by sharing resources and expertise freely.³⁰

Gilliland claims that archivists must demonstrate their trustworthiness by being transparent in their processes and decisions, and by speaking up for those who cannot and by sharing resources freely. Facebook could benefit from following these suggestions. If they were to be transparent in their processes and defend those who need it most (or rather fix their algorithms that allow for hate groups to be targeted to), they would most likely take a step towards regaining the trust of the Facebook user community.

Additionally, Gilliland suggests that "Archivists need to come together across national, sector and disciplinary boundaries and think and act both locally and with a sense of global responsibility and conscience". While I am primarily concerned with Facebook, Facebook is unlikely to change their policies and ways unless the users or the government demand the same of other social media websites. Thus, there is a need for the government, Facebook users, the Facebook company, and

³⁰ Gilliland, Anne J. "Trust Matters," *Provenance* (forthcoming).

other large technology companies to come together to create an international system of an ethics of information online.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Facebook has invisible actors lurking on the Facebook user community that many Facebook users may not know about. These actors take the shape of CCM's and algorithms, which are inherently biased. As Facebook positions itself as seemingly neutral information hub upon which Facebook users share information, this is a problem as these invisible actors are reviewing content and taking some of it down or advertising to groups that the Facebook algorithms have made that reflect and align with the biases of the CCM's, the algorithms' creators, and of the Facebook leadership at large. Thus, the Facebook community users need to take action now to demand that Facebook be more transparent with its policies and processes regarding content review in order to ensure that people are aware of these invisible biased actors lurking in their Facebook user community and of the danger that these invisible actors present to changing the Facebook user community's values to align with the companies' political values. Ultimately, there is no perfect solution to this problem. But through educating Facebook users about these invisible actors and their biases, by demanding that government step in to help regulate Facebook and other social media companies to be more transparent with their policies, and by asking Facebook to hire more diverse teams of engineers and employees at all levels of the company, we might be able to start decreasing the biases inherent in the current Facebook content review and advertising processes and we might be able to start rebuilding the Facebook user community's trust in Facebook and its processes.

Works Cited

- Crawford, Kate. "Opinion | Artificial Intelligence's White Guy Problem." *The New York Times*, January 20, 2018, sec. Opinion.
<https://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/26/opinion/sunday/artificial-intelligences-white-guy-problem.html>.
- Community Standards | Facebook." Accessed June 9, 2018.
<https://www.facebook.com/communitystandards/>
- "Facebook Help Center." Accessed June 9, 2018.
https://www.facebook.com/help/1540345696275090/?helpref=hc_fnav.
- "Facebook - Resources." Accessed June 9, 2018.
<https://investor.fb.com/resources/default.aspx>.
- Gilliland, Anne J. "Trust Matters," *Provenance* (forthcoming).
- Julia Angwin, Hannes Grassegger. "Facebook's Secret Censorship Rules Protect White Men...." Text/html. ProPublica, June 28, 2017.
<https://www.propublica.org/article/facebook-hate-speech-censorship-internal-documents-algorithms>.
- Julia Angwin, Madeleine Varner. "Facebook Enabled Advertisers to Reach 'Jew Haters.'" Text/html. ProPublica, September 14, 2017.
<https://www.propublica.org/article/facebook-enabled-advertisers-to-reach-jew-haters>.
- Roberts, Sarah T. "Social Media's Silent Filter." *The Atlantic*, March 8, 2017.
<https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2017/03/commercial-content-moderation/518796/>.
- Tufekci, Zeynep. "Opinion | The Latest Data Privacy Debacle." *The New York Times*, June 8, 2018, sec. Opinion.
<https://www.nytimes.com/2018/01/30/opinion/strava-privacy.html>.