Twitter Thread by Joan Donovan, PhD



Joan Donovan, PhD
@BostonJoan



Just gonna leave this here. When we released the Alternative Influence Network report (@beccalew is the author), many were criticial of the humble recommendation that social media companies should review accounts as they gained popularity.

Becca wrote, “In a media environment consisting of networked influencers, YouTube must respond with policies that account for influence and amplification, as well as social networks.” This recommendation was simple, clear, and I told every company of the implications.

I wonder if we would be in this situation today if some of the more prominent disinformation voices had supported this recommendation, instead of saying that deplatforming threatened free speech.

Too busy trying to spot a bot maybe? Too worried about declining data stockpiles?

It’d abhorrent to have been arguing for simple policy fixes for years and only have support for them when hell touches down for the white middle class. BIPOC and women have been organizing for decades to get policies enforced for community safety online.

Instead of learning their work and policy recommendations and doing everything we can as researchers to help get these shared concerns on the table, I see white men rebranding as “disinformation,” “extremism,” and “conspiracy” experts.

It’s bumming me out.

Most repeat the same lines that Q believers are deluded and can be saved. For every one that is saying that deplatforming means it’s harder for you to find extremists, I wish you could hear yourself.

The problem is the design of social media as a content delivery system.

The same values of openness and scale that built these companies wealth reinforced the growth of white supremacist and conspiracist ideologies. It took a decade for that model to give us Trump.

The only way to talk society off the ledge is to work on smaller scales.

We need to build our communication system differently. I highly recommend following @ColorOfChange @BrandingBrandi @changeterms @culturejedi @mediajustice @stevenrenderos @womenindisinfo @ReFrameMentor @jonathan_c_ong @hypervisible @fightfortheftr @gabriellelim @lotus_ruan

The list continues @RMAjayi @dalitdiva @EqualityLabs @marylgray @nandoodles @sjjphd @JacquieSMason @BridgetMarie @LionsWrite @eramanujam @EvanFeeney @WideAsleepNima

And of course, stay with the trouble caused by insufficient infrastructure w/ @safiyanoble @ubiquity75 @sivavaid @EmmaLBriant @stacyewood @drbrittparis @IrenePasquetto @sarahbmyers @sobieraj @TarletonG @YochaiBenkler @JonasKaiser @nancybaym @zephoria @wphillips49 @meredithdclark

And more from those who care about technologies disarming doublespeak: @dude_crooks @drbethcoleman @LizCarolan @lizlosh @ruha9 @alondra @LatoyaPeterson @sassycrass @mutalenkonde @Combsthepoet @LeonYin @JuliaTicona1 @JuliaAngwin @EthanZ @alicetiara @YESHICAN @Data4BlackLives

And the anthropologists & sociologists who care about the people embedded in the systems @BiellaColeman @LimnMagazine @AaronPanofsky @gleemie @KeeangaYamahtta @tressiemcphd @alexhanna @ztsamudzi @xuhulk

And then there was one, @amelia_acker, who has kept all the receipts on presidential tweets since before it was cool. I cannot wait to see her work on the archives and their enemies.

The bottom line is we don't need to give it a fancy name like "circuit breaker" or "break glass" because it's the most simple and logical policy going forward: do not reward hate, violence, and incitement with money and clout. Instead, amplification needs curation. #10kLibrarians

People seem to really like lists, so I'll keep going. For different ways of thinking about design and history of tech: @lnakamur @schock @histoftech @PopTechWorks @merbroussard @kmtamurphy @shannonmattern @cjack @cmcilwain @aschrock @DocDre @whkchun

https://t.co/uwzKlwUX7J

> @mapc @blnaveen @praymurray @anjakovacs @gonzatto @hugocristo @souzaeduardo @mamaazure @fredvanamstel
>
> — Raghav Agrawal (@impactology) January 18, 2021