

Twitter Thread by WIRED



WIRED
@WIRED



On Wednesday, The New York Times published a blockbuster report on the failures of Facebook's management team during the past three years. It's.... not flattering, to say the least. Here are six follow-up questions that merit more investigation. 1/

1) During the past year, most of the anger at Facebook has been directed at Mark Zuckerberg. The question now is whether Sheryl Sandberg, the executive charged with solving Facebook's hardest problems, has caused a few too many of her own.

2/ <https://t.co/DTsc3g0hQf>

It was Sandberg, the story reports, who seethed after Stamos disclosed to Facebook's board audit committee that the extent of Russian interference was still unknown and unchecked. It was Sandberg who chastised Stamos for investigating the Russian campaign without the company's approval. It was Sandberg who sided with Kaplan about leaving the Russians out of the company white paper on election interference and Sandberg who encouraged Stamos to be less specific in his initial blog post about Russia's propaganda campaign. Sandberg appealed to senator Amy Klobuchar (D-MN) to dial down her attacks on Facebook. And Sandberg was the one who came out in support of the Stop Enabling Sex Trafficking Act, a decision the *Times* asserts was motivated in part to make other tech giants like Google look bad.

2) One of the juiciest sentences in [@nytimes'](#) piece involves a research group called Definers Public Affairs, which Facebook hired to look into the funding of the company's opposition. What other tech company was paying Definers to smear Apple? 3/ <https://t.co/DTsc3g0hQf>

During this period, a conservative news website called NTK Network, which the *Times* says is affiliated with Definers, published a number of stories critical of Apple. But, in the *Times* report, Miller also says that Definers' Apple work is funded by a third technology company. In other words, Facebook paid Definers; Facebook was fighting Apple; Definers wrote stories critical of Apple; but another technology company was paying for those stories.

3) The leadership of the Democratic Party has, generally, supported Facebook over the years. But as public opinion turns against the company, prominent Democrats have started to turn, too. What will that relationship look like now? 4/ <https://t.co/DTsc3g0hQf>

4) According to the [@nytimes](#), Facebook worked to paint its critics as anti-Semitic, while simultaneously working to spread the idea that George Soros was supporting its critics—a classic tactic of anti-Semitic conspiracy theorists. What exactly were they trying to do there? 5/

5) Did Facebook lie about what they knew about Russian operations on the platform during the 2016 election? It depends on who you ask. 6/ <https://t.co/DTsc3g0hQf>

The *Times* story provides lots of damning evidence that Facebook's management team was less interested than they should have been in learning the full extent of Russian operations on the platform. It describes the company's former chief security officer, Alex Stamos, as running almost a rogue campaign to uncover the truth: "Acting on his own, [Stamos] directed a team to scrutinize the extent of Russian activity on Facebook." When he tells Sandberg about the work, she becomes angered. "Looking into the Russian activity without approval, she said, had left the company exposed legally. Other executives asked Mr. Stamos why they had not been told sooner."

6) It seems as though Facebook has changed dramatically since it first acknowledged Russian interference. But just how much has it actually changed? And are any of these fixes enough to address what seems to be a serious problem for Facebook? 7/ <https://t.co/DTsc3g0hQf>

Read more about what [@nytimes](#)' report revealed, and how we're grappling with the questions we still have here: <https://t.co/DTsc3g0hQf> 8/