

Opinion

I thought the web would stop hate, not spread it

This is what the internet has come to: thugs like Mohammed bin Salman funding tech companies to host the vitriol of Cesar Sayoc and Robert Bowers.

Kara Swisher
Contributing Writer

When I was a reporter at The Washington Post back in the pre-Internet days, there was a man who would write me a letter every time I had a story that had a name in it that he perceived to be Jewish.

His anti-Semitic screeds were intricate and obsessive. He would cut my article out of the paper, highlight the names, and in a chicken-scratch scrawl write endless lines of venomous bile about how the various businesspeople he noted were secretly plotting to take over the world and kill the “real” Americans. It was riveting — the care he took was clearly apparent — and nauseating at the same time.

It frightened me, but it was only a letter, sent only to me. Fast forward to today, when everyone has the ability to see the toxic online stylings of Cesar Sayoc, the Trump supporter who has been arrested and charged for a series of mail bombs that he sent to CNN and a list of prominent Democrats. He was all over social media spewing his bile, which escalated on Twitter and Facebook starting in 2016.

It was the same with another radicalized man with issues, Robert Bowers, who has been charged in the murder of 11 people at a synagogue in Pittsburgh. His preferred outlet was an internet underbelly site called Gab, an alt-right platform with an adorable name and a dead-ugly purpose. As The New York Times’s Kevin Roose noted, Gab was the “last refuge for internet scoundrels — a place where those with views considered too toxic for the mainstream could congregate and converse freely.”

Internet companies like Stripe, GoDaddy and Joyent have now “deplatformed” Gab, as they did with Alex Jones this year. It took the Bowers attack for them to notice exactly who their customer was.

Of course, they said their usual so-sorrys for facilitating this druck. And Twitter did yet another elaborate apology dance for not removing Mr. Sayoc from the platform after at least one complaint about his behavior.

But it takes only seconds to draw a line between the public posts of these internet goblins and their real-life attacks. What is happening on social networks and across digital communications platforms is disturbing and ever metastasizing. And preventable.

I wrote my first column for The Times on this, months ago. Let me say it again: Social media platforms — and Facebook and Twitter are as guilty of this as Gab is — are designed so that the awful travels twice as fast as the good. And they are operating with sloppy disregard of the consequences of that awful speech, leading to disasters that they then have to clean up after.



KAGENMI/ISTOCK, VIA GETTY IMAGES

And they are doing a very bad job of that, too, because they are unwilling to pay the price to make needed fixes.

Why? because draining the cesspool would mean losing users, and that would hurt the bottom line. Consider this: On Monday, New York Times reporters easily found almost 12,000 anti-Semitic messages that had been uploaded to Instagram in the wake of the synagogue attack.

That was *after* the killings. And please do not saunter over to YouTube or Twitter or Reddit if you want any relief, as you will only find more of the same.

The negligence does not stop at the platforms but includes who pays for these platforms, which is how I found myself at a dinner party recently where the guests were ranking Silicon Valley funders from most to least toxic: Russia, China, Kuwait, Qatar, along with various dicey high-net-worth individuals across the globe.

“They are all linked to awful behav-

ior in some way if you are being really honest with yourself,” a well-known entrepreneur said. “Thank goodness for Singapore.” (Apparently “Crazy

What is happening on social networks and across digital communications platforms is disturbing and ever metastasizing. And preventable.

Rich Asians” had been good for the brands of funds tied to the Singapore government, like Temasek and GIC.) And of course there is Mohammed bin Salman, the crown prince of Saudi Arabia, who has flooded tech with Saudi investments. His glossy reform sheen has worn thin in the wake of the brutal murder of the journalist Jamal Khashoggi at what appears certainly to have been the behest of the government Prince Mohammed heads — or more precisely, beheads.

His government also jails activists and decimates Yemen with a war, but it was only a few months ago that he was squired around Google headquarters by Sergey Brin. In hindsight, the obsequious reception now looks unfortunate, to say the least.

So where are we now? Far too much of the money social media companies are using to host thugs like Mr. Sayoc and Mr. Bowers was paid for by thugs like Prince Mohammed. And, other than some tut-tutting about the horror of it all, there are no signs that the industry that considers itself the most woke on the planet is thinking of giving the money back or talking about not taking it in the future.

I cannot tell you how sad that is to write, because when I first saw the internet way back when, I hoped that it would help eliminate the attitudes that had fueled those horrible letters to me. I naively thought a lone man sending a reporter a missive of malevolence could not find such refuge on the wide-

open internet, where his hate would be seen for what it was and denounced and exorcised.

I was obviously very wrong. Instead, the internet gave people like him the space to grow and thrive. Tech made no real rules, claiming the freedom from any strictures would be O.K. in what is the greatest experiment in human communications ever.

We have no idea how to deal with this situation, except to watch it play out over and over again, and allow it to kill us cell by cell.

Or not. “You must live life with the full knowledge that your actions will remain,” Zadie Smith wrote. “We are creatures of consequence.”

We have met the creature and it is a monster. I shudder to think what the consequences will be.

KARA SWISHER is the editor at large for the technology news website *Recode* and producer of the *Recode Decode* podcast and *Code Conference*.

What if we’re all coming back?

The prospect of being reborn as a poor person in a world ravaged by climate change could lead us to very different political decisions.



Michelle Alexander

I can’t say that I believe in reincarnation, but I understand why some people do. In fact, I had a bizarre experience as a teenager that made me wonder if I had known someone in a past life.

I was walking to school one day, lost in thought. I turned the corner onto a wide, tree-lined street and noticed a man on the other side heading my direction. For an instant, we held each other’s gaze and a startling wave of excitement and recognition washed over me. We spontaneously ran toward each other, as if to embrace a long-lost friend, relative or lover. But just as we were close enough to see the other’s face, we were both jolted by the awareness that we didn’t actually know each other.

We stood in the middle of the street, bewildered. I mumbled, “I’m so sorry — I thought I knew you.” Equally embarrassed, he replied: “Oh, my God, this is so strange. What’s happening right now?” We backed away awkwardly — me, a teenage black girl; he, a middle-aged white man. I never saw him again.

The incident shook me deeply. This was not a case of mistaken identity. Something profound and mysterious happened and we both knew it.

Still, I’m not among the 33 percent of Americans (including 29 percent of Christians) who believe in reincarnation. Lately, though, I’ve been thinking that if more of us did believe we were coming back, it could change everything.

At first, I thought about reincarnation in the narrowest possible terms, wondering what future life I’d earn if karma proved real. It’s a worrisome thing to contemplate. It’s easier to speculate about what kind of future lives other people deserve. Maybe Bull Connor — that white supremacist Alabama politician who ordered that black schoolchildren protesting segregation be attacked with police dogs and fire hoses — has already been born again as a black child in a neighborhood lacking jobs and decent schools but filled with police officers who shoot first and ask questions later. Maybe he’s now subjected to the very forms of bigotry, terror and structural racism that he once gleefully inflicted on others.

This kind of thought experiment is obviously dangerous, since it can tempt us to imagine that people have somehow earned miserable fates and deserve to suffer. But considering future lives can also be productive, challenging us to imagine that what we do or say in this life matters and might eventually catch up with us. Would we fail to respond with care and compassion to the immigrant at the border today if we thought we might find ourselves homeless, fleeing war and poverty, in the next life? Imagining ourselves in those shoes makes it harder to say: “Well, they’re not here legally. Let’s build a wall to keep those people out.” After all, one day “those people” might be you.

Once I entered college, I found myself less interested in karma and more interested in politics. It occurred to me that if we’re born again at random, we can’t soothe ourselves with fantasies that we’ll come back as one of the precious few on the planet who live comfortably. We must face the fact that our destiny is inextricably linked to the fate of others. What kind of political, social and economic system would I want — and what would I fight for — if I knew I was coming back somewhere



JOSH HANER/THE NEW YORK TIMES

in the world but didn’t know where and didn’t know who I’d be?

In law school, I discovered that I wasn’t the first to ponder this type of question. In his landmark 1971 book, “A Theory of Justice,” the political philosopher John Rawls urged his audience to imagine a wild scene: A group of people gathered to design their own future society behind “a veil of ignorance.” No one knows his or her place in society, class position or social status, “nor does he know his fortune in the distribution of natural assets and abilities, his intelligence and strength and the like.” As Rawls put it, “If a man knew that he was wealthy, he might find it rational to advance the principle that various taxes for welfare measures be counted unjust; if he knew he was poor, he would most likely propose the contrary principle.” If denied basic information about one’s circumstances, Rawls predicted that important social goods, such as rights and liberties, power and opportunities, income and wealth, and conditions for self-respect

would be “distributed equally unless an unequal distribution of any or all of these values is to everyone’s advantage.”

Back then, I was struck by how closely Rawls’s views mirrored my own. I now believe, however, that the veil of ignorance is quite distorted in an important respect. Rawls’s veil encourages us to imagine a scenario in which we’re equally likely to be rich or poor or born with natural talents or limitations. But the truth is, if we’re reborn in 50 years, there’s only a small chance that any of us would be rich or benefit from white privilege.

Almost half the world — more than three billion people — live on less than \$2.50 per day. At least 80 percent of humanity lives on less than \$10 per day. Less than 7 percent of the world’s population has a college degree. The vast majority of the earth’s population is nonwhite, and roughly half are women. Unless radical change sweeps the globe, the chances are high that any of us would come back as a nonwhite

woman living on less than \$2.50 per day. And given what we now know about climate change, the chances are very good that we would find ourselves suffering as a result of natural disasters — hurricanes, tsunamis, droughts and floods — and enduring water and food shortages and refugee crises.

This month, the world’s leading climate scientists released a report warning of catastrophic consequences as soon as 2040 if global warming increases at its current rate. Democratic politicians expressed alarm, yet many continue to accept campaign contributions from the fossil fuel industry that is responsible for such a large percentage of the world’s greenhouse gas emissions.

It’s nearly impossible to imagine that our elected officials would be so indifferent if they knew climate scientists were foretelling a future that they would have to live without any of the privileges they now enjoy.

Rawls was right: True morality becomes possible only when we step outside the box of our perceived self-interest and care for others as much as we care for ourselves. But rather than imagining a scenario in which we’re entirely ignorant of what the future holds, perhaps we ought to imagine that we, personally, will be born again into the world that we are creating today through our collective and individual choices.

Who among us would fail to question capitalism or to demand a political system free from corporate cash if we knew that we’d likely live our next life as a person of color, earning less than \$2.50 a day, in some part of the world ravaged by climate change while private corporations earn billions building prisons, detention centers and border walls for profit?

Not I. And I’m willing to bet, neither would you. We don’t have to believe in reincarnation to fight for a world that we’d actually want to be born into.