

# Facebook Says It Is Deleting Accounts at the Direction of the U.S. and Israeli Governments

By [Glenn Greenwald](#)

Global Research, February 12, 2018

[The Intercept](#) 30 December 2017

Region: [Middle East & North Africa, USA](#)

Theme: [Media Disinformation](#)

*In September of last year, we [noted that](#) Facebook representatives were meeting with the Israeli government to determine which Facebook accounts of Palestinians should be deleted on the ground that they constituted “incitement.” The meetings — called for and presided over by one of the [most extremist](#) and [authoritarian](#) Israeli officials, pro-settlement Justice Minister Ayelet Shaked — came after Israel threatened Facebook that its failure to voluntarily comply with Israeli deletion orders would result in the enactment of laws requiring Facebook to do so, upon pain of being severely fined or even blocked in the country.*

The predictable results of those meetings are now clear and well-documented. Ever since, Facebook has been on a censorship rampage against Palestinian activists who protest the decades-long, illegal Israeli occupation, all directed and determined by Israeli officials. Indeed, Israeli officials have been [publicly boasting](#) about how obedient Facebook is when it comes to Israeli censorship orders:

Shortly after news broke earlier this month of the agreement between the Israeli government and Facebook, Israeli Justice Minister Ayelet Shaked said Tel Aviv had submitted 158 requests to the social media giant over the previous four months asking it to remove content it deemed “incitement.” She said Facebook had granted 95 percent of the requests.

She’s right. The submission to Israeli dictates is hard to overstate: As the New York Times [put it](#) in December of last year,

“Israeli security agencies monitor Facebook and send the company posts they consider incitement. Facebook has responded by removing most of them.”

What makes this censorship particularly consequential is [that](#) “96 percent of Palestinians said their primary use of Facebook was for following news.” That means that Israeli officials have virtually unfettered control over a key communications forum of Palestinians.

In the weeks following those Facebook-Israel meetings, [reported The Independent](#),

“the activist collective Palestinian Information Center reported that at least 10 of their administrators’ accounts for their Arabic and English Facebook pages — followed by more than 2 million people — have been suspended, seven of them permanently, which they say is a result of new measures put in place in

the wake of Facebook's meeting with Israel." Last March, Facebook briefly shut down the Facebook page of the political party, Fatah, followed by millions, "because of an old photo posted of former leader [Yasser Arafat](#) holding a rifle."

A [2016 report](#) from the Palestinian Center for Development and Media Freedoms detailed how extensive the Facebook censorship was:

Pages and personal accounts that were filtered and blocked: Palestinian Dialogue Network (PALDF.net) Gaza now, Jerusalem News Network, Shihab agency, Radio Bethlehem 2000, Orient Radio Network, page Mesh Heck, Ramallah news, journalist Huzaifa Jamous from Abu Dis, activist Qassam Bedier, activist Mohammed Ghannam, journalist Kamel Jbeil, administrative accounts for Al Quds Page, administrative accounts Shihab agency, activist Abdel-Qader al-Titi, youth activist Hussein Shajaeih, Ramah Mubarak (account is activated), Ahmed Abdel Aal (account is activated), Mohammad Za'anin (still deleted), Amer Abu Arafa (still deleted), Abdulrahman al-Kahlout (still deleted).

Needless to say, Israelis have virtually free rein to post whatever they want about Palestinians. Calls by Israelis for the [killing of Palestinians are commonplace](#) on Facebook, and largely remain undisturbed.

**THE TIMES OF ISRAEL**

Facebook campaign calls for 'vengeance' against Arabs

DECEMBER 30, 2017  
CURRENT TOP STORIES

# Facebook campaign calls for 'vengeance' against Arabs

Hundreds of users photograph themselves, and a cat, holding signs urging retribution for the killing of three Israeli teenagers

By TOI STAFF  
2 July 2014, 3:46 pm | 43

an warns  
against  
legal  
gatherings'  
fresh  
protest  
supported in  
Tehran

LI NOORANI and ERIC DOLPH  
hard-liners rally as new protests challenge government

er arrest of demonstrators, Trump says Iran 'the world is watching'

gest Iran protests since 2009 lead to Tehran

SCROLL TO VIEW MORE

A picture posted to Facebook depicts two girls holding a sign that reads: 'Hating Arabs is not racism; it's morality!' (photo credit: The People of Israel Demand Vengeance/Facebook)

Thousands of Israelis have been taking to social media in the past two days to publicly demand vengeance over the killing of three Jewish teenagers shortly after they were abducted while hitchhiking in the West Bank on June 12. The bodies of the three were found on Monday in a field north of

SPONSOR

As Al Jazeera [reported last year](#),

"Inflammatory speech posted in the Hebrew language ... has attracted much

less attention from the Israeli authorities and Facebook.”

One study found that “122,000 users directly called for violence with words like ‘murder,’ ‘kill,’ or ‘burn.’ Arabs were the No. 1 recipients of hateful comments.” Yet there appears to be little effort by Facebook to censor any of that.

Though some of the most inflammatory and explicit calls for murder are sometimes removed, Facebook continues to allow the most extremist calls for incitement against Palestinians to flourish. Indeed, Israel’s leader, Benjamin Netanyahu, [has often used social media](#) to post what is clearly incitement to violence against Palestinians generally. In contrast to Facebook’s active suppression against Palestinians, the very idea that Facebook would ever use its censorship power against Netanyahu or other prominent Israelis calling for violence and inciting attacks is unthinkable. Indeed, as Al Jazeera [concisely put it](#), “Facebook hasn’t met Palestinian leaders to discuss their concern.”

Facebook now seems to be explicitly admitting that it also intends to follow the censorship orders of the U.S. government. Earlier this week, the [company deleted](#) the Facebook and Instagram accounts of Ramzan Kadyrov, the repressive, brutal, and authoritarian leader of the Chechen Republic, who had a combined 4 million followers on those accounts. To put it mildly, Kadyrov — who is given free rein to rule the province in exchange for ultimate loyalty to Moscow — is the opposite of a sympathetic figure: He has been [credibly accused](#) of a wide range of horrific human rights violations, from the imprisonment and torture of LGBTs to the [kidnapping and killing](#) of dissidents.

But none of that dilutes how disturbing and dangerous Facebook’s rationale for its deletion of his accounts is. A Facebook spokesperson told the New York Times that the company deleted these accounts not because Kadyrov is a mass murderer and tyrant, but that

“Mr. Kadyrov’s accounts were deactivated because he had just been added to a United States sanctions list and that the company was legally obligated to act.”

As the Times notes, this rationale appears dubious or at least inconsistently applied: Others who are on the same sanctions list, such as Venezuelan President Nicolas Maduro, remain active on both Facebook and Instagram. But just consider the incredibly menacing implications of Facebook’s claims.

What this means is obvious: that the U.S. government — meaning, at the moment, the Trump administration — has the unilateral and unchecked power to force the removal of anyone it wants from Facebook and Instagram by simply including them on a sanctions list. Does anyone think this is a good outcome? Does anyone trust the Trump administration — or any other government — to compel social media platforms to delete and block anyone it wants to be silenced? As the ACLU’s Jennifer Granick told the Times:


It’s not a law that appears to be written or designed to deal with the special situations where it’s lawful or appropriate to repress speech. ... This sanctions law is being used to suppress speech with little consideration of the free expression values and the special risks of blocking speech, as opposed to blocking commerce or funds as the sanctions was designed to do. That’s really problematic.

Does Facebook's policy of blocking people from its platform who are sanctioned apply to all governments? Obviously not. It goes without saying that if, say, Iran decided to impose sanctions on [Chuck Schumer for his support of Trump's policy](#) of recognizing Jerusalem as the Israeli capital, Facebook would never delete the accounts of the Democratic Party Senate minority leader — just as Facebook would never delete the accounts of Israeli officials who incite violence against Palestinians or who are sanctioned by Palestinian officials. Just last month, Russia [announced retaliatory sanctions](#) against various Canadian officials and executives, but needless to say, Facebook took no action to censor them or block their accounts.

Similarly, would Facebook ever dare censor American politicians or journalists who use social media to call for violence against America's enemies? To ask the question is to answer it.



As is *always* true of censorship, there is one, and only one, principle driving all of this: power. Facebook will submit to and obey the censorship demands of governments and officials who actually wield power over it, while ignoring those who do not. That's why declared enemies of the U.S. and Israeli governments are vulnerable to censorship measures by Facebook, whereas U.S. and Israeli officials (and their most tyrannical and repressive allies) are not:



All of this illustrates that the same severe dangers from state censorship are [raised at least as much by the pleas for Silicon Valley giants](#) to more actively censor “bad speech.” Calls for state censorship may often be well-intentioned — a desire to protect marginalized groups from damaging “hate speech” — yet, predictably, they are far more often used *against* marginalized groups: to censor them rather than protect them. One need merely look at how [hate speech laws are used in Europe](#), or [on U.S. college campuses](#), to see that the censorship victims are often [critics of European wars](#), or [activists against Israeli occupation](#), or [advocates for minority rights](#).



## French high court: BDS activists guilty of discrimination

Judges upholds ruling against activists who called to boycott Israeli products; French law prohibits targeting of nations for discrimination

By JTA

23 October 2015, 11:18 pm | 18

17K shares



One can create a fantasy world in one's head, if one wishes, in which Silicon Valley executives use their power to protect marginalized peoples around the world by censoring those who wish to harm them. But in the real world, that is nothing but a sad pipe dream. Just as governments will, these companies will use their censorship power to serve, not to undermine, the world's most powerful factions.

## State GOP debates condemning hate groups — and that might include Black Lives Matter

18



### Top 10 Trending Articles

- Most Viewed
- Most Commented
- Most Shared
- Here's the story of Otis, the dog seen carrying a bag of food during Harvey
- What's the think tank of the Trump era? Try internet message boards
- Critics have every right to be annoyed with trade holdup
- Don Shaughnessy: NFL Sundays won't be the same without Chris Berman
- How bad is Harvey, compared to Katrina?
- Dropping off a friend at Logan? It could cost you

Just as one might cheer the censorship of someone one dislikes without contemplating the long-term consequences of the principle being validated, one can cheer the disappearance from Facebook and Instagram of a Chechen monster. But Facebook is explicitly telling you that the reason for its actions is that it was obeying the decrees of the U.S. government about who must be shunned.

It's hard to believe that anyone's ideal view of the internet entails vesting power in the U.S. government, the Israeli government, and other world powers to decide who may be heard on it and who must be suppressed. But increasingly, in the name of pleading with internet companies to protect us, that's exactly what is happening.

The original source of this article is [The Intercept](#)

Copyright © [Glenn Greenwald](#), [The Intercept](#), 2018

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

## **Become a Member of Global Research**

Articles by: [Glenn Greenwald](#)

**Disclaimer:** The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)

[www.globalresearch.ca](http://www.globalresearch.ca) contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)