



Public Comment Appendix for

2023-002-IG-UA

Case number

In November 2022, an Instagram user posted a video with a caption in Swedish. The video contains an audio recording, also in Swedish, of a woman describing her experience in a violent intimate relationship, including feeling unable to discuss her situation with her family. The audio does not contain specific descriptions of violence. The caption notes the woman in the audio recording consented to it being published, and that the voice has been modified. It says that there is a culture of blaming victims of gender-based violence, and little understanding of how difficult **it is for women to leave a violent partner. The caption says, “men murder, rape and abuse women mentally and physically - all the time, every day.”** It also provides a helpline number and says it hopes women reading the post will realize they are not alone. The post has been viewed about 10,000 times, shared fewer than 20 times and has not been reported by anyone.

Meta removed the content from Instagram under its [Hate Speech Community Standard](#). The Hate Speech Community Standard prohibits making general claims, or “unqualified behavioural statements,” that people of a particular sex or gender are “violent criminals” or “sexual predators.” Meta's automated systems identified the content as potentially violating. After two human reviews, Meta removed the post and applied a “standard strike” to the user’s account. The user appealed, and a third human reviewer upheld the company’s decision. The content was then identified by Meta's automated High Impact False Positive Override (HIPO) system, which aims to identify content that does not violate Meta’s policies which has been wrongfully removed. This sent the content for additional review, where two more moderators found that it violated the Hate Speech policy.

The user then appealed to the Board. In their appeal, they said they frequently **speak about men’s violence** against women and aim to reach women who have survived violence. As a result of the Board selecting this case, Meta determined that

its decision to remove the content was in error, restored the post, and reversed the strike.

The Board selected this case to explore Meta’s policies and practices in moderating content that targets people based on a protected characteristic, such as sex and gender. This case falls within the Board’s “Gender” and “Hate speech against marginalized groups” [strategic priorities](#).

The Board would appreciate public comments that address:

- How Meta's Hate Speech policy may result in the removal of content containing testimonies or condemnation of gender-based violence.
- Insights on potential challenges and benefits of Meta’s approach to power imbalances between different “protected characteristics” in its Hate Speech policy.
- Insights on any challenges faced in sharing testimonies and condemnation of gender-based violence on Facebook and Instagram.
- Insights on the socio-political context in Sweden (and around the world), regarding violence against women, particularly intimate partner violence.
- How Meta’s [strike system](#) could be improved to better protect activists, human rights defenders, journalists and others against having their content mistakenly removed and penalties applied to their accounts.

In its decisions, the Board can issue policy recommendations to Meta. While recommendations are not binding, Meta must respond to them within 60 days. As such, the Board welcomes public comments proposing recommendations that are relevant to these cases.

Case description



Public Comment Appendix for

2023-005-IG-UA

Case number

“Violence against women” decision to consider two cases together.

The Oversight Board has decided to consider an additional case together with the case that we announced in March 2023. This means the forthcoming decision will consider two cases about violence against women, the original case announced March 9 (2023-002-IG-UA) and a second case, announced today (2023-005-IG-UA). Adding the second case will allow the Board to explore how Meta’s **Hate Speech** policy impacts content discussing gender-based violence in more detail and with greater nuance and to provide comprehensive recommendations to Meta.

To give the panel sufficient time to consider any public comments submitted for this case, we will, exceptionally, only be opening public comments for seven days, instead of our usual 14 days. If you have already submitted your comments for the previously announced case, you are welcome to submit any additional thoughts through this channel.

The original case (2023-002-IG-UA) concerned a post including audio of a woman describing her experience in a violent intimate relationship, and a caption saying, "men murder, rape and abuse women mentally and physically – all the time, every day." Meta removed the post under its Hate Speech Community Standard. After the user appealed the decision to the Board, Meta reviewed its decision and told us it believes that removing the post had been an error.

After we announced the case, we found that the same user appealed another case (2023-005-IG-UA) to the Board. This concerned a post including a video of a woman acknowledging that she is a man-hater. She says that the difference between hating men and misogyny is that hating men is rooted in fear, because men murder and rape worldwide. Meta removed the post for violating its Hate Speech Community Standard. The user appealed to the Board. After the Board selected the case, Meta reviewed its decision again, and told us it believes it was correct.



Public Comment Appendix for
2023-002-IG-UA & 2023-005-IG-UA
Case number

The Oversight Board is committed to bringing diverse perspectives from third parties into the case review process. To that end, the Oversight Board has established a public comment process.

Public comments respond to case descriptions based on the information provided to the Board by users and Facebook as part of the appeals process. These case descriptions are posted before panels begin deliberation to provide time for public comment. As such, case descriptions reflect neither the Board's assessment of a case, nor the full array of policy issues that a panel might consider to be implicated by each case.

To protect the privacy and security of commenters, comments are only viewed by the Oversight Board and as detailed in the [Operational Privacy Notice](#). All commenters included in this appendix gave consent to the Oversight Board to publish their comments. For commenters who did not consent to attribute their comments publicly, names have been redacted. To withdraw your comment, please email contact@osbadmin.com.

To reflect the wide range of views on cases, the Oversight Board has included all comments received except those clearly irrelevant, abusive or disrespectful of the human and fundamental rights of any person or group of persons and therefore violating the [Terms for Public Comment](#). Inclusion of a comment in this appendix is not an endorsement by the Oversight Board of the views expressed in the comment. The Oversight Board is committed to transparency and this appendix is meant to accurately reflect the input we received.



Public Comment Appendix for

2023-002-IG-UA

Case number

11

Number of Comments

Regional Breakdown

1	1	6	2
Asia Pacific & Oceania	Central & South Asia	Europe	Latin America & Caribbean
0	0	1	
Middle East and North Africa	Sub-Saharan Africa	United States & Canada	

Public Comment Appendix for

2023-005-IG-UA

Case number

3

Number of Comments

Regional Breakdown

0	1	0	0
Asia Pacific & Oceania	Central & South Asia	Europe	Latin America & Caribbean
0	0	2	
Middle East and North Africa	Sub-Saharan Africa	United States & Canada	

2023-002-IG-UA

Case number

PC-10993

Public comment number

Europe

Region

Withheld

Commenter's first name

Withheld

Commenter's last name

English

Commenter's preferred language

Withheld

Organization

No

Response on behalf of organization

Short summary provided by the commenter

Anti-violence and anti-discrimination activism must be protected and should not falsely be classified as hate speech against perpetrators.

Full Comment

It is an important element of legitimate and important anti-violence and anti-discrimination work to point out the characteristics of the perpetrators. It is well-established by research that domestic violence - and especially sexualized violence - are predominantly perpetrated by men against women. Pointing out this social problem should not be interpreted as hate speech against men. Classifying pointing out the prevalence of men's violence against women as "hate speech against men" is common anti-feminist rhetoric that deflects responsibility and silences both survivors and gender equality activists.

Meta must change its hate speech policy regarding "generalizations" and must explicitly allow generalizations that are supported by solid research.

Just as women activists and survivors of male violence must be protected and should not be silenced by inappropriate "hate speech against men" accusations, other groups of people affected by structural violence must also be protected in their outcry against violence and discrimination (e.g., victims of racism, targets of homophobia/transphobia).

Hate speech - by definition - targets marginalized people. When marginalized people speak out against their victimization and call out the dominant groups in society this cannot be classified as hate speech.

Link to Attachment

No Attachment

2023-002-IG-UA

Case number

PC-10998

Public comment number

United States and Canada

Region

Withheld

Commenter's first name

Withheld

Commenter's last name

English

Commenter's preferred language

Withheld

Organization

No

Response on behalf of organization

Short summary provided by the commenter

Opinions should never be removed unless that opinion calls for violence and hate against a person, group of people, or entity.

Full Comment

Policing opinions is a violation of free speech. People should be free to say what they want as long as their opinion does not call for violence and harm against a person, group of people, business or government entity. The woman may not be wrong in her opinion. Men, women and children are physically and mentally abused every day throughout the world. The woman was speaking from her own personal experiences and in her reality, that is what she believes. Meta has no proof that men around the world don't harm women every day. Just like Meta cannot prove that women harm men everyday. If you can, then show your data on the post instead of removing it.

Let people speak. Let people share their opinions and NEVER factcheck those opinions. It's crossing a dangerous line into authoritarianism.

Meta should use the same factcheck system as Twitter - a community based system where a consensus is found by differing ideologies. Remove your bots that search for keywords and automatically suspend accounts. It's wrong and unreliable.

Link to Attachment

No Attachment

2023-002-IG-UA

Case number

PC-10999

Public comment number

Europe

Region

Carolina

Commenter's first name

Are

Commenter's last name

English

Commenter's preferred language

Centre for Digital Citizens,
Northumbria University

Organization

No

Response on behalf of organization

Short summary provided by the commenter

Meta's removal of content discussing gender-based violence (GBV) is concerning on four grounds: it showcases the failures of Meta's automated moderation; it highlights the opacity of its policies; it shows how the former two factors influence its human moderators and, finally, it leads to questions about the efficacy of its appeals systems. This case shows how broken Meta's current approach to content moderation is, showcasing a disrupted chain of decisions that starts with AI and ends with human moderators, designing vulnerable users out of its spaces. More investment in the labour of everyone involved and a more user-centred, contextual approach to governance is required to improve users' online lives.

Full Comment

The case at hand and previous examples of automated content moderation show that gendered moderation moves **beyond the removal and containment of women's bodies**, affecting our words and ability to denounce abuse. Women like myself have long been raising awareness of the disparity between the moderation our content received compared with the allowing of the abuse directed at us via cyber-flashing in Direct Messages and abuse in comments. Research by the Brennan Center has shown how even jokes or fair comments about men are moderated as hate speech, when misogynist and racial abuse are not equally flagged by AI. Participants in my forthcoming studies have found their sexual assault survival stories, information about safe abortions, STIs and contraception to be removed by Instagram. For **some, given Meta's strikes system, this led to account deletion following an accumulation of violations** – something particularly concerning given that, aware of

Meta's reliance on automation and overzealousness with censorship, malicious actors are using flags to game the system and silence users they disagree with. The combination of lack of context in automated moderation, a technical workforce made largely of men, and a set of broad and opaque policies enable mistakes like the one this case addresses. More efforts towards gender diversity in hiring technical workers and investment initiatives to bring more women to the table are therefore greatly needed. An audit of how Meta addresses stories of survival, conversations on domestic violence and rape, and GBV activism is also needed, to understand the extent of the problem.

Automation mistakes are inevitably connected to opaque policies that are open for both the AI and human moderators to interpret, policies that are not often thought up with 'real life' in mind.

Firstly, there seems to be a gap between the broad Community Standards that are accessible to the public, and the internal guidelines that employees and moderators interpret: for instance, in the case of sexual solicitation policies, users are not told **what constitutes 'sexually suggestive' content that triggers de-platforming for solicitation.** It is therefore likely that internal policies pertaining to GBV may also not be accessible to users, leading them to inadvertently break Community Standards. More transparency around and communications about such internal guidelines is therefore necessary to prevent these mistakes from arising.

Further, while the Hate Speech Community Standard can be an added protection from the vile accusations that often target the LGBTQIA+ community, its real-life translation is a policy version of #notallmen. Given that most violent crimes and sexual assaults worldwide are committed by men, stating that **"men murder, rape and abuse women mentally and physically - all the time, every day" is a fact, not hate speech.** Meta should connect its policies and their enforcement to the wider context surrounding posts instead of applying blanket one-size-fits-all to **moderation that doesn't take offline inequalities into account.**

Meta should be making an active choice to improve its awareness and moderation of protected categories, contextualising its policies and their enforcement within **real-world data and research.** Given that the enforcement of Meta's policies disproportionately privileges content by dominant groups while over-moderating posts by other groups, e.g. removing content by Muslim groups as terrorism while **leaving White supremacist content in place as found by the Brennan Center's report** on double standards in content moderation, more information is needed – both as a notification to users and as a transparency report – about the steps taken to remove content. Users and regulators have a right to know about whether content was removed solely due to AI, due to the AI and a moderator, or following a report, and this knowledge is important to understand **Meta's processes for society as a whole.** **Only once civil society and regulators know more about Meta's chain of moderation** can we truly provide beneficial recommendations to improve the process. For instance, Meta could explore the implementation of a form of moderator public

vote to avoid crucial decisions about speech, activism and free expression to be left to single moderators or to AI.

Further, Meta would benefit from allowing communities to at least partially self-moderate, not unlike in Subreddits or Facebook groups, once content has been picked up as a violation, for them to have the final word about a context they are **more aware of in tandem with the company's moderators.**

The fact that Meta is swift to delete, but slow and/or inefficient to reinstate and appeal is concerning. The removal of content in the case at hand highlights how little room for recourse there is upon de-platforming of content or accounts on Meta-owned platforms. As my research and personal experience have previously highlighted, it is almost impossible to speak to a human within Meta to challenge decisions, to the point that users find themselves having to pay hackers, potentially opening themselves up to scammers, in order to gain some form of control over their content. This betrays a content moderation system that relies on cheap labour and does not care for the working conditions of those involved.

Meta does not seem to care about the time users spend crafting content to post, or **indeed about this content's emotional value**, just like it does not seem to support its moderators to make informed, thought-through choices about content through better working conditions. A content moderation system that privileges speed over accuracy and worker wellbeing is fully inadequate. Greater investment and support for moderators is needed, to equip these workers to make better, more informed and culturally aware decisions combined with the policy interventions above.

[Link to Attachment](#)

No Attachment

2023-002-IG-UA

Case number

PC-11003

Public comment number

Europe

Region

Withheld

Commenter's first name

Withheld

Commenter's last name

English

Commenter's preferred language

Withheld

Organization

No

Response on behalf of organization

Short summary provided by the commenter

I believe that Meta's decision to remove the content due it being "an unqualified behavioural statement" was incorrect. The post, as described in this Public Comment brief, was a personal testimony that supported the statement in the post. **The statement in the post that "“men murder, rape and abuse women mentally and physically - all the time, every day”** id factually correct: domestic abuse in the UK leads to "two women being murdered each week" (lwa.org.uk) & The police receive a domestic abuse-related call every 30 seconds (refuge.org.uk). These two data points above support the phrasing 'all the time, every day'- if the phrasing was ALL men then that could have been considered hate speech but the post did not say that.

Full Comment

I believe that Meta's decision to remove the content due it being "an unqualified behavioural statement" was incorrect. The post, as described in this Public Comment brief, was a personal testimony that supported the statement in the post. **The statement in the post that “men murder, rape and abuse women mentally and physically - all the time, every day”**; id factually correct: domestic abuse in the UK leads to "two women being murdered each week" (lwa.org.uk) The police receive a domestic abuse-related call every 30 seconds (refuge.org.uk). These two data points above support the phrasing "all the time, every day"- if the phrasing was ALL men then that could have been considered hate speech but the post did not say that. I am providing this comment in a personal capacity, as a member of public who is a social media user and personally subscribes on Instagram. I am supportive of action against domestic abuse and gender equality. While I understand the mandate of

Meta in addressing hate speech, I do not believe it has been applied appropriately in this case.

There has been, historically, an agenda to minimise the gendered aspects of domestic violence and state that it is anti-men as some men are also victims of domestic abuse. This is true but is predominantly women who are disproportionately affected. Decisions like this by Meta, to state that women making powerful statements about the scale of abuse by men are in fact making statements about the perpetrators of domestic abuse as hate speech, undermines the campaign to address domestic abuse.

[Link to Attachment](#)

No Attachment

2023-002-IG-UA

Case number

PC-11012

Public comment number

Central and South Asia

Region

Noor

Commenter's first name

Waheed

Commenter's last name

English

Commenter's preferred language

Digital Rights Foundation

Organization

Yes

Response on behalf of organization

Short summary provided by the commenter

Meta must consider why it has certain conditions in its hate speech policy such as **“unqualified behavioral statements”** levied against a particular sex or gender. This is namely to counter harmful stereotypes especially towards vulnerable groups and gender minorities. Given that intimate partner violence towards all genders is statistically largely perpetuated by men, it is irresponsible for Meta to render testimonials by women and gender minorities against men as "unsubstantiated". This damages a survivor's credibility and deprives them of the foremost ways by which they can raise awareness of the situation, i.e on social media. Meta moderators should undergo gender sensitivity training for better understanding of a post's context.

Full Comment

Meta's Hate Speech Policy is taking too literal an approach in this case. Meta must consider the underlying reasoning why it has certain conditions in its hate speech policy such as “unqualified behavioral statements” levied against a particular sex or gender. The pressure here lies in the understanding of the expression “unqualified” in the case of male-female violence especially when there is a studied disproportionate amount of evidence that men perpetuate violence against both other men, women and gender minorities. The description of the post did not say **“all men”** simply **“men”**. **Even in cases that use “all men”, the intention is often to shed light on the gender hierarchy in society rather than literally condemning all men as violent perpetrators.** Additionally, Meta needs to be clear about why they have this requirement in their hate speech protocols in the first place, namely to counter harmful stereotypes especially towards vulnerable groups and gender

minorities - so assumptions like “all trans women are frauds” or “all women are promiscuous” “all men from XYZ race are dangerous” are more likely to fall within the ambit of this “hate speech” requirement because it does tangible harm offline and poses real-life consequences by exacerbating already existing societal problems, application and interpretation of policies cannot be divorced from real-life harms. Any statements regarding any gender or sex should be assessed within the context.

Testimonials and the ability to share one’s personal experiences is a fundamental aspect of freedom of expression, even if those experiences are negative, disturbing, graphic or troubling in nature. The ability to share testimonials also forms the basis of the appeal of social media. However, user-testimonials are obviously not taken under oath and there is no concept of perjury on social media. In the event that a testimony may be false, there are local legal mechanisms by which a court-order request of removal can be made to Meta. However, Meta should be cognizant that provided such testimony is not levied against public figures, it cannot be tried as defamation and that often instances where testimonies may be true but may lack the necessary threshold of evidence such mechanisms (such as defamation claims) can be abused by perpetrators in positions of power to silence survivors (as was seen in some cases of the MeToo movement). Additionally, a testimony may be true without having to bear the burden of being universal or exclusively representative. According to key facts published by the World Health Organization in 2021, globally about 1 in 3 (30%) of women worldwide have been subjected to either physical and/or sexual intimate partner violence or non-partner sexual violence in their lifetime. Most of this violence is intimate partner violence. Worldwide, almost one third (27%) of women aged 15-49 years who have been in a relationship report that they have been subjected to some form of physical and/or sexual violence by their **intimate partner**. Additionally, the US Department of Justice’s Bureau of Justice Statistics reports in its Criminal Victimization, 2020 Supplemental Statistical Tables **that regardless of the victims’ sex, a greater** percentage of violent incidents involved male offenders (79%) than female offenders (17%) or offenders of both sexes (3%). Given the alarming prevalence of this phenomenon globally and that most violent crimes, including intimate partner violence towards all genders, are statistically largely perpetuated by men, it is irresponsible for Meta to render **testimonials by women and gender minorities against men as “unsubstantiated”**. It also damages a survivor’s credibility and deprives them of the foremost ways by which they can raise awareness of the situation, i.e on social media.

In the event Meta is concerned about an allowance for testimonials or anecdotal evidence being taken out of context to the detriment of the work of activists, journalists, human rights defenders and journalists and users themselves, they can institute an internal mechanism of post tagging that can allow posters to pre-tag their work or disclaim the content of the post as a testimonial or an anecdote. This would allow Meta to re-evaluate the content of the post in light of that context as

opposed to a direct application of their various content regulation policies. (With obvious exceptions being in case of dangerous criminal conduct, misuse of the tagging feature etc. – in which case a high standard of transparency behind why an account is receiving a strike should be maintained). That this post was flagged multiple times shows a concerning lack of awareness on part of the human content moderation team at Meta. Moderators must also be mandatorily subjected to gender-sensitivity and GBV training that can help better distinguish the social and political nuances when making decisions involving user experiences around gender and sexuality. This will allow them to make more informed decisions on whether or not the context is helpful or harmful.

Link to Attachment

[PC-11012](#)

2023-002-IG-UA PC-11024 Latin America and Caribbean
Case number Public comment number Region

Juanita Castro English
Commenter's first name Commenter's last name Commenter's preferred language

Karisma Foundation Yes
Organization Response on behalf of organization

Short summary provided by the commenter

In the attached brief, we present some general comments on the socio-political context of gender-based violence in the world, with special emphasis on impunity and stigma.

Additionally, the Colombian experience on digital escache (digital complaints of gender-based violence) is presented. In order to point out the importance of having a differential approach to this type of discourse and to study the context that surrounds this type of testimony and where it can be used as a basis for the development of a differential approach to this type of speeches and condemnations. The case under study of the Oversight Board is an opportunity to vindicate the denunciations of gender-based violence.

Full Comment

Gender-based violence (GBV) is an ongoing and significant problem worldwide. According to the United Nations (UN), **gender-based violence is defined as “any act of gender-based violence that results in, or is likely to result in, physical, sexual or psychological harm or suffering to women whether occurring in public or private life”.** **Gender-based violence includes violence against women that is “more specific than gender-based violence in that it only applies to people who identify or present as women”.** **And, its scope extends to adult women, adolescents and girls.**

Violence against women is evident in different behaviors and spaces, such as at home and at work. Likewise, this type of violence is materialized through different actions, e.g., physical, psychological, economic, digital and workplace violence. Regarding data on violence against women in the world, organizations such as UN Women, the World Bank and the World Health Organization (WHO) point out that

“an estimated 736 million women—almost one in three—have been subjected to physical and/or sexual intimate partner violence, non-partner sexual violence, or both at least once in their life (30 per cent of women aged 15 and older).”

In particular, one form of violence against women is intimate partner violence (IPV). According to official data, **“most violence against women is perpetrated by current or former husbands or intimate partners. More than 640 million women aged 15 and older have been subjected to intimate partner violence (26 per cent of women aged 15 and older).”** And, UN Women indicated that **“Globally 81,000 women and girls were killed in 2020, around 47,000 of them (58 per cent) died at the hands of an intimate partner or a family member, which equals to a woman or girl being killed every 11 minutes in their home”**

Two concerns about this issue are impunity and the stigma surrounding violence against women. Stigma and misconceptions about this type of violence have the impact of silencing victims. Specifically, stigma is often associated with ideas such as that the victim sought to be in this situation of violence - by remaining in the relationship - so that the perpetrator's acts are accepted. Other conceptions that blur intimate partner violence is that it only occurs in marital relationships, leaving out other couple dynamics that involve trust and dependency. Stigma is not exclusive to IPV: gender based violence directed towards public women (politicians, journalists and social leaders) are justified as occupational hazards or the cost to pay for being public figures, for example.

This stigma implies not only the silencing of victims, but the maintenance of all violent acts as a private matter, based on the shame felt by the victims. It also translates to obstacles in accessing justice and reparations: women often hide incidents of violence for fear of appearing weak or of reprisals, they also often suffer revictimization during complaints, officials responsible for prosecuting perpetrators are resistant to initiating prosecutions, and there is not always adequate legal protection or access to integrated services. This unfortunate perspective on gender based violence, but also has an effect on society in general. Lack of institutional responses to violence promotes a discourse of state tolerance. This context reflects the importance of recognizing violence against women and working to ensure safe spaces to talk about this issue.

In Colombia, for several years, testimonies and condemnations of gender-based violence made on social networks such as Facebook and Instagram have been recognized and protected. It should be noted that this protection is based on freedom of expression and a series of limits have been established for its exercise. This type of denunciation is known as **“escrache digital”** or, so called, **digital complaints**. In the **“escrache digital”**, people who have been victims of gender-based violence and violence against women point out - publicly, usually using a social network - the facts constituting the violence plus, on some occasions, presented with slurs, condemnations and the call for a social and institutional response.

In the last four years, the Colombian Constitutional Court has analyzed five cases related to these digital complaints. In these five cases, the facts that supported the legal action are similar: a person (the victim of violence, a social collective or a third person) denounces in digital spaces, such as Facebook or Instagram, the occurrence of gender-based violence, along with insults and/or the condemnation of the violence. However, one challenge identified is that these complaints are often challenged in court for its content and tone, as the legal constitutional action is usually filed by the persons identified as perpetrators, since they consider their rights to honor, good name and privacy to have been violated. Therefore, the Court has had to define, weigh and protect the rights in conflict: the freedom of expression of the complainants of violence vs. the honor and good name of the alleged perpetrators.

Specifically, the Court has protected digital complaints by considering them a legitimate exercise of freedom of expression and, moreover, because they constitute a special protected speech as they involve a matter of special interest to society.

Link to Attachment

[PC-11024](#)

2023-002-IG-UA

Case number

PC-11025

Public comment number

Europe

Region

Silvia

Commenter's first name

Semenzin

Commenter's last name

English

Commenter's preferred language

Cyber Rights Organization

Organization

Yes

Response on behalf of organization

Short summary provided by the commenter

Meta's Hate Speech policy once again results harmful for gender-based violence survivors

Full Comment

We believe that Meta's Hate Speech policy once again results harmful for gender-based violence survivors.

It is well known how sexual and socio-affective education has a positive impact in counterbalancing violence against women and the LGBTQ+ community, which shows the importance of disseminating more information among young people. This has recently pushed many survivors to bravely speak in public about their personal experiences to generate awareness on the topic. It is very common among sex positive survivors to see their online discourse censored, shadow-banned or limited, but in this way, Meta perpetuates a rape culture that contributes to gender **stereotypes and taboos which are detrimental to women and sexual minorities'** freedom of speech.

At Cyber Rights Organization we strive for providing online safe spaces to survivors to express themselves, share their experience and contribute to a more positive culture around sexualities, gender, and intersectional feminism. Survivors shall not just continue to face online revictimization, slut shaming and sexist discourse, which is unfortunately still very present on the platform. They deserve to have their voices listened, empowered and pushed by Meta.

Link to Attachment

No Attachment

2023-002-IG-UA

Case number

PC-11026

Public comment number

Europe

Region

Pille

Commenter's first name

Tsopp-Pagan

Commenter's last name

English

Commenter's preferred language

Women's Support and Information
Centre NPO

Organization

Yes

Response on behalf of organization

Short summary provided by the commenter

Violence against women (VAW) is one of the most widespread violations of human rights and a manifestation of the power imbalance between women and men. Comprising physical, sexual, psychological, and economic abuse, it cuts across boundaries of age, race, culture, wealth and geography. These forms of violence **disproportionately affect women's well-being**, autonomy and access to opportunities and remain one of the most persistent forms of gender inequality. Gender-related killings, also known as femicide, are the extreme manifestation of VAW. According to a 2018 report by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), 87 000 women were intentionally killed worldwide in 2017. More than one third were killed by a current or former partne

Full Comment

No additional information can be submitted at this point, unfortunately.

Link to Attachment

No Attachment

2023-005-IG-UA

Case number

PC-11202

Public comment number

United States and Canada

Region

Deborah

Commenter's first name

Downing

Commenter's last name

English

Commenter's preferred language

DID NOT PROVIDE

Organization

No

Response on behalf of organization

Short summary provided by the commenter

Feelings, opinions, and perceptions are never wrong.

Full Comment

The woman confirmed her hate of men and accused all men of horrible things. That was wrong. However, it's what she believes for whatever reason. Meta should NEVER silence voices based on Meta's interpretation of hate speech. Feelings, opinions and perceptions are never wrong. Ever. They may be offensive but people should always have the right to freedom of expression. Adding context to make a factual correction is fine but shutting down someone's viewpoint is as Orwellian as it gets.

Link to Attachment

No Attachment

2023-005-IG-UA

Case number

PC-11205

Public comment number

United States and Canada

Region

Gary

Commenter's first name

Brown

Commenter's last name

English

Commenter's preferred language

n/a

Organization

No

Response on behalf of organization

Short summary provided by the commenter

This woman is generalizing to the Nth degree. Saying that all men do this kind of thing is the same as saying that ALL women are bitches, while certainly SOME are but definitely not all. Another example is that all African Americans are criminals; NOT TRUE! She seems to be the type that has consistently chosen the wrong type of men, and has become convinced that all men are the same. This would certainly qualify as hate speech, and worst of all, a blatant lie.

Full Comment

See summary above, I'm not writing it twice because instructions were unclear.

Link to Attachment

No Attachment

2023-005-IG-UA

Case number

PC-11217

Public comment number

Central and South Asia

Region

Noor

Commenter's first name

Waheed

Commenter's last name

English

Commenter's preferred language

Digital Rights Foundation

Organization

Yes

Response on behalf of organization

Short summary provided by the commenter

Given that historically and statistically men tend to perpetuate violence towards all other genders, claiming to "hate-men" or making generalized comments about the nature of gender-based violence (GBV) against men cannot be taken as bullying or discrimination in the same sense as when those generalized comments are used against other (more vulnerable) demographics (like women, minorities etc.). Any such comments should be evaluated in context of the post.

Full Comment

In light of the second case added to the deliberation of the Swedish Gender-Based Violence (GBV) case, the Digital Rights Foundation would like to add the following **points for consideration along with its original submission. The term “man-hater”** (both assigned or self-identified) is a broad generalization about men, however, it cannot be considered a form of discrimination or bullying in the context it was used in. The original post is in the context of an ongoing conversation around gender-based violence, of which men are statistically and historically the largest perpetrators – not only against women but towards other men. It is imperative that Meta does **not categorize this kind of generalization as a form of “discrimination”** in the traditional sense. Discrimination standards exist in light of hierarchical systems of power based on gender, race, class, etc. and thus dependent on the context of the speaker and recipient of the comment. It is understandable that Meta may consider **this a “double standard”, however given that such moderation has the potential to silence conversations around GBV a balance must be struck.** While gender identity is a protected characteristic, **broad comments on “men” do not have the same potential for harm as broad comments about women, gender minorities, sexuality, race, ethnicity and religion.** In considering whether or not a post is harmful, Meta

should look to other context clues, for example, any post calling for violence against men, bullying specific individuals or making racially disparaging comments in addition to attacking their gender can be removed.

[Link to Attachment](#)

No Attachment



Public Comment Appendix for
2023-002-IG-UA & 2023-005-IG-UA

Case number

End of public comments