

Joint Letter to House Judiciary Committee Members from Three Project Veritas Whistleblowers: Zachary Vorhies(Google), Zachary McElroy(Facebook), and Ryan Hartwig(Facebook)

For Public Release

Dated 7/30/2020

Letter from Zach Vorhies

Dear Honorable Members of the House Judiciary Committee,

My name is Zach Vorhies and I am a software engineer best known for blowing the whistle on Google's extensive censorship regime. I disclosed this information to the Department of Justice and Project Veritas in June and August of 2019.

I resigned from Google after discovering a wide-ranging censorship project called "Machine Learning Fairness." This project and its subcomponents represent a censorship regime that transforms America's open internet system into a Chinese-style censored internet system. It is no coincidence that this "Machine Learning Fairness" system was conveniently fast-tracked into Google's products immediately after Donald Trump won the election. To add insult to injury, it's also not a coincidence many of the design documents ([link](#)) for the news re-ranking documents used the Comey's Russian-Collusion investigation to inform how the algorithms at news.google.com would be changed.

"We don't manually intervene on any particular search result." These were the words of Google CEO Sundar Pichai on December 11th, 2018 at the House Judiciary Committee. If the Google CEO had simply done an internal search for the term "blacklist" from inside the company, he would have found the "[youtube controversial query blacklist](#)" spanning 42 pages that illustrate search suppression and a profound anti-Trump bias. Although this is far from the only example, it shows the degree that Google is willing to publicly assert neutrality, while internally yielding stark impartiality.

Today we see wide-spread censorship in the media and censorship of websites deemed "conservative," along with websites that challenge the World Health Organization narrative.

Perhaps the most shocking thing about Google is their willingness to cooperate with China's military and share their artificial intelligence (AI) intellectual property, while simultaneously ending cooperation with the Pentagon. Fei-Fei Li, a Chinese national and VP of Google's Cloud AI services said that when it comes to AI, Google is "borderless". This is a big problem given that China has mandated that technology with military value has to be shared with the People's Liberation Army, since 2017.

Following the July 29th, 2020 hearing, members of the House Judiciary Committee can ask additional questions in their antitrust investigations of Big Tech. I humbly propose the following:

- Has any technology from Deep Mind or your other AI ventures been transferred or accessed by the Chinese Military?
- Has any of the real-time location data, user browser history or ISP data been accessed by the Chinese Military, directly or indirectly through 3rd parties?
- Is “Machine Learning Fairness” still being used in Google products to alter search results?
- Does Google centralize or share it’s content moderation algorithm with Facebook, Twitter or Instagram?

Sincerely,

Zach Vorhies

Google Whistleblower and Former Senior Software Engineer

Letter from Ryan Hartwig

Dear Honorable Members of the House Judiciary Committee,

My name is Ryan Hartwig and during the course of nearly two years I worked as a content moderator for Cognizant, within their assignment for Facebook. After seeing the bias in Facebook content moderation, I opted to come forward with hidden camera footage and inside information through Project Veritas. Many of the documents I uncovered existed as early as 2017. The problem I uncovered was not with only a few rogue content moderators, it was systemic and involved a consistent application of a convoluted and corrupt policy at Facebook. The bias at Facebook is built into the community guidelines and many directives straight from Facebook advised content moderators to make exceptions to the policy.

Facebook specifically references Mill’s Harm Principle as a guiding framework for its policies, yet Facebook doesn’t define the difference between what John Stuart Mills defines as “harm” versus “offense.” According to Mill, an offense is something that would hurt our feelings. He goes on to say that an “offense” is less serious and should not be prevented. The grand majority of the thousands of posts I deleted over the course of two years were “offenses” and not speech that would cause real-world harm.

In Mark Zuckerberg’s testimony on July 29, 2020, he stated that he is “somewhat familiar with the concerns that they’ve raised”. He also stated the following: “I certainly do not want our platforms to be run in a way that has any ideological bias and I want people to be able to discuss

a range of issues...” It is important to note that apart from the actual moderators having bias, the policy itself has ideological bias built into its framework. Discovery into these documents will show evidence of these claims, though I unfortunately doubt Mark Zuckerberg would ever agree to come clean about his practices.

Over the last month I’ve had the opportunity to do media interviews with over 20 different news outlets, both in the U.S. and abroad. In my interviews in Spain, Canada, and Colombia, I noticed that citizens are concerned about Facebook’s reach and influence in their elections.

Conservatives in these countries also suffer political censorship. This is not just a domestic concern, this is a global pandemic; political censorship has infected the world in a major way, including in Brazil where the federal judiciary is colluding with Facebook and Twitter against Brazilian President Jair Bolsonaro. Facebook and Twitter are quick to fold when strongarmed by a corrupt federal mob (equivalent of mainstream media in the United States) purely for political purposes. Sad, indeed.

Under the current system, any political group is liable to be the target of censorship and that should raise flags for everyone. It would be a shame if roles were reversed and liberals were instead the target of a conservative-minded social media publication. Neutrality is important regardless of who is in power.

Bias is allowing attacks against certain sexual orientations for not supporting LGBT rights. Bias is making a newsworthy exception for Don Lemon to issue a blanket statement labeling white males as terror threats.

Political bias means not labeling Antifa as a criminal organization despite mountains of evidence to the contrary. Political bias means deleting videos of Trump supporters being victimized and attacked. Political bias means protecting certain whistleblowers and environmental activists and pulling those “jobs” into the queue for more scrutiny.

These are just a few examples of what I uncovered as an entry-level content moderator making \$15/hour. If I was able to reveal such blatant bias, I’m certain there is much more happening at a higher level among Facebook’s engineers and executive staff. Unsurprisingly, the Facebook lobbying powerhouse continues to deny the mere existence of bias. Such willful blindness is perpetuated by certain members of the Elitist Left in House Judiciary who are apparently too scholarly to recognize an elephant that is right in front of her or his face.

I strongly urge members of Congress to take action whether it be through antitrust or other legislation to limit Facebook's power to stifle political expression.

Thank you for looking into this matter as we attempt to preserve Americans' right to express themselves politically on the internet.

Sincerely,

Ryan Hartwig
Former Content Moderator at Cognizant for Facebook

Letter from Zach McElroy

Dear Honorable Members of the House Judiciary Committee,

My name is Zach McElroy and I was formerly a content moderator for Facebook who blew the whistle on political bias of many kinds at the company just last month with Project Veritas.

Immediately upon starting my job as a moderator, I saw Facebook's internal policies and policy exceptions which contained a myriad of problems and double standards, all targeting conservatives, which will lead to election interference.

While the subject of yesterday's hearing was antitrust, we saw the topic of tech censorship steal the stage for much of the afternoon, and for good reason - it is the most important issue we face today in the world of big tech. In light of that, I would like to analyze yesterday's hearing with a focus on the matter of tech censorship and its pernicious effects on the American public. I hope our representatives will seek to focus on getting something done about it already - the time is long past due.

Mark Zuckerberg claims that Facebook's "goal is to offer a platform for all ideas" - unless they're dangerous, or even just unpopular ideas, as their own policies have shown. It is nearly impossible to have a contrary opinion about immigration, or to speak as a dissident about gender, race relations, or any other socio-political subject on the platform without being banned for wrongthink, and it's all heavily skewed in one direction - anything right-of-center.

Zuckerberg goes on to say they have distinguished themselves as a company that "defends free expression the most" - more like "stifles the most", and that's saying something when you realize how unabashedly radical others like Twitter and YouTube are. In any case, this is a wholeheartedly disingenuous thing to say. Facebook does little to nothing to protect free speech where it matters most. Zuckerberg has failed to make Facebook an open forum for discussion and debate, instead he instituted a dictatorship that oppresses Americans who love their country.

He then says "We do have community standards around things that you can and cannot say - I think you would likely agree with most of them" and lists various things which are outright illegal, such as human trafficking and support of terrorism. The thing is, this is precisely what should be removed from their platform, and in my opinion, nothing more - that is, content which is illegal.

Zuckerberg admits to having AI handle a large portion of their censorship - 89% of "hate speech" is automatically identified. In light of this information, the public needs to see how this AI was formulated and programmed. As broken as their policy is, if the AI functions true to their written policy, it's already more than likely to be a monster of free speech abuse.

Mark Zuckerberg says that "There is diversity in where [moderators] are hired". I can confirm that nearly every single person at the content moderation office in which I worked was not only left-leaning, but some had no shame in expressing their approval of exacting "revenge" against conservatives. Another former coworker confided in me that she felt unable to express herself freely as the office was ideologically biased against conservatives.

I can confirm that for the individuals and organizations on Facebook's "hate" lists, I cannot recall a single one that is not right wing. For example, Antifa, a violent organization listed by the DHS as a terrorist organization, is exempt from this list, yet comedian Gavin McInnes is on the same level as Adolf Hitler.

Rep. Gaetz directly asked Zuckerberg about the evidence of political bias exposed in the Project Veritas reports, to which Zuckerberg responded, "If the behavior that they cited is true, then that would be unacceptable in our operation" - well, I have *shown* it to be true, not just in their moderators' biases, but in Facebook's policies, and policy exceptions themselves.

Just yesterday, Rep. Paul Gosar along with many others introduced legislation calling for crucial Section 230 reform. This is precisely the right move to make, and is all that is needed to get these big tech monsters in line.

I can only be so blunt: *please do something already*. We're almost out of time.

Sincerely,

Zach McElroy
Facebook Whistleblower and Former Content Moderator