

# The sick fucks at Facebook – Meta should be put out of business

## Meta didn't want people to read this book. Now it's a No. 1 bestseller.

Story by knotopoulos@businessinsider.com (Katie Notopoulos)

- "Careless People," the book by a former Meta employee, debuted at No. 1 on The New York Times Bestseller list.
- Meta tried to legally prevent the author, Sarah Wynn-Williams, from promoting the book.
- Siri, what does the "Streisand effect" mean?

Sarah Wynn-Williams published a memoir of her time working in global policy at Meta (then called Facebook) that gave a deeply unflattering portrayal of the company and its executives.

Ahead of its March 11 release, Meta filed an emergency motion with an arbitrator. The judge ruled that Wynn-Williams had likely violated her non-disparagement agreement with the company and had to stop promoting or selling the book. (The publisher pointed out that the arbitration ruling did not affect it, and the book is currently for sale.)

Last week, I speculated that Meta's move was backfiring: it set off a new wave of headlines and drew even more attention. Come on, who wouldn't want to check out the book Mark Zuckerberg doesn't want you to read?

My theory has since gained credence. The book just debuted at No. 1 on The New York Times Bestseller list for nonfiction. It also ranks fifth on Amazon's bestseller list.

Just before the ruling, Business Insider's Pranav Dixit interviewed Wynn-Williams. She doesn't appear to have conducted an interview since.

Typically, nonfiction books are announced months, more often years in advance, and review copies are sent long before the release to drum up publicity. This one abruptly burst into existence — announced less than a week before its release. But it appears the incredibly brief promotional window didn't hurt sales.

I should note here that the book is not without controversy (I suppose that's obvious). Meta has feverishly denounced its contents, dismissing it in their official statement as the work of a disgruntled employee who was fired for "toxic behavior" and poor performance. Meta has also said it wasn't fact-checked (an irony lost on no one, given the company's recent changes to fact-checking on its own platforms).

Andrew Bosworth, CTO of Meta, said on Threads that the book is "full of lies. Literally stories that did not happen." Other current and former Meta employees posted on social media that the book doesn't reflect the Meta they knew. Katie Harbath, who overlapped with Wynn-Williams and was present for some of the things that happened during the period of 2011-2017 that the book covers, wrote a blog post about how it contains inaccuracies that undermine its larger point. She wrote:

---

But when the facts are wrong, the conclusions people draw are flawed, too. The company's real failures deserve scrutiny. Exaggerations, omissions, and distortions only muddy the conversation.

---

However, at least one former Meta employee has supported the book, writing on her public LinkedIn that it feels true to her experience.

Here's my opinion, having read the book: Ask any two coworkers what their experience at a company was a decade ago, and I promise you'll get different answers. And in a memoir written years later, yes, details and conversations could be misremembered.

But it's a forest-for-the-trees thing. The most damning moments in the book had already been reported in the news (Meta's PR dedicated an entire page on its website to point out that the book is full of "old news"). No one on Earth, not even Mark Zuckerberg and his new philosophy of not apologizing for world events out of his control, would look at Facebook in the 2010s and not agree that mistakes were made — some of them quite serious. You already know that, we all already know that. What the book offers is a glimpse inside the rooms where those decisions were made. That's compelling.

Whether Meta's attempt to quash the book by enforcing a non-disparagement "Careless People," the book by a former Meta employee, debuted at No. 1 on The New York Times Bestseller list.

Meta tried to legally prevent the author, Sarah Wynn-Williams, from promoting the book.

Siri, what does the "Streisand effect" mean?

Sarah Wynn-Williams published a memoir of her time working in global policy at Meta (then called Facebook) that gave a deeply unflattering portrayal of the company and its executives.

Ahead of its March 11 release, Meta filed an emergency motion with an arbitrator. The judge ruled that Wynn-Williams had likely violated her non-disparagement agreement with the company and had to stop promoting or selling the book. (The publisher pointed out that the arbitration ruling did not affect it, and the book is currently for sale.)

Last week, I speculated that Meta's move was backfiring: it set off a new wave of headlines and drew even more attention. Come on, who wouldn't want to check out the book Mark Zuckerberg doesn't want you to read?

My theory has since gained credence. The book just debuted at No. 1 on The New York Times Bestseller list for nonfiction. It also ranks fifth on Amazon's bestseller list.

Just before the ruling, Business Insider's Pranav Dixit interviewed Wynn-Williams. She doesn't appear to have conducted an interview since.

Typically, nonfiction books are announced months, more often years in advance, and review copies are sent long before the release to drum up publicity. This one abruptly burst into existence — announced less than a week before its release. But it appears the incredibly brief promotional window didn't hurt sales.

I should note here that the book is not without controversy (I suppose that's obvious). Meta has feverishly denounced its contents, dismissing it in their official statement as the work of a disgruntled employee who was fired for "toxic behavior" and poor performance. Meta has also said it wasn't fact-checked (an irony lost on no one, given the company's recent changes to fact-checking on its own platforms).

Andrew Bosworth, CTO of Meta, said on Threads that the book is "full of lies. Literally stories that did not happen." Other current and former Meta employees posted on social media that the book doesn't reflect the Meta they knew. Katie

Harbath, who overlapped with Wynn-Williams and was present for some of the things that happened during the period of 2011-2017 that the book covers, wrote a blog post about how it contains inaccuracies that undermine its larger point. She wrote:

But when the facts are wrong, the conclusions people draw are flawed, too. The company's real failures deserve scrutiny. Exaggerations, omissions, and distortions only muddy the conversation.

However, at least one former Meta employee has supported the book, writing on her public LinkedIn that it feels true to her experience.

Here's my opinion, having read the book: Ask any two coworkers what their experience at a company was a decade ago, and I promise you'll get different answers. And in a memoir written years later, yes, details and conversations could be misremembered.

But it's a forest-for-the-trees thing. The most damning moments in the book had already been reported in the news (Meta's PR dedicated an entire page on its website to point out that the book is full of "old news"). No one on Earth, not even Mark Zuckerberg and his new philosophy of not apologizing for world events out of his control, would look at Facebook in the 2010s and not agree that mistakes were made — some of them quite serious. You already know that, we all already know that. What the book offers is a glimpse inside the rooms where those decisions were made. That's compelling.

Whether Meta's attempt to quash the book by enforcing a non-disparagement clause was another one of those mistakes? Well, I suppose soon we can argue it

out in the Community Notes. clause was another one of those mistakes? Well, I suppose soon we can argue it out in the Community Notes.