Twitter Thread by Dean Baker



Dean Baker
@DeanBaker13

In response to my posts supporting repeal of Section 230 (https://t.co/ceZZWXyzi6 and https://t.co/af0rjlGTVF) I have a number of people give me horror stories about bad post-repeals hypotheticals (thread)

Let me say that none of these hypoetheticals sound that bad to me (I couldn't care less if Substack goes under -- sorry to all the Substackers out there), but let me give a hypothetical horror story allowed by Section 230

Imagine that some right-winger bought tens of millions of dollars worth of ads on Facebook, with a doctored photo, showing your favorite politician, activist, writer, academic etc, doing the the most disgusting thing imagineable

The target of these ads would of course have the right to sue the person who paid for the ads for defamation.

Suppose that "person" was the XYZ corporation, whose existence is a post office box in Lincoln, Nebraska, registered to John Doe.

That would be the end of the line, barring some serious investigative work to find the real person/people behind the ad.

What about Mark Zuckerberg, who pocketed tens of millions from this libelous ad? Well, Section 230 says that he has no responsibility.

That is in contrast to a print outlet like the NYT or broadcast outlet like CNN, both of which could be sued up the wazoo if they had run this ad.

Okay, that's my Section 230 horror story for the day.