Twitter Thread by Nick Disband the Police Mamatas ■■■■■



Nick Disband the Police Mamatas ■■■■■
@NMamatas



Am I concerned about Twitter banning the President? No, because I've been online since I was 17 years old. Any venue too haphazardly moderated—either too strictly or too loosely—grows unstable and collapses.

So what if Twitter is Too Big. So was MySpace, Livejournal, Usenet...

Did Twitter make a mistake? I don't think so. Its primary concern is that its HQ is here in the US and frankly the Reps are more likely to drop the hammer on social media than the Dems, especially if the Reps can ignore election results.

The irony is that the recent conservative rage over Section 230 is so misplaced. If you want to turn social media into publishers responsible for the user-base's content, you're going to have giant swaths of users banned to avoid lawsuits.

Every town and city newspaper gets letters from their subscribers reading, "Jesus told me in a dream that we should go down to City Hall and string up the mayor! This Monday, at 3pm...."

They don't publish them. Think for two seconds as to why.

Same with printing. Years ago I edited the book SAVING PRIVATE POWER by Mickey Z which included images of a Nazi swastika. Printer wouldn't run the plate, and yes it was an anti-Nazi book.

Didn't want to have a worker traumatized by seeing 10000 swastikas go by.

There has never been and cannot be a duty to provide an audience outside of re-education camps.

All the faux libertarian complaints about Big Tech monopoly capital (lol) boil down to the fact that capital isn't a direct appendage of an oppressive state at all times.

Should there be a government-run social media platform? Ooh, maybe.

Do you wish C-Span was more like Public Access? (I kinda do.)

https://t.co/Hv87WZBjSG

But I guarantee most people wouldn't use a state-backed social media platform, because if it was really "anything goes" it would be nothing but torture porn, evangelical sermons, and algorithm-generated ad copy.