



ORDO IURIS

INSTITUTE FOR LEGAL CULTURE

Warsaw, 17.09.2019

HUMAN DIMENSION IMPLEMENTATION MEETING 2019 I OSCE

2th working session

Institute for Legal Culture_short statement

Nowadays, traditional media such as the press or television no longer have such impact as in the 20th century. Needless to say, new social media and video platforms have a greater impact on shaping public opinion every year.

In a situation where the owners or administrators of online platforms do not commit censorship or preventive censorship - social media are a tool for the implementation of basic human rights, such as freedom of speech and the right to unfettered expression. These values constitute the basic foundation on which every democratic state of law should be based.

Unacceptable should be the situation when the user publishing on his profile content that is legal but not compatible with the views of the administrators of the social platform is blocked. This is a modern form of censorship and should be clearly condemned.

In recent months, in Poland, we have been dealing with the mass removal and blocking of conservative and right-wing columnists and channels on Facebook and YouTube. An example was YouTube blocking the material of television in Real24 presenting the celebrations of the 75th anniversary of the Warsaw Uprising. A symbolic event for Poles in which Warsaw residents took up an unequal fight with the German Nazi occupier. Events during which, within a few days, the Germans carried out the so-called Slaughter of Wola, killing 60,000 people in a few days. After the fall, the Germans razed the left bank part of Warsaw to the ground. For several days, the coverage of the anniversary celebrations was removed. The owner of the YouTube platform - Google, pointed to "violation of community standards". At the same time, it was not indicated to the publishers which fragment from the 4 hour recording was considered to be prohibited.

Another case was YouTube blocking a video of the mass of the Archbishop of Kraków or the "I believe" program in which the teachings of the Catholic Church were discussed. In addition to the content removed by YT, the channel on which the "I Believe" program was published was blocked for a period of three months. There was no clear explanation for such actions except enigmatic information about "violation of community standards". The new community standards introduced by YouTube in June were applied to materials published many months earlier. It is worth pointing out that after a few days the blockade has been undone. The YouTube platform did not respond to the allegations made against it.

News about the censorship of conservative and Catholic content by administrators of social networks comes to us from many European countries. Increased censorship of conservative and patriotic content took place, among others in Estonia and Hungary.

Often, there are situations in which profiles are deleted and the user of a social networking site or video platform is not precisely informed what video materials and what content was considered as "incompatible with community standards". The lack of relevant national regulations prevents users of social networking sites from applying a clear appeal procedure, involving an independent national court or administrative



ORDO IURIS

INSTITUTE FOR LEGAL CULTURE

authority. Such an authority or court would assess the compliance with the national law of the operation of a social platform that has removed or blocked a certain type of content.

Nowadays a threat to freedom of speech is not just a simple censorship involving blocking or removing content. Increasingly, censorship also takes an economic form. On Facebook, the algorithms can see the underlying coverage of posts published by conservative journalists. For example, the kresy.pl fan page has reached tens of thousands of recipients in the past. The current number of recipients rarely exceeds the number of several hundred. The smaller the reach of a given post and the number of clicks on the link shared in the post, the smaller the remuneration of smaller media from ads published on their websites.

Even Facebook authorities themselves admit to artificial limitation of ranges. An example of such activities was the reduction of the reach of pro life organizations by the Irish abortion referendum. Such actions in relation to right-wing journalists also take place under the guise of the so-called fight against disinformation. The fight that the European Commission took two years ago. What resulted in, among others establishing a modern censorship office - "Network of independent information verifiers".

The Ordo Iuris Institute supports personal freedoms and human rights. Personally, I am for unrestricted freedom of doing business. Unfortunately, in relation to social networks lack the relevant provisions leads to censor content by platforms owners . Relevant regulations that set the framework for the functioning of enterprises - monopolists, operate in other key sectors, e.g. in telecommunications, energy, rail, etc.

As far as users publishing from a given territory are concerned, the national provisions of the given country should apply. This applies especially to regulations or community regulations adopted by social platforms. Special legislation has already been adopted in some countries. An example would be the German Social Media Act.

These regulations should apply only to providing users of social networking sites with unrestricted freedom of speech and the freedom to present their views. The relevant restrictions could apply only to such cases when the published content is contrary to the criminal law of a given State. Restrictions and bans should be defined clearly and precisely. In particular, social networking sites would not be able to remove and block content that is legitimate, but considered by their owners and administrators as "controversial" or "politically incorrect." The introduction of new regulations in various countries should be limited to guaranteeing freedom of expression on the web. Unfortunately, it is easy to imagine situations where, under the pretext of fighting censorship, a given country will lead to larger censorship. One should clearly warn against such a phenomenon.

Attorney

Tomasz Piotr Chudzinski

Legislative Analysis Centre