



August 1, 2024

President Donald Trump
c/o The Trump Organization
Mar-a-Lago Club
1100 S Ocean Blvd.
Palm Beach, FL 33480

Dear President Trump:

On behalf of Chamber of Progress – a tech industry coalition promoting technology’s future – I am writing to urge you to clarify your position on Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act as voters and donors assess the candidates in this year’s general election.

Section 230 directly impacts the ability to post and access a vast range of speech on the Internet, from comments on local news articles to posts on the biggest social media sites. As you’re aware, Section 230 also enables online platforms that host third-party content to moderate and curate the content they host.

Since its enactment, Section 230 has fostered a vibrant online ecosystem featuring a variety of online platforms with varying content moderation and curation strategies, providing consumers with a range of choices on how they connect online.

Voters deserve to know your stance on this critical shield for online speech. During your presidency, you fought for the repeal of Section 230.¹ Since your departure from the White House, however, you have overseen the launch of your own social media platform, Truth Social, which relies on Section 230 to host and curate third-party content. Notably, your legal team has also invoked Section 230 in court to defend against lawsuits.

As this year’s election nears, we urge you to explain your stance on Section 230 and whether you would pursue changes to or the repeal of this important law should you win the election.

The Importance of Section 230 for Online Speech

While debate over Section 230 often focuses on the law’s impact on large online social media platforms, the reality is that Section 230 allows platforms both big and small to host content posted by users, shielding platforms from lawsuits over what users have to

¹NPR, [Trump Vows to Veto Defense Bill Unless Liability Shield for Big Tech is Scrapped](#).

say. In essence, Section 230 places responsibility for what's posted online on the people who post it.

Section 230 has helped individuals, non-profits, and other small providers maintain comment sections on community bulletins, run websites on niche topics, and foster open discussion on the web. Anyone with a website, app, or forum that includes content from other users relies on Section 230 to protect themselves from frivolous lawsuits over speech online.²

The net impact of Section 230 for the United States has been two-fold. First, it has fostered a diverse set of online communities with different approaches to content moderation. While some platforms like YouTube have maintained and enforced a detailed policy to limit the spread of misinformation online, others, like Twitter, have taken a more hands-off approach when it comes to moderating user posts.

Your platform, Truth Social, has fostered a community of right-wing activists and creators while taking down conversations about abortion rights and the January 6 riots.³

Section 230 protects these content moderation decisions as well. And while we may disagree over the impact of Truth Social's user policies, these protections have created an online environment where users can select the social media platform where content moderation is most appropriate for their tastes.

Attempts to Repeal Section 230 as President

Following your loss in the 2020 election and a right-wing outcry over election-time content moderation decisions,⁴ you championed a late-term push for the repeal of Section 230, denouncing it as “a grave threat to National Security” and “dangerous and unfair.”⁵

Toward that end, you vetoed the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), a bill that funds and sets policy for the Department of Defense, because the bill did not include language repealing Section 230.

In a rebuke of that move, the Senate overrode your veto - the first and only veto of your Administration - in a bipartisan 81-13 vote.

Trump's Use of Section 230

Since leaving the White House, you have launched your own social media platform, which hosts roughly one million active monthly users. Third parties, including conservative

² Chamber of Progress. [Understanding Section 230 and the Impact of Litigation on Small Providers.](#)

³ NBC News. [On Trump's Truth Social, anti-FBI sentiment builds with little oversight.](#)

⁴ CNBC. [Facebook and Twitter Defend Election Safeguards and Moderation Practices.](#)

⁵ Washington Post. [Trump Threatens to Veto Major Defense Bill.](#)

influencers, have used the platform to share posts with medical misinformation,⁶ white nationalist content,⁷ and calls for violence against federal law enforcement officials.⁸ Without Section 230, Truth Social would face the threat of liability for hosting and moderating this content.

Notably, Truth Social has incorporated pieces of Section 230 into its user policies to protect it from such liability.⁹ Section 230 protects the right of social media platforms to moderate content, stating that:

“No provider or user of an interactive computer service shall be held liable on account of any action voluntarily taken in good faith to restrict access to or availability of material that the provider or user considers to be obscene, lewd, lascivious, filthy, excessively violent, harassing, or otherwise objectionable...”

Truth Social’s user policies mirror Section 230’s language, requiring new users to agree that their posts won’t be “obscene, lewd, lascivious, filthy, violent, harassing, libelous, slanderous, or otherwise objectionable.”

Not only has Truth Social incorporated Section 230 into its user agreement, but your own legal team has repeatedly used Section 230 to defend you in court. In one lawsuit alleging that your retweets were libelous, your legal team employed Section 230 to claim immunity for republishing another Internet user’s content.¹⁰ In another pair of lawsuits over your alleged involvement with Wikileaks’ dissemination of hacked DNC documents, your legal team relied on Section 230 in their motions to dismiss.^{11,12}

Again in 2020, in a lawsuit over tweets linking to false information about Dominion Voting, your legal team employed Section 230 in your defense.¹³ In this case, a federal appeals court sided with your application of Section 230 to individual user content.

Silence on Section 230 Since Launch of Truth Social

During a three-month period beginning in October of 2020, you tweeted thirty times about the repeal of Section 230, and made it a policy priority in the debate of the National Defense Authorization Act.

⁶LA Times. Column: [I spent 24 hours on Trump’s Truth Social so you don’t have to.](#)

⁷Axios. [Truth Social verifies white nationalist Nick Fuentes.](#)

⁸Washington Post. [FBI attacker was prolific contributor to Trump’s Truth Social website.](#)

⁹TechDirt. [Trump’s Truth Social Bakes Section 230 Directly Into Its Terms. So Apparently Trump Now Likes Section 230.](#)

¹⁰Kasowitz Benson Torres LLP. [Motion to Dismiss.](#)

¹¹Counsel for Donald J. Trump for President. [Motion to Dismiss.](#) October 25, 2017.

¹²Counsel for Donald J. Trump for President. [Motion to Dismiss.](#) December 7, 2018.

¹³Technology and Marketing Law Blog. [Section 230 Applies to Tweeted Links to Defamatory Content.](#)

Since launching Truth Social, we've noticed that your Truth Social account has been silent on the issue of Section 230, despite posting thousands of times on the platform.¹⁴ Your Truth Social posts have included discussions on public policy, including issues like immigration and gun safety, but Section 230 has not been mentioned.

Additionally, the recently released 2024 GOP Platform includes a section on tech policy, highlighting the party's promise to repeal President Biden's AI Executive Order and to reform federal cryptocurrency regulations. Again, the platform avoids the topic of Section 230 entirely. During your recent appearance at the Republican National Convention, the topic of Section 230 again went without mention.

Let Voters Know Where You Stand

With less than half a year remaining before the 2024 general election, we urge you to elucidate your stance on Section 230 and speech online so that voters and donors may make an informed decision about who to support in the 2024 election.

With a wide range of online speech at stake, we believe the issue merits clarity and honest discussion from our presidential candidates.

Sincerely,



Adam Kovacevich
Chamber of Progress

¹⁴Business Insider. [Trump's all-caps, high-octane rage posting is even more intense than it was during his 2016 campaign](#). April 23, 2024.