

Report on Government Take-Down Requests

RESOLVED:

Shareholders request that Meta Platforms, Inc. (“Company”) provide a report, published on the company’s website and updated semi-annually – and omitting proprietary information and at reasonable cost – that specifies the Company’s policy in responding to requests to remove or take down content from its platforms by the Executive Office of the President, Members of Congress, or any other agency, entity or subcontractor on behalf of the United States Government.

This report shall also include an itemized listing of such “takedown” requests, including the name and title of the official making the request; the nature and scope of the request; the date of the request; the Company’s action or inaction to the request; and a reason or rationale for the Company’s response, or lack thereof.

SUPPORTING STATEMENT:

In *Bantam Books, Inc. vs. Sullivan (1963)*, and in other cases, the Supreme Court of the United States has ruled that private entities may not engage in suppression of speech at the behest of government, as it has the same effect as direct government censorship.

On July 15, 2021, White House press secretary Jen Psaki was asked, “Can you talk a little bit more about this request for tech companies to be more aggressive in policing misinformation? Has the administration been in touch with any of these companies and are there any actions that the federal government can take to ensure their cooperation, because we’ve seen, from the start, there’s not a lot of action on some of these platforms.”

Psaki replied, “Sure. Well, first, we are in regular touch with these social media platforms, and those engagements typically happen through members of our senior staff, but also members of our COVID-19 team, given, as (Surgeon General) Dr. (Vivek) Murthy conveyed, this is a big issue of misinformation, specifically on the pandemic.”

Evidence – and testimony by Company Chairman and CEO Mark Zuckerberg – shows the Company has been subject to overtures from the U.S. government to censor. For example, in a podcast interview in August 2022, Mr. Zuckerberg said¹ Facebook restricted reach among users to a *New York Post* article about Hunter Biden’s laptop, after the FBI told the Company to be on “high alert” for so-called “Russian propaganda.”

¹ Wulfsohn, Joseph A. “Mark Zuckerberg tells Joe Rogan FBI warned Facebook of ‘Russian propaganda’ before Hunter Biden laptop story,” FoxNews.com, Aug. 25, 2022. See <https://fxn.ws/3G21OUY>.

Also, Facebook maintained a “content requests system” for use by government and law enforcement to request censorship of so-called “disinformation.”² The Internet domain³ for the company’s portal even has the word “takedowns” in it.

Shareholders need to know whether the Company cooperates with government officials engaged in unconstitutional censorship, opening the Company to liability claims by victims. Shareholders also need to know whether the Company fails to disclose these potential liabilities as material risks in its public filings.

² Klippenstein, Ken & Fang, Lee. “Truth Cops: Leaked Documents Outline DHS’s Plans to Police Disinformation,” *The Intercept*, Oct. 31, 2022. See <https://bit.ly/3huDXmz>.

³ See “facebook.com/xtakedowns/login”.