Question for written answer E-000567/2025
to the Commission
Rule 144
Angéline Furet (PfE), Tiago Moreira de Sá (PfE), Afroditi Latinopoulou (PfE), Filip Turek (PfE), Gerald Hauser (PfE), Roman Haider (PfE), Marie-Luce Brasier-Clain (PfE), Valérie Deloge (PfE), Gerolf Annemans (PfE), Dominik Tarczyński (ECR), Pascale Piera (PfE), Petr Bystron (ESN), Sarah Knafo (ESN), Hermann Tertsch (PfE), Fernand Kartheiser (ECR), Pierre Pimpie (PfE), Jorge Martín Frías (PfE), Branko Grims (PPE), Diana Iovanovici Şoşoacă (NI), Jorge Buxadé Villalba (PfE), Jean-Paul Garraud (PfE), Virginie Joron (PfE), Barbara Bonte (PfE), António Tânger Corrêa (PfE), Petar Volgin (ESN), Nikola Bartůšek (PfE), Anna Bryłka (PfE), Hans Neuhoff (ESN)

Subject: Cost of censorship on social media

Mark Zuckerberg, the CEO of Meta, recently announced that the company was terminating its fact-checking program in the United States and, in a similar vein to X (formerly Twitter), adopting ‘community notes’ instead. Zuckerberg also accused the European Union of ‘institutionalising censorship’ and hampering innovation.

These comments call the EU’s commitment to freedom of speech and digital innovation into question.

1. In the light of the above accusations of censorship and holding back innovation, could the Commission clarify its position on these matters? What costs have been incurred as a result of current European laws in this field – particularly the Digital Services Act – and their implementation?

2. What is the profile of EU fact-checkers, and what criteria are used to recruit professionals whose task it is to ensure diversity of opinion?

Supporters[1]

Submitted: 7.2.2025

[1] This question is supported by Members other than the authors: Julien Leonardelli (PfE), Julie Rechagneux (PfE), Catherine Griset (PfE)