

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000528/26
to the Commission
Erik Kaliňák (NI)
(9 February 2026)**

Subject: Is the DSA ultimately a tool for silencing inconvenient opinions?

A report of the US House of Representatives' Judiciary Committee of 3 February 2026 entitled 'The Foreign Censorship Threat, Part II' laid bare the Commission's true intentions for the DSA. It is not intended to protect EU citizens, quite the contrary — it was and is exclusively about suppressing inconvenient opinions that do not conform to the Commission's single permitted narrative. How else can the Commission explain its pressure on social media platforms, which it forced to censor statements such as 'there are only two genders' or 'stop the transgender agenda for children' before the 2023 Slovak elections — positions that TikTok itself described as common in Slovakia, but which the Commission demanded be removed as 'hateful content'?

1. In light of this report, does the Commission still intend to claim that the DSA is intended to protect EU citizens?
2. Who does the Commission actually represent when it fears the voice of European citizens so much that it wants to dictate what opinions they are allowed to hold through the DSA?
3. The report by the Judiciary Committee points to a far-reaching scandal involving von der Leyen and her Commission (both the current and previous ones). Regrettably, this is not the first scandal, and I fear it will not be the last. After all this, and multiple attempts to remove her, isn't it time for her to leave?

Submitted: 9.2.2026

**Answer given by Executive Vice-President Virkkunen on behalf of the European Commission
(20 April 2026)**

The Commission rejects the unsubstantiated and unfounded claims made by the Judiciary Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives in its report of 3 February 2026.

The Digital Services Act (DSA) ⁽¹⁾ empowers users of online platforms to appeal removals, receive explanations and seek redress where their content is removed or restricted by platforms.

This protects users' freedom of expression. For example, between April 2024 and June 2025, Meta reversed almost one third ⁽²⁾ of 68 million contested content moderation decisions on Facebook and Instagram.

Users can also appeal platform decisions through out-of-court dispute settlement. In early 2025, they overturned 52% of decisions out of the more than 1 800 complaints ⁽³⁾ submitted.

The DSA does not prescribe which content is illegal; this is determined by national law or other EU laws. The Commission does not have the competence to mandate the removal of lawful content and has no role in individual moderation decisions. These decisions lie with platforms themselves, according to their own terms and conditions.

However, the DSA obliges platforms to specify the reasons for restriction or removal of content and mitigate systemic risks. When online platforms fail to meet these transparency and accountability obligations, the Commission acts.

In April 2024, the Commission opened an investigation into Meta for suspected demotion of political content through their recommender systems ⁽⁴⁾.

In October 2025, the Commission preliminarily found Meta failed to provide adequate reporting tools for illegal content or effective appeals mechanisms ⁽⁵⁾.

The President of the Commission and the Commission are fully focused on keeping Europe independent, secure and competitive, including in technical matters.

⁽¹⁾ Regulation (EU) 2022/2065 on a single market for digital services and amending Directive 2000/31/EC (Digital Services Act), <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2022/2065/oj/eng>.

⁽²⁾ <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/dsa-impact-platforms#ecl-inpage-greater-transparency-in-content-moderation-and-more-options-to-appeal>.

⁽³⁾ <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/news/two-years-digital-services-act-allows-50-million-content-moderation-decisions-platforms-be-reversed>.

⁽⁴⁾ https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/ip_24_2373.

⁽⁵⁾ <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/news/commission-preliminarily-finds-tiktok-and-meta-breach-their-transparency-obligations-under-digital>.