



X Marks the Plot: "Defenders of Democracy" Trying to Destroy the One True Social-media Democracy

We hear continual warnings from the Establishment and the Left (and the overlap there is profound) about "attacks on democracy." Donald Trump, of course, is supposed to be a "threat to democracy." Yet it all appears like projection. Why?

Because the self-proclaimed "defenders of democracy" are now aiming to destroy the only major extant social-media democracy: X (formerly Twitter).

Two recent stories epitomize this. The first involves an actual UK government plot to destroy X. The second revolves around a study blaming Elon Musk, X's owner, for causing college professors' departure from the platform. An article at The Independent on the matter actually calls it the "Twitter brain drain." It's yet another attack based on the supposition that it is freedom of speech that's the social-media perversion. It's inversion — of reality.





Beatchoose/Wikimedia Commons

True Spirit of Social Media

Social media was thus named precisely because it was supposed to be about the *people*. This is why it was granted Section 230 protection from defamation suits. The idea was that since any user could post anything — and was in other words, the publisher — the platform couldn't be held responsible for what was published. It makes sense.

It's also history.

The reality is that social-media companies today generally behave *as* publishers. They prioritize material that aligns with their agenda and censor or "shadow-ban" what doesn't. A shadow-ban, by the way, is when your posts are hidden from your followers. It's sneaky, underhanded, and dishonorable because you *think* you're getting your message out, but the platform is "ghosting" you.

For details on Big Tech censorship, you can click here, here, here, here, here, <a href="here, here, <a href="here, here, <a href="here, <a href="here</a







Twitter Brain Drain — or Brain Gain?

Of course, that's if *all* social-media companies favor one candidate. This gets at one reason the Establishment now despises X. Its departure from the censorship regime represents a breach in the Establishment's Truth-repelling phalanx.

This brings us to the article on The Independent, which is relevant because it's reflective of typical mainstream-media anti-X bias. It showcases <u>a study</u>, published last Tuesday, titled "The Vibes Are Off: Did Elon Musk Push Academics Off Twitter?"

The short answer is no — of course not. The academics *fled*.

But that's not supposed to be your takeaway. A study researcher stated that X had been "an important platform for academic communication and networking, especially among social scientists." But now, they're fading away. The researchers attribute this to certain changes at X. As The Independent reports:

These include mass layoffs of the company's staff, the reinstatement of tens of thousands of accounts that had been suspended for violating Twitter's Terms of Service [many of which were censored unjustly], changes to Twitter's verification process and the rise of misinformation on the platform.

... "We argue that a combination of these features of the threat and then the reality of Musk's ownership of the Twitter corporation influenced academics either to quit Twitter altogether or at least reduce their engagement with the platform..."

My, poor babies. Coming to mind could be the <u>nursery rhyme lyrics</u>, "When the boys came out to play, Georgie Porgie ran away." I mean, what would be the reaction if conservatives fled a platform because liberals could finally express themselves freely?

What's Eatin' Ya, Teach?

But question: Why should these academics care about those changes? They can still say what they wish.

The kicker is that X allows you to mute or block other users and even make your tweets private. Translation: You can still have your echo chamber there if you desire. So what's the real issue?

Perhaps these academics are upset that the narrative is no longer controlled, as in their classrooms, where they can punish students with grade reduction. Maybe they're cowards who can't handle criticism. Perhaps they're sensitive snowflakes who melt under the warm light of Truth. Maybe it's misguided principle, where they just "won't be part of Musk's right-wing vanity project!" Or, most likely, it's a combination of two or more of the above.

Anyway, is it really a "brain drain"? Well, just ponder the apocryphal saying, often misattributed to Mark Twain, "Never let your schooling interfere with your education."

As for "misinformation," it's hard even taking this seriously. As I've <u>reported</u>, the mainstream media specialize in misinformation. Academics, that oh-so intellectual bunch, may be even worse. As *The Economist* <u>reported</u> in 2013: A shocking *three-quarters or more of research studies in many fields are complete bunk*. (Also see 2014's "<u>Blinding Me With Science</u>: <u>Fraud and Folly for Fame and Funding</u>.")

Small Men in Big Government

What's apparently not bunk, however, is the aforementioned UK government plot. As Blaze Media reported Tuesday:



Written by **Selwyn Duke** on October 24, 2024



A whistleblower revealed that a nonprofit focusing on "digital hate" has a stated goal to destroy Elon Musk's X platform.

Leaked documents show that the Center for Countering Digital Hate, a U.S. nonprofit and British charity, have an internal goal to "Kill Musk's Twitter."

Images from January, March, and October 2024 list "Kill Musk's Twitter" as an annual priority.

... Reporters Paul Thacker and Matt Taibbi posted other screenshots revealing the nonprofit was hoping to discuss policy with [Minn.] Sen. Amy Klobuchar's team and to seek "a quote/press release endorsement" from her. The document showed the nonprofit already had a meeting set up with the senator's team.

According to Thacker, the nonprofit held a private conference with a group of liberal representatives who were organizing against Musk.

Guests included members of the Joe Biden administration, [Calif.] Congressman Adam Schiff's office, Biden State Department officials, Canadian Member of Parliament Peter Julian, and Media Matters for America. [Relevant tweet below.]

And all this, of course, is justified with that "misinformation" ruse. Yet are there worse purveyors of mis- and disinformation than governments? Why, a major role of intelligence agencies is to spread disinformation!

At least X allows "community notes." This is where, when a large number of users identify a post containing misinformation, a note correcting the record is attached to it. It's another aspect, too, of X's vibrant social-media democracy. And know this: Even Elon Musk, X's big boss man, has been community-noted. Try "community-noting" a government official in Britain and you may be arrested. (They call that "hate speech.") Of course, statists want this standard in the U.S. as well.

Now who, again, is the threat to "democracy"?





Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

24 Issues Per Year
Optional Print Edition
Digital Edition Access
Exclusive Subscriber Content
Audio provided for all articles
Unlimited access to past issues
Coming Soon! Ad FREE
60-Day money back guarantee!
Cancel anytime.