

**Question for written answer E-002562/2022
to the Commission**

Rule 138

Karen Melchior (Renew)

Subject: Ensuring freedom of speech on very large online platforms for the defence of the fundamental right to health under the Digital Services Act

An American pro-choice group, known as Jane's Revenge, founded in response to the overturn of Roe v. Wade, has taken responsibility for the vandalism of 'crisis pregnancy centers' across the country. These organisations, set up by pro-life groups, aim to deceive women seeking independent medical advice and persuade them not to have an abortion.

Meta recently made the decision to classify Jane's Revenge as a terrorist organisation. As a result, they are subjected to the same speech restrictions as the Islamic State group. This means that any social media user found praising, supporting or representing them on Meta's platforms could have their account banned. For comparison, Meta does not even classify groups associated with the 6 January 2021 Capitol attacks as terrorist organisations.

Under the Digital Services Act (DSA), the Commission is responsible for overseeing the content moderation practices of very large online platforms.

1. Is Meta's decision compatible with Facebook's obligations under Article 26.1.b of the DSA, which forces companies to consider the effect of their content moderation practices on the right to freedom of speech?
2. How could a European organisation similar to Jane's Revenge appeal against a decision to include it on the list of dangerous organisations under the DSA?