

# What will Elon Musk's ownership of Twitter mean for 'free speech' on the platform?

27 April 2022, by John Hawkins and Michael James Walsh



Credit: Pixabay/CC0 Public Domain

In a surprise capitulation, the board of Twitter has announced it will support a [takeover bid](#) by Elon Musk, the world's richest person. But is it in the public interest?

Musk is offering US\$54.20 a share. This values the company at US\$44 billion (or A\$61 billion)—making it one of the largest leveraged buyouts on record.

[Morgan Stanley and other large financial institutions](#) will lend him US\$25.5 billion. Musk himself will put in around US\$20 billion. This is about the size of a single [bonus](#) he is expected to receive from Tesla.

In a [letter](#) to the chair of Twitter, Musk claimed he would "unlock" Twitter's "extraordinary potential" to be "the platform for [free speech](#) around the globe."

But the idea that [social media](#) has the potential to represent an unbridled mode of public discourse is underpinned by an idealistic understanding that has [surrounded social media](#) technologies for [some time](#).

In reality, Twitter being owned by one person, some of whose own tweets have been [false](#), [sexist](#), [market-moving](#) and [arguably defamatory](#) poses a risk to the platform's future.

## Can Twitter expect a total overhaul?

We see Musk's latest move in a less-than-benign light, as it gives him unprecedented power and influence over Twitter. He has mused about making several potential changes to the platform, including:

- [reshuffling](#) the current [management](#), in which he says he doesn't have confidence
- adding an [edit button](#) on tweets
- weakening the current content moderation approach—including through supporting temporary suspensions on users rather than outright bans, and
- potentially moving to a "freemium" model similar to Spotify's, whereby users can [pay to avoid more intrusive advertisements](#).

Shortly after becoming Twitter's largest individual shareholder earlier this month, Musk [said](#) "I don't care about the economics at all."

But the bankers who lent him US\$25.5 billion to eventually acquire the platform probably do. Musk may come under pressure to lift Twitter's profitability. He claims his top priority is free speech—but potential advertisers may not want their products featured next to an extremist rant.

What Elon Musk is doing is what plutocrats have been doing: using money to buy power and power to protect their money, taking control of media to rig the discourse and hedge against resentment, and branding themselves the solution to the very problem they are.

— Anand Giridharadas @ The.Ink (@AnandWrites) [April 25, 2022](#)

In recent years, Twitter has implemented a range of [governance and content moderation](#) policies. For example, in 2020 it broadened its "[definition of harm](#)" to address COVID-19 content contradicting guidance from authoritative sources.

Twitter claims developments in its content moderation approach have been to "[serve the public conversation](#)" and address [disinformation and misinformation](#). It also claims to respond to user experiences [of abuse](#) and general [incivility users must navigate](#).

Taking a longer-term view, however, it seems Twitter's bolstering of content moderation could be seen as an effort to save its reputation following [extensive backlash](#).

### **Musk's 'town square' idea doesn't hold up**

Regardless of Twitter's motivations Musk has openly challenged the growing number of moderation tools employed by the platform.

He has even labeled Twitter a "de facto public square." This statement appears naïve at best. As communications scholar and Microsoft researcher [Tarleton Gillespie](#) argues, the notion that social media platforms can operate as truly open spaces is fantasy, given how platforms must moderate content while also disavowing this process.

Gillespie goes on to suggest platforms are obliged to moderate, to protect users from their antagonists, to remove offensive, vile, or illegal content and to ensure they can present their best face to new users, advertisers, partners, and the public more generally. He [says](#) the critical challenge then "is exactly when, how, and why to intervene."

Platforms such as Twitter can't represent "town squares"—especially as, in Twitter's case, only a small proportion of the town is using the service.

Public squares are [implicitly](#) and explicitly regulated through social behaviors associated with [relations](#)

[in public](#), backed by the capacity to defer to an authority to restore public order should disorder arise. In the case of a private business, which Twitter now is, the final say will largely default to Musk.

Even if Musk were to implement his own town square ideal, it would presumably be a particularly free-wheeling version.

Providing users with more leeway in what they can say might contribute to increased polarity and further coarsen discourse on the [platform](#). But this would again discourage advertisers—which would be an issue under Twitter's current economic model (wherein [90% of revenue comes from advertising](#)).

### **Free speech (but for all?)**

Twitter is considerably [smaller than other](#) major social media networks. However, research has found it does have a disproportionate influence as tweets can proliferate with [speed and virality](#), [spilling over to traditional media](#).

The viewpoints users are exposed to are determined by algorithms geared towards maximizing exposure and clicks, rather than enriching users' lives with thoughtful or interesting points of view.

Musk has suggested he may make Twitter's algorithms open source. This would be a welcome increase in transparency. But once Twitter becomes a [private company](#), how transparent it is about operations will largely be up to Musk's sole discretion.

Ironically, [Musk has accused Meta](#) (previously Facebook) CEO Mark Zuckerberg of having too much control over public debate.

Yet Musk himself has a history of trying [to stifle his critics' points of view](#). There's little to suggest his actions are truly to create an open and inclusive town square through Twitter—and less yet to suggest it will be in the [public interest](#).

This article is republished from [The Conversation](#) under a Creative Commons license. Read the

[original article.](#)

Provided by The Conversation

APA citation: What will Elon Musk's ownership of Twitter mean for 'free speech' on the platform? (2022, April 27) retrieved 19 August 2022 from <https://techxplore.com/news/2022-04-elon-musk-ownership-twitter-free.html>

*This document is subject to copyright. Apart from any fair dealing for the purpose of private study or research, no part may be reproduced without the written permission. The content is provided for information purposes only.*