

## Deplatforming and Section 230

**Roman Mars** [00:00:00] I know there's a lot of things going on in the world, but because Trump is not in office, I actually don't have a good idea of what we're going to talk about today. So please tell me what we're going to talk about.

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:00:09] Well, we are actually going to talk a bit more about Trump because his shadow seems to linger here. But I thought you and I would talk about that subject of deplatforming.

**Roman Mars** [00:00:20] Oh, okay. Well, that's interesting.

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:00:22] All right. So, on Tuesday, February 9th, Trump's second impeachment trial began. The Senate first decided in a 56 to 44 vote that a former president can, in fact, stand trial for impeachment even after having left office. And that trial moved very quickly. House impeachment managers, who serve as the prosecution team, showed us some dramatic images and videos of what happened on January 6th, when Trump supporters attacked the Capitol and delayed Congress's certification of the election. Remember, there was just one single charge or article of impeachment against Trump, and that was for inciting an insurrection. Representative Jamie Raskin was the lead manager. And in his closing argument, he said...

**Jamie Raskin** [00:01:10] It's now clear beyond doubt that Trump supported the actions of the mob, and so he must be convicted. It's that simple.

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:01:17] He was not. The trial ended on Saturday, February 13th. Now, a majority of the Senate did vote to convict Trump, including seven Republican senators. But the 57 to 43 vote fell short of what the Constitution requires, and that's a two thirds majority.

**Patrick Leahy** [00:01:35] The yeas are 57, the nays are 43. Two thirds of the senators present not having voted guilty, the Senate and judges that responded, Donald John Trump, former president of United States, is not guilty as charged in the article of impeachment.

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:01:55] Now, Trump was acquitted of that single charge of inciting the Capitol attack on January 6th, and because of the acquittal, the Senate never held a vote on disqualifying Trump from office. So, he's free to run for president in 2024. Trump's the first president to be impeached twice and the first to be tried after leaving office. And for that, he makes history. But I'd like us to return to the riot at the Capitol just one more time for a different perspective to look at the link between what happened in Washington and what happened online. So, you ready?

**Roman Mars** [00:02:29] I'm ready. Let's do it.

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:02:30] So remember that many of the rioters came directly from President Trump's Save America rally that began that morning on the Ellipse--that's the park near the White House. And Trump had addressed the crowd with some fiery language, but it was elsewhere that really mattered. For weeks and really for months, Trump had been on social media--especially on Twitter and Facebook--with false claims that there had been election fraud and that he, not Biden, had won the election. And if you look back now, you can see pretty clearly how much social media was tangled up in the

events of January 6th. So first, barriers around the Capitol were breached by his supporters around 1:00 that day. And about an hour later, rioters broke into the building, and some of them started scaling the walls of the Capitol, too. And about 20 minutes after that, both the House and the Senate adjourned and started to evacuate because of the violence. And right around that time, Trump tweets and posts, "Mike Pence didn't have the courage to do what should have been done to protect our country and our Constitution, giving states a chance to certify a corrected set of facts, not the fraudulent or inaccurate ones which they were asked to previously certify. USA demands the truth." Now, less than an hour, Trump tweeted and posted again, but he didn't condemn the violence. And at 4:17, Trump released a video that was posted on Twitter, Facebook, and YouTube. He tells the rioters that he loves them. You remember that?

**Roman Mars** [00:04:02] Yeah, I do.

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:04:02] He urges them to go home. But he also continues to claim that the election was stolen and that he understands how the rioters feel. And at 6:00 that night, he tweets and posts that his supporters should remember this day forever. An hour later, Facebook removes Trump's posts--the things that he just said. They make a statement that these posts contribute to rather than diminish the risk of ongoing violence. And just minutes later, Twitter also removes Trump's tweets and shuts down his account for 12 hours. And it wasn't until 8:00 that night that Congress eventually reconvenes to count the Electoral College votes--it's still January 6th--and eventually they certify that Biden has won the 2020 election. Now, the next day--Thursday--Facebook announces that it will ban Trump indefinitely. Mark Zuckerberg, Facebook CEO, said that Trump's posts would provoke further violence.

**Newscaster** [00:04:59] According to Mark Zuckerberg in a statement, he said, "The shocking events of the last 24 hours clearly demonstrate that President Donald Trump intends to use his remaining time in office to undermine the peaceful and lawful transition of power to his elected successor, Joe Biden."

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:05:15] So he still has Twitter. So, on Friday morning, Trump tweets that he's not going to be going to Biden's inauguration. And that prompts Twitter to permanently suspend him from their website for what they say is "incitement of violence." Now, by the weekend, Trump's accounts are suspended not just on Facebook and Twitter, but on YouTube, Instagram, Snapchat, Twitch, and TikTok. So, Trump had been "deplatformed." So, you might have heard of that term. It means being removed from social media sites. And Trump was especially good during the presidency at using his online platforms. It's sort of hard to think about Trump without thinking of the powerful social media presence he had. In fact, that's kind of what prompted our conversations here, right?

**Roman Mars** [00:06:00] Totally.

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:06:00] Yeah. And so even though Trump was acquitted by the Senate, again, he's going to face another court of sorts and probably make history with that, too. That's the Facebook Oversight Board, also known as the Facebook Supreme Court.

**Roman Mars** [00:06:16] Oh, I didn't know that. This is What Trump Can Teach Us About Con Law, an ongoing series where we take the current events surrounding the former president and use them to examine our Constitution like we never have before. Our music is from Doomtree Records. Our professor and neighbor is Elizabeth Joh. And I'm your fellow remote learning student and host, Roman Mars. I mean, I think after being in school

with you for four years, I know the answer to this. But is there any credence to the idea that deplatforming for these private companies is a First Amendment issue at all?

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:07:23] The short answer is no. Now the Constitution's First Amendment stops the government from restricting or punishing your speech. And we have a pretty robust set of free speech protections because of the First Amendment. But the Supreme Court draws the line at government action. Now, social media websites aren't subject to First Amendment restrictions because they're private companies, as you point out. And a private entity doesn't have to give you a place to speak. If a social media website decides to ban you from their services, that's just not a First Amendment issue. Don't forget, these private companies have their own First Amendment rights. They enjoy First Amendment protections from the government, just like you and I do. That's why, for example, the government couldn't force Facebook to post material that it doesn't want to. That would be unconstitutional compelled speech, presumably.

**Roman Mars** [00:08:14] That's right. That makes sense to me.

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:08:15] Yeah. So, the same is true for any possible argument you also hear, which is kind of related to this topic, and that's whether social media websites are required to give people fair treatment under the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment. I think you can guess at the answer at this. No. No.

**Roman Mars** [00:08:32] No.

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:08:34] The same problem as we see with the First Amendment. The Equal Protection Clause does limit the government's ability to make discriminations based on categories like race or gender. But it's the same issue. Equal protection applies to government action. These just aren't restrictions that apply to private companies or private people. But all of this confusion is perfectly understandable because people today don't go to some physical public square usually to make their voices heard as much as they go online, right?

**Roman Mars** [00:09:05] Yeah. Yeah.

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:09:05] So all of these places like Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram--they feel like public squares where people debate, make speeches, tell us what they think and what they want you to think. And that's kind of the problem; it feels like a public square, but in general, these websites aren't.

**Roman Mars** [00:09:24] I mean, the other thing that people bring up besides First Amendment arguments when it comes to deplatforming is this issue of Section 230. I kind of understand, but I don't know how it relates to deplatforming and what it really means. It's really about a protection that says these platforms aren't responsible for the content that's put on them by other people. But I don't understand why the different constituencies want or don't want this thing to happen or not happen.

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:09:51] Yeah, it's a total confusing mess if you just pay attention online. If you listen to what lawmakers and politicians say, it certainly sounds like Section 230 might prevent what's happening.

**Politician** [00:10:02] And what needs to happen is we need to subpoena Jack Dorsey. We need to subpoena Mark Zuckerberg. We also, Tucker, need to pass legislation right now that would change that Section 230...

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:10:14] It's not quite right. So why don't we start with some basics? In 1996, Congress added a new provision called Section 230 to the Communications Decency Act of 1934. Remember, in 1996--this is the dawn of the Internet as we know it now--Congress is trying to figure out how to handle online content. So that means when someone posts something offensive or objectionable online, who's supposed to be responsible for that? And how should the government regulate that? It's not really clear what the best response is. Now let's think about life outside of the internet. If a traditional newspaper like The Washington Post or The New York Times publishes a column that makes a false claim--say that someone has committed a crime, but they actually didn't--then that newspaper can be liable for a defamation claim. And you and I have talked about defamation before. And a newspaper or any place that publishes its own content presumably has the ability to review the dozens of columns or newspaper stories they publish every day. But if you're on Twitter or Facebook--or back in the day, AOL or Myspace--and you were held to this standard, you couldn't exist. A website can't scroll through a million comments every single day. It's just impossible. So instead, Section 230 is probably one of the most significant pieces of federal internet law that Congress ever created. So, the important part of the law says that "No provider or user of an interactive computer service shall be treated as the publisher or speaker of any information provided by another information content provider."

**Roman Mars** [00:11:55] Clear as day.

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:11:59] Clear as day.

**Roman Mars** [00:11:59] I think I do kind of get it. Who are the different content providers in the various clauses of this phrase?

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:12:07] Yeah, not the clearest piece of language. But basically Section 230 means that websites are generally not going to be legally responsible for what users post on these websites. There are some really important exceptions to this, like federal criminal law and intellectual property laws. But it's a major source of what we call "legal immunity" or "legal protection" for these websites. So let me give you an example. It means that if I post something on Facebook that's defamatory--like I say something defamatory about you--that means that Facebook isn't responsible legally for the post that I put up. I'm the user who posted it, and I might be legally responsible. But not Facebook--they don't face the same consequences. Now there's another portion of 230 that also gives these websites legal immunity or protection when they moderate content. So, here's the language: "No provider or user of an interactive computer service shall be held liable on account of any action voluntarily taken in good faith to restrict access to or availability of material that the provider or user considers to be obscene, lewd, lascivious, filthy, excessively violent, harassing, or otherwise objectionable, whether or not such material is constitutionally protected." Now, what does that mean? Now it means that a website can delete your post, take it down, or ban you if you've posted something that they find objectionable--and you can't sue them for it. So, you can think of both of these pieces of Section 230 as making the internet that we live with today possible. It allows websites to keep stuff up and to take stuff down without having to be worried that they're going to be sued every single time they do that. So, Section 230 is a really big deal for the internet. The internet that we live with today probably wouldn't exist without it, because this is not a

rule that's just for big tech. It applies to any what the law calls "interactive computer service." So that means even if I run a blog that only ten people read or I run a message board about Star Wars or cats or cooking or whatever--Section 230 protects all of these, too. So, for example, if somebody posts something defamatory in the comments section, I didn't produce that, and I won't be liable for it. So, it really does make the internet possible. You know, if that website had to worry every single time about all of these things, then these websites probably--or at least in the form that we know them--wouldn't exist at all. None of that would exist, right?

**Roman Mars** [00:14:39] You can think of those two ideas as being responsible for trillions and trillions of dollars of capital creation because those companies wouldn't exist at all. And if they did, they'd be tiny compared to what they are today. They couldn't be as open as they are. It's not that I love the world that Facebook has created for us, but it is kind of stunning what Section 230 allowed for the creation of.

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:15:04] Yeah, and that's exactly right. This is sort of what Congress was thinking about in the 1990s, right? There's this new thing called the internet. "You know, maybe it's going to work out. Who knows?" And the idea is to give these new-fangled websites the freedom to allow all kinds of content and to give the websites incentives because it's about taking things down and leaving things up to moderate content on their own without worrying too much about legal responsibility. So that's the law. So why don't we talk about politics for a moment? So, Roman, what's your impression of how politicians talk about 230--Section 230?

**Roman Mars** [00:15:36] Well, when 230 is brought to my attention these days, it seems to be from conservative politicians having the opinion that these platforms are discriminatory against conservative viewpoints. And therefore, they want to take away Section 230 so that they can no longer discriminate against conservative viewpoints. And it seems to me laughable. But, you know, please tell me more.

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:16:03] It is pretty nonsensical. It's kind of a weird argument. So, for instance, Senator Ted Cruz said in a hearing last fall to Twitter CEO Jack Dorsey, "Who the hell elected you and put you in charge of what the media are allowed to report and what the American people are allowed to hear?" You know, Trump multiple times while president said things like, "Repeal Section 230." You know, others have complained that these social media companies are biased usually against conservative voices, and therefore, "You should get rid of Section 230." None of this would be accomplished by getting rid of Section 230. If Section 230 didn't exist, these social media websites probably wouldn't exist this way in the way they do right now at all. All of this is terribly confusing because you hear these words like "censorship," "free speech," "these are free speech problems," "it sounds like discrimination against political conservatives," and it does remind us of the enormous influence that these companies have. But mostly it makes for just good political theater, and it gives people a quick phrase they can remember. "Get rid of Section 230." It gets them to be mad about it but not really giving us any sense of what the law is actually about.

**Roman Mars** [00:17:17] Yeah, I mean, presumably if Twitter or Facebook were actually responsible for the things that Trump said, if there was no Section 230, Trump would have been off that platform a way long time ago.

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:17:29] Long ago. So, then there's another problem, right? So, Roman, from your perspective, what's the biggest issue in social media today?

**Roman Mars** [00:17:40] Well, I would say that it's because you can slice and dice the audience, you can feed them more and more inflammatory information to sort of cut them off from any type of mass understanding of actual facts.

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:17:54] Exactly. There are the lies. There are conspiracy theories. There are calls for violence that don't quite meet the test of criminal incitement, but they're pretty dangerous. There are leaders of all kinds, elected or not, that use their positions on these platforms to mislead, distort the truth, or just plain out lie. A company like Facebook would use employees, or they employ people they call "content moderators," to review posts that either have been flagged by other users or Facebook's AI--artificial intelligence--for violating their policies. So, there are human beings making decisions about whether a post stays up or has to be taken down. But the more aggressively the tech companies do this, then they also face calls that they're engaged in censorship. And that kind of sounds like a free speech issue, but it kind of isn't. So still, it's a huge problem. So, what do we do? These huge tech companies have enormous power in our lives, and they're now getting attacked from the political right and the left as well.

**Roman Mars** [00:18:57] So given they are private companies and given that Section 230 is one of the reasons why any of these companies exist, and so therefore is probably not going to go anywhere unless it destroys the companies, what are some of the tools that are available for making social media more a responsible place?

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:19:12] Well, one solution for an extreme case is deplatforming, right? You completely lose your ability to post content as a user. Now, do you remember, Roman, what it was like when Trump was deplatformed basically everywhere within days of the insurrection?

**Roman Mars** [00:19:27] Yeah, I remember it was peaceful.

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:19:31] It was peaceful. He was effectively silenced.

**Roman Mars** [00:19:34] It was pretty stunning. Like, it was pretty stunning to know that it really took, you know, five large tech companies to quell all of this foment. You know, it was pretty amazing how effective it was, actually.

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:19:52] It was astonishing how big of an impact it had on everyone's perceptions. And that decision to permanently remove the ability of the then sitting president to post content online is a really big deal. It doesn't matter what you think of Trump, the president. It actually doesn't, I don't think, matter what you think of Trump's statements leading up to and around the Capitol attack. It's really about the power of these websites. They're not considered by our laws or our courts to be actual public squares, but they more or less behave like public squares. It's just that private companies happen to own them. And when Twitter, Facebook, and these other companies effectively silence a sitting president, it seems like an idea that not everybody feels comfortable with. You know, sure, of course, he had access to cable news, and he could give interviews to newspapers. But social media was Trump's favorite mode of communication to the public. So, the question is: Was that the right thing to do, how do you make that decision, and who should make that decision?

**Roman Mars** [00:20:57] Yes. But we can continue talking about it.

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:21:03] And Facebook's solution has been to create a kind of Facebook Supreme Court. It's called the Facebook Oversight Board. The board is independently financed and is supposed to make decisions independently.

**Roman Mars** [00:21:18] So how does the Facebook Supreme Court work?

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:21:20] All right. So, the Oversight Board now has 20 members and eventually there are supposed to be 40. And board members come from all around the world just because Facebook is a global company. And the board members that are there now are people like lawyers, writers, politicians, human rights activists, and academics. And right now, any Facebook or Instagram user--or Facebook itself--can ask the board to take up a case. And the kinds of cases that you can ask to be reviewed by the board are ones where Facebook has taken down your content. In the future, the board might be able to consider other kinds of cases, like where someone is upset that content exists on Facebook and you want Facebook to take it down. But that's not yet something the board can review. And then there are some other issues like how the company uses algorithms or maybe how it makes decisions about advertising. But the board can't consider those either. So, if this were a real court--a federal court--we might say that the board has fairly limited jurisdiction. You can only look at certain kinds of cases.

**Roman Mars** [00:22:20] And they have a pretty limited concept of who has standing inside of their purview.

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:22:24] So presumably, yes. That's fair. It's for people who are injured by having their own content taken down.

**Roman Mars** [00:22:30] Yeah. Exactly.

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:22:31] Just like the US Supreme Court, the Facebook Oversight Board doesn't have to take every single case it's asked to. It has the discretion to choose so they can be choosy about what they want to hear. Now, when the board does choose, it's a pretty big group of people, right? They're supposed to be a random assignment of four members, plus one member from the region where the case arises because, again, it can come from anywhere in the world. And the composition of any one panel is anonymous. So that's unlike the way the actual United States Supreme Court works. Both the user who is complaining about this case and a Facebook representative have the opportunity to file written briefs. So, in this sense, it sort of feels like an adversarial system, like the normal legal system we know. But there's no oral argument or anything like that. The panel--the Facebook court--can ask for outside expert opinions, or it can even ask for research while it makes its decision. And so, in that sense, it's very unlike our United States Supreme Court, which never does anything like this at all. So, when the panel actually reaches a decision, it has a rationale, which is very law-like, right? It doesn't just say, "Here's the result." They explain how they came to the decision. And in fact, the opinion might offer whether there were dissenting views because there would be five people made up this decision. It doesn't yet seem to have a role for a separate dissenting opinion, but it does note dissenting views. Then there's another internal process where once the panel has made a decision in a particular case, the entire board--a majority of them--has to approve that panel decision. But here's the interesting part. Yeah, here's the important part. Facebook has said that it considers the board's decision binding.

**Roman Mars** [00:24:13] Hmm.

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:24:13] But there's another way in which the Facebook Supreme Court--as I'm calling them--is not like the United States Supreme Court because when the United States Supreme Court decides a case, there's an actual dispute between two parties that they have to resolve. But whatever the decision that the United States Supreme Court makes--whatever they do--that's binding. It's the law for everyone. That's not the case with the Facebook Oversight Board. Their decisions don't become broad Facebook policy at all. It just decides that particular case.

**Roman Mars** [00:24:42] Wow. So, it's like a Supreme Court case that sets no precedent. It applies nothing to any other case. It's specific to just that.

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:24:51] Well, it appears not to make the law of the land in the same way that the United States Supreme Court does.

**Roman Mars** [00:25:00] So does Trump have a case in front of the Facebook Supreme Court? And what is that about? How is it going?

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:25:05] Yes, actually, it does. Now, the Facebook Oversight Board just started working at the end of last year. But already they have what might be their most consequential case ever. On January 21st, Facebook itself asked the board to consider Trump's indefinite suspension. And the board agreed to take up the case. Or if it were the Supreme Court, we'd say they granted cert. Now, Facebook asked the board to consider two questions. One, was the decision to indefinitely suspend Trump correct? And second, whether the board had policy recommendations for the company about what to do when it comes to suspending any political leader. Now, in any case that the Facebook board takes up, they can accept public comments. In the Trump case, the board received more than 9,000 comments. And some of these were written by lawyers and public interest folks, and they had the feel of kind of amicus or friend of the court briefs. They were kind of weighing in in a lawyerly way about what they think should happen. So that feels a little bit like, you know, a real, actual, live appellate court or a Supreme Court case where parties that aren't part of the case weigh in because they think that the issue is so important. And it also appears that Trump--or probably Trump's lawyers--have weighed in, too because Facebook confirmed that a user statement has been received in the case regarding President Trump. So, I assume the user statement refers to President Trump--or former president Trump.

**Roman Mars** [00:26:36] Wow.

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:26:37] Now, remember, again, according to the Oversight Board's charter--because they have a charter--Facebook's bound by whatever decision it makes, whether they tell Facebook that Trump has to stay suspended, or they tell them you have to give him his account back. And the board's also being asked to make policy recommendations, which is very much not like the way we think of regular courts. The United States Supreme Court actually isn't allowed to just give advice in general. They can only decide actual cases. So, this private Supreme Court from Facebook has until April, under the terms of their charter, to make a decision about Trump.

**Roman Mars** [00:27:13] At that point when they're making a decision in April--or maybe they'll make it before April, but they have until April--will this decision really matter?

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:27:20] I think it's going to be really important because this is kind of a parallel legal universe for social media companies that Facebook has created. If it works,



we might see other tech companies try to do something similar. Everybody's just going to be watching to see, like with a real Supreme Court case, how the board is going to reach its decision because it's going to have a rationale in a regular legal opinion. Is it going to just focus on Trump's posts on Facebook? Or will the board consider things like what happened in the physical world? I mean, I think that it will be interesting to see how they decide whether or not someone with that large of a reach on Facebook gets their account back or not and what will be the actual reasons. But this grand experiment also might not work at all because remember--as you and I have talked about many times--with regular courts, a big part of how our system operates is that we all have a perception that the courts are independent and that they're legitimate. So, what if users, journalists, and critics of Facebook find, like, this isn't legitimate at all. Maybe this is just like a prop for Facebook. Or there might be a criticism that this Facebook Supreme Court just isn't powerful enough; they can't actually make any system wide changes, so it's kind of a pretend court. So, whatever they do--we'll have to wait and see--it's bound to make some portion of the public unhappy or angry no matter what they decide. We just don't know which.

**Roman Mars** [00:28:49] It seems like what happens, though, is you revert back to the concept of the status quo, which is the company gets to do whatever it wants to. So, like, an illegitimate court in the world--in our democracy--is a dangerous thing because then who decides what? It's all chaos. An illegitimate Facebook court is just like, "Well, then Facebook decides." And that's the way we were before.

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:29:12] Yeah. I mean, I think it's kind of a no-win situation in a way for Facebook, right? They've tried to create this entity that feels lawlike and court-like, but it doesn't quite have all of the characteristics of a real court. It's sort of halfway. So, I think it's bound to be disappointing to people one way or the other. And I guess maybe, you know, the one advantage that Facebook is trying to put out to the world is saying, "Look, this is better than our gut intuition." And maybe their response may be it's actually not that much better than your gut intuition.

**Roman Mars** [00:29:44] Right. You know what's going to happen when the subgroup of five makes a decision that the larger group of 50 or 40 does not agree with? And then how do they decide that? What happens then? They just opened the can of worms into a barrel of worms. It just seems like they've added these layers. They've set all this stuff up that they're these masters of the universe. And why don't they just decide? It seems like pageantry to me.

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:30:13] That's possible. It may end up being that way. And then maybe one legitimate critique is, you know, maybe it's suspicious or maybe it's a sign of weakness that they had to farm this out to another team instead of making the decision themselves.

**Roman Mars** [00:30:24] I don't want them to have this much power either. But if they have it, have it. Just do what you think is right, and then I can judge you on what you think is right, you know, rather than this other sort of nonsense. I don't know. It's super intriguing.

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:30:37] It is intriguing. And I think that one of the things that's happening is we also desperately want a democracy for our major institutions, even when they're not technically bound by these constitutional norms. We want them to feel as if they are almost bound by the same norms. And it kind of sounds like that's what Facebook is doing.

**Roman Mars** [00:30:55] I can see that. And that's why we have this mission creep when it comes to the First Amendment--why we think it applies to all venues, even when it is not about the government at all.

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:31:08] I mean, and of course, there'll be Trump's own reaction, which may be something like, "Well, I didn't want to be there anyway at all."

**Roman Mars** [00:31:14] Yeah. But I don't have to hear it, so it'll be fine. Thank you so much.

**Elizabeth Joh** [00:31:21] Thanks. Take care.

**Roman Mars** [00:31:30] This show is produced by Elizabeth Joh, Chris Berube, and me, Roman Mars. You can find us online at [trumpconlaw.com](http://trumpconlaw.com). All the music in Trump Con Law is provided by Doomtree Records, the Midwest Hip hop Collective. You can find out more about Doomtree Records, get merch, and learn about their monthly membership exclusives at [doomtree.net](http://doomtree.net). We are a proud member of Radiotopia from PRX, supported by listeners just like you.