



Are British Censors Winning?

May 21, 2026

An outfit in the United Kingdom called Ofcom, the main enforcer of the U.K.'s Online Safety Act, is requiring social platforms to implement onerous procedures to censor "hate," including stripping users of anonymity — or face mammoth fines, bans in the U.K., and other draconian penalties.

Nobody would object to compelling the removal of content that is clearly criminal. But is that what most so-called "hate" content really is? Of course not. Much of what irks censors and the merely censorious is merely vituperative, and no small part of what gets their goat is nothing other than sharp disagreement with those authorities who decide what "hate" is — that is, the censors themselves.

Last year, the social media platform X formally decried Ofcom's demands as "overreach" even as it tried to comply with the new regulations. The platform [objected](#) to U.K. mandates that would "prevent adults from encountering 'illegal' content" and impose "steps to ensure age verification that limit adults' anonymity online."

But X has now caved. It has agreed to review most content flagged as illegal "hate" within two days. All the language of that earlier remonstrance is "gone now," *Reclaim the Net* observes. What remains is only an agreement to comply with an organization and a system known to be militantly hostile to freedom of expression — and to Elon Musk's X.

What could X do instead?

Fight.

Pull out of the United Kingdom and tell UK users, "Sorry. You're just going to have to use a VPN to disguise your location in the UK if you want to keep using your X account," with links to [free VPNs](#).

This is Common Sense. I'm Paul Jacob.

[Links for further reading...](#)