

PRESS RELEASE 8/17/11

We are disappointed with the Court's decision in the backpage.com case. Our reading of the opinion indicates that the Court felt bound to follow what it saw as the Congressional expression of national policy to grant immunity to "Interactive Computer Service Providers" for postings on their websites. This immunity is set forth in the Communication Decency Act. The Court held that this immunity can only be addressed by Congress.

When the Communication Decency Act was introduced, its intent was to protect children from the abuses of the internet. In my opinion, as the Communication Decency Act passed through the legislative process, the Act transformed into the "Protect the Large Internet Corporations Act." The Congressional Immunity in the Act protects businesses that knowingly profit from criminal postings including profits for advertisements for sex with trafficked children.

We plan to continue our fight in the Courts and we ask everyone who cares about sexual trafficking of children on the Internet to write to their Senators and Congressional Representatives and tell them to change this law now. This is a movement that should be supported by all political parties and can be achieved without impairing non-criminal communications and the freedoms on the internet.

In this case we believe that, backpage.com was more than an Internet Computer Service Provider. We believe by their conduct, backpage.com was responsible, in part, for the development of the sex trafficking ads. It also profits from these ads. Hence, we urged it became an "Information Content Providers." Under the law we suggest it should be liable. We will pursue this position further.