R/LINUX

comments   other discussions (1)   Phreakiture (**3,508**) | | | | | **preferences** | logout

---

1869

Discussion **I pulled the actual bill text from 5 state age verification laws. They're copy-pasted from two templates. Meta is funding one to dodge ~$50B in COPPA fines — and the other one covers Linux.**

(self.linux)

submitted 8 days ago by aaronsb

> Several people asked me to do a deeper writeup after my earlier post. I went through the enrolled bill text, lobbying disclosures, and financial filings. This is the full picture.
>
> ## What's happening as best I can figure out so far
>
> Age verification bills have been introduced in 25+ US states. They look bipartisan and independent. They aren't. There are two model templates being distributed to state legislatures by outside groups, and when you compare the actual statutory language side by side, you find identical invented terminology, matching multi-clause definitions, and character-for-character duplicate passages.
>
> One template is funded by Meta. The other applies to every operating system — including Linux.

---

search

this post was submitted on 06 Mar 2026
1,869 points (99% upvoted)

shortlink: `https://redd.it/1rmhxkl`

Submit a new link

Submit a new text post

linux

join

☑ Show my flair on this subreddit. It looks like:

Phreakiture   (edit)

Please Read the full Rules here before posting or commenting

GNU/Linux is a free and open source software operating system for computers. The operating system is a collection of the basic instructions that tell the electronic parts of the computer what to do and how to work. Free, Libre and open source software (FLOSS) means that everyone has the freedom to use it, see how it works, and change it.

GNU/Linux is a collaborative effort between the GNU project, formed in 1983 to develop the GNU operating system and the development team of Linux, a kernel. Linux is also used without GNU in embedded systems, mobile phones, and more. These can include things like Android or ChromeOS. GNU itself is also used without Linux, some examples appear in projects like Debian/kFreebsd and Guix GNU/Hurd.

- What is free software? 🔗
- Basic history of GNU/Linux 🔗
- Linux announcement post from 1991
- The Linux Kernel 🔗

The two templates

Template 1: "App Store Accoun
requires app stores (Apple/Google)
ages and share age data with deve
Utah (signed), Texas (signed, block
Louisiana (signed), plus Alabama, A
Hawaii, Kansas, Kentucky, and a fe
Sponsors are mostly Republicans. F
Digital Childhood Alliance, a coalitic
groups. Meta funds it.

Template 2: "Digital Age Assura
requires operating system provider
at account setup and send age sign
API. Active in California (signed), Il
Colorado (introduced), New York (ir
Sponsors are mostly Democrats. Pu
Common Sense Media. This is the c
explicitly covers all OS providers —
distributions.

Both result in universal age verifica
infrastructure. The difference is wh

The copy-paste evidence

I pulled enrolled text from Utah SB
2420, Louisiana HB 570, California
Illinois SB 3977. Details with verba
in the comments, but here's the su

Template 1 (UT/TX/LA): All thre
invented age categories — "child" (
"younger teenager" (13-16), "older
18), "adult" (18+). These aren't ex
terms. The definitions for "app stor
change," "verifiable parental conse
device" are the same sentences be
Louisiana, with Texas as a light rep
harbor clause — developers aren't
relied on app store age data — use
language in all three.

Template 2 (CA/IL): "Operating
provider," "signal," and the core ma
are character-for-character identica
California and Illinois. IL SB 3977 is
with different dates.

Why Meta is paying for T

This is where it gets interesting. It'
engineering costs.

Under COPPA, collecting data from
without parental consent costs $53
violation — but only when a compa
knowledge" a user is under 13. Met
doesn't. But a 2023 complaint by 3
Attorneys General documented ove
reports of under-13 Instagram user
Meta closed a small fraction of thos

The math: 1.1M violations x $53,08
theoretical penalties. ACT | The Ap
trade group, estimates the realistic
~$50 billion.

For scale, Epic Games got fined $2
violations with 34.3M daily users. M
billion.

The App Store Accountability Act fi:
Meta. Under ASAA, app stores verif
a "flag" to developers. Meta respon
they don't determine age. The safe
(Utah §13-75-402): developers are
they "relied in good faith on age ca
provided by an app store provider."
knowledge" shifts to Apple/Google.
exposure gets neutralized.

ACT estimates this transfers ~$70E
costs onto every other app develop
ecosystem.

The money trail

The front group: In Feb 2025, 50
formed the Digital Childhood Allianc
ASAA. The founding member list in
Heritage Foundation, the Institute f
Studies, and the National Center or
Exploitation (formerly Morality in M
DCA's board chair, Dawn Hawkins,
NCOSE. The DCA is registered as a
structure that is not required to dis
During a Louisiana Senate hearing,
asked executive director Casey Ste
funds them. She confirmed tech co
but refused to name them. Bloomb
through three sources: Meta is one
funders.

Linux on Mobile:
- Android
    - Termux
- Jolla (SailfishOS)
- PostmarketOS
- Replicant🔗
- ZeroPhone

Movements:
- Free Culture
- Free Software
- Hack Bloc

Desktop Environments:
- Budgie
- Cinnamon
- Enlightenment / e17
- GNOME
- KDE
- LXDE / LXQt
- XFCE

Window Managers:
- awesomewm
- Openbox
- xmonad
- i3

Fluff
- LinuxMemes
- UnixPorn
- UsabilityPorn
- WildLinuxAppears

Learning/resources
- CommandLine
- Linuxadmin
- LinuxDev
- Linux From Scratch
- Linux Projects
- Software Freedom Law Center🔗
- Raspberry Pi Forums🔗
- OSdev

Creativity:
- Blender
- FOSSPhotography
- FreeCAD
- GIMP Chat🔗
- Krita Forums🔗/Chat🔗
- LibreDesign
- LibreOffice
- LibreStudio
- LinuxAudio
- LinuxFilmMaking

Help
- /r/linuxquestions
- /r/bash with [HELP] tag

Webcasts:
- Level 1 Techs🔗
- The Lunduke Hour🔗
- Linux Unplugged (formerly Linux Action Show)
- Bad Voltage🔗
- Hacker Public Radio🔗

The lobbying numbers:

- $26.2M federal lobbying in 20
  record, more than Snapchat,
  Microsoft, and Nvidia combine
- $5.84M in Q3 2025 alone on
  safety/privacy bills
- $199.3M cumulative since 20
  quarterly filings
- 86 lobbyists on payroll (up fr
  firms in 45 of 50 states
- 12 lobbyists in Louisiana, 13
  Ohio — all states with ASAA b
- Meta lobbied in support of the
  Louisiana laws
- Meta lobbied **against** KOSA a
  CSAM Act — bills that put res
  platforms

Named lobbyists from Q3 filings: Jo
and Christopher Herndon (both for
Counsel, Senate Commerce Commi
Kaur Gill (former Senior Counsel, S
Judiciary). 40+ external firms retai

A federal ASAA was introduced by
(R-UT) and Rep. John James (R-MI

Why Linux users should

California AB 1043 and Illinois SB 3
"operating system provider" as "a
that develops, licenses, or controls
system software on a computer, m
any other general purpose computi
covers Canonical, Red Hat, the Linu
Valve (SteamOS), and arguably an
a Linux ISO.

These bills require OS providers to
account setup and provide age sign
applications via API. For Linux, that
someone has to build age verificati
account creation flow — and expos
apps can query for the user's age b

The Texas version was already bloc
court on First Amendment grounds
2025 "The Year States Chose Surve
Safety." But California's law is alre
takes effect in 2027.

TL;DR

- FaiFCast🔗

Other operating systems:

- AROS🔗
- BSD
- FreeBSD
- Genode🔗
- Haiku
- HelenOS🔗
- HURD
- Minix
- Plan 9

Rules

Please review full details on rules here.. All
rules will be applied regardless of the number
upvotes a post/comment has.

- **No support requests** - This is not a
  support forum! Head to
  /r/linuxquestions or /r/linux4noobs for
  support or help. Looking for a distro?
  Try r/findmeadistro.
- **No spamblog submissions** - Posts
  should be submitted using the original
  source with the original title. Posts that
  are identified as either blog-spam, a
  link aggregator, or an otherwise low-
  effort website are to be removed.
  Some reasons for removal are that
  they contain re-hosted content, usually
  paired with privacy-invading ads. If
  there's another discussion on the
  topic, the link is welcome to be
  submitted as a top level comment to
  aid the previous discussion. Please
  see: r/linux/wiki/rules/banneddomains
- **No memes, image macros, rage
  comics, overdone jokes** - Meme
  posts of any kind are not allowed in
  r/linux. Feel free to post over at
  /r/linuxmemes instead. This rule can
  also apply to comments, including
  overdone jokes, comment-chain jokes,
  or other redditisms that are popular
  elsewhere.
- **Reddiquette, trolling, or poor
  discussion** - r/linux asks all users
  follow Reddiquette. Reddiquette is ever
  changing, so a revisit once in awhile is
  recommended. Top violations of this
  rule are trolling, starting a flamewar,
  or not "Remembering the human" aka
  being hostile or incredibly impolite.
  Additionally, sexism/racism/other isms
  are not allowed. See also:
  /r/linux/wiki/rules/userconduct
- **Relevance to r/linux community /
  Promoting closed source
  applications over FOSS** - Posts
  should follow what the community
  likes: GNU, Linux kernel, developers of
  open source software, or other
  applications on Linux. Take some time

Two model bills are being distribute
legislatures. One (App Store Accou
shifts age verification from Meta to
neutralizing Meta's ~$50B COPPA e
funds the coalition distributing it, s
$26.2M lobbying in 2025, and has I
states. The other (Digital Age Assu
requires all OS providers — includir
build age verification into account s
text across states contains identica
terminology and copy-pasted passa
and verbatim bill quotes in commer

Detailed evidence with verbatim bil
comparisons, lobbying filings, and a
sources in the comment chain belo

239 comments share save hide report cros

to get the feel of the subreddit if
you're not sure!

- **Spamming self-promotion,
  surveys, crowdfunding** - Submitting
  your own original content is welcome
  on r/linux, but we do ask that you
  contribute more than just your own
  content to the subreddit as well as
  require you to interact with the
  comments of your submission. We set
  that no more than 10% of your posts
  should be your content. Please be
  aware that this does not supersede
  other rules. Additionally, surveys for
  your blog/news source/paper/own use
  are not allowed. Please see
  /r/linux/wiki/rules/crowdfunding for
  those crowdfunding..

- **No misdirecting links, sites that
  require a login, or URL shorteners**
  - In short: if your link doesn't go right
  to the content it will be removed. Sites
  that require a login to view the content
  are not allowed in r/linux. Example: A
  private Facebook post or a news
  organization that doesn't have free
  article views. URL shorteners and links
  that misdirect users to ads/jokes are
  also banned. See a list here, although
  the mods will make a decision on a per
  domain basis as needed:
  /r/linux/wiki/rules/banneddomains

- **No NSFW** - No NSFW links or images
  without mod approval. No discussion
  that is overly-suggestive to what is
  normally considered NSFW.

- **Non-useful Image Upload/Fluff
  Image** - Images of "Linux in the wild",
  plushies, Tux, and more are not
  encouraged for posting as a top level
  submission. If necessary, this can
  apply to comments too at mod
  discretion. The image/video upload
  feature is for posts regarding
  features/guides/etc. See also: Meme
  rule.

See even more subreddit and external links
over at the supplemental page

This subreddit is fan ran and not affiliated
with any organization.

MODERATORS

MESSAGE THE MODS

Kruug
iamedwards
jampola
MarlinMr
AutoModerator
MAGIC_EYE_BOT

BotDefense

ouyawei   Mate

purpleidea   mgmt config Founder

Skip_Tracing

…and 1 more »

RECENTLY VIEWED LINKS

Discussion Follow-up to my bill text comparison: I traced who wrote the OS-level age verification template that covers Linux. Meta, Google, and Snap all supported it.

379 points | 37 comments

Discussion I pulled the actual bill text from 5 state age verification laws. They're copy-pasted from two templates. Meta is funding one to dodge ~$50B in COPPA fines — and the other one covers Linux.

1862 points | 239 comments

Awesome 💥 ‼ The best and creepiest robot I've ever seen.

2488 points | 244 comments

Event I traced $2 billion in nonprofit grants and 45 states of lobbying records to figure out who's behind the age verification bills. The answer involves a company that profits from your data writing laws that collect more of it.

11.8k points | 477 comments

clear

account activity

top 200 comments show all 239

sorted by: **top**

save

content policy   formatting help

[−] **capinredbeard22** 190 points 8 days ago

This is how laws are being written these days. Special interest groups provide the same text to various / all states. No need for representatives to think or write on their own.

permalink embed save report reply

> [−] **HeadPristine1404** 60 points 7 days ago
>
> This has been going on for decades. Lobbyists provide what they call "example language" to lawmakers. A lot of times this example language makes it verbatim into the final law.
>
> permalink embed save parent report reply
>
> > [−] **littlebobbytables9** 32 points 7 days ago
> >
> > Which is not in the abstract a bad thing. It's actually very helpful when there's uniformity across states. The issue here is that it's a stupid law lol
> >
> > permalink embed save parent report reply

> [−] **mosy48** 9 points 7 days ago
>
> This is pretty much how all laws get written unfortunately. The key is to hit the ground w/ broad contextual education before a bad idea gets viral.
>
> permalink embed save parent report reply

> [−] **northrupthebandgeek**   3 points 5 days ago
>
> > No need for representatives to think or write on their own.
>
> Makes me wonder why we need representatives at all.
>
> permalink embed save parent report reply
>
> > [−] **capinredbeard22** 3 points 5 days ago
> >
> > We need them to take money from lobbyists, bribes, and corporations and … wait a second
> >
> > permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **aaronsb** [S] 159 points 8 days ago

The Money: Meta's COPPA Exposure, Lobbying Operation, and the DCA

The $50B problem

Under COPPA, collecting data from kids under 13 without parental consent costs $53,088 per violation. The trigger: "actual knowledge" that a user is under 13. Meta claims it doesn't have actual knowledge — its terms say you must be 13+.

A 2023 complaint by 33 state Attorneys General documented over 1.1 million reports of under-1 Instagram users since 2019. Meta closed a small fraction. Surveys estimate 8% of 8-to-12-year-olds use Facebook and 10% use Instagram.

The math: 1.1M x $53,088 = ~$58B theoretical max. For scale, Epic Games got $275M for COPF violations with 34.3M daily users. Meta had 2.96 billion. ACT | The App Association estimates Meta's realistic exposure at ~$50B.

Meta can't easily purge these users — identifying and removing under-13 accounts would itself constitute "actual knowledge," triggering the liability they're trying to avoid.

The App Store Accountability Act solves this. App stores verify age, send a flag. Meta responds t the flag. The safe harbor says developers aren't liable if they relied on app store data in good faith. Meta's "actual knowledge" shifts to Apple/Google. ACT estimates this transfers ~$70B in compliance costs onto every other developer.

The lobbying numbers

From federal filings and reporting:

- **$26.2M** federal lobbying in 2025 (OpenSecrets) — all-time record
- **$5.84M** in Q3 2025 alone on child safety/privacy (Legis1)
- **$199.3M** cumulative since 2009, 63 quarterly filings
- **86 lobbyists** on payroll, up from 65 in 2024 (Dome Politics)
- Lobbying firms in **45 of 50 states**
- 12 lobbyists in Louisiana, 13 in Texas, 14 in Ohio, 4 in Alabama
- Meta lobbied in support of Utah and Louisiana app store laws
- Meta lobbied **against** KOSA (S.1748) and STOP CSAM Act (S.1829) — bills that put responsibility on platforms
- Named lobbyists: John Branscome and Christopher Herndon (both former Chief Counsel, Senate Commerce), Sonia Kaur Gill (former Senior Counsel, Senate Judiciary)
- 40+ external lobbying firms retained
- Federal ASAA introduced by Sen. Mike Lee (R-UT) and Rep. John James (R-MI)

Pattern: Meta supports bills shifting responsibility to app stores. Meta opposes bills putting responsibility on platforms.

The Digital Childhood Alliance

The DCA was formed in Feb 2025 and now claims 140+ member organizations. It's registered as **501(c)(4)** — a "social welfare" entity that can lobby for specific legislation and is **not required to disclose donors**.

Leadership: - **Casey Stefanski** — Executive Director. Refused to name funders under questioning by Louisiana Sen. Jay Morris (Center Square) - **Dawn Hawkins** — Board Chair. Also CEO of the National Center on Sexual Exploitation (formerly Morality in Media) - **John Read** — Senior Policy Counsel. 30 years at DOJ Antitrust Division investigating app stores and Big Tech

Notable founding members from the original press release: Heritage Foundation, Institute for Family Studies, National Center on Sexual Exploitation, Family Policy Alliance, American Principle Project, Digital Progress Institute.

The DCA also has a sister entity — the **Digital Childhood Institute** (501(c)(3), tax-deductible donations) — described as the "research and education arm." Two entities, one vision, two tax structures.

Bloomberg confirmed through three sources that Meta funds the DCA. The 501(c)(4) structure means we don't know who else is funding it or how much Meta contributes.

Court challenges and opposition

- **Texas SB 2420 blocked** — US District Court, Western District of Texas issued a preliminary injunction in Dec 2025, finding the law likely violates the First Amendment (Texas Tribune) Lawsuit filed by the Computer & Communication Industry Association
- **EFF** called 2025 "The Year States Chose Surveillance Over Safety"
- **ACLU** has flagged these bills as threats to anonymous speech
- **Chamber of Progress** formally opposed Louisiana HB 570
- **ACT | The App Association** published a detailed analysis arguing ASAA transfers $70B in costs from Meta to the rest of the ecosystem
- Age verification vendor **Yoti** ($210M raised, 1B+ checks performed) was found tracking users and sending data to ad networks — the companies that would implement these laws have their own privacy problems

permalink embed save report reply

[−] **Mcnst** 30 points 7 days ago

> Meta can't easily purge these users — identifying and removing under-13 accounts would itself constitute "actual knowledge," triggering the liability they're trying to avoid.

It's funny that the summary admits that Meta has no choice but to lobby for these laws — a 53k fine for each user is no joke — yet noone is actually interested in any solution beyond simply blaming Meta for everything.

You know what, to everyone downvoting this obvious fact, each time it's pointed out — you're part of the problem for failing to keep your politicians accountable, for passing the buck, for passing and for failing to curtail the prior ridiculous laws that made this stupid new law necessary for the business in the first place.

Maybe if we had a culture of revoking silly old laws instead of simply creating new silly ones to fix the old silly ones, this whole passing of the buck wouldn't be necessary. What other choice does Meta have? Downvote, and it doesn't matter? Then what else do you expect?

permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **Offbeatalchemy** 34 points 7 days ago

> You know what, to everyone downvoting this obvious fact, each time it's pointed out — you're part of the problem for failing to keep your politicians accountable, for passing the buck, for passing and for failing to curtail the prior ridiculous laws that made this stupid new law necessary for the business in the first place.

You're wild if you're thinking people in this subreddit about LINUX and FOSS would support politicians that would put a law like this in the first place.

We can vote, we can call politicians, and we can nag peoples ears off but at the end of the day, corporate interests have much more way than any individual citizen doe and on top of that, the average citizen/lawmaker not understanding the implication of the laws being put in place. Being placated by "it's to protect children" is clearly they need to hear and letting the smarter people figure it out.

I'm downvoting you for implying the people HERE is responsible for these draconial laws we'd kill in a second if we could. We're not passing the buck. We didn't have many options in the first place.

permalink embed save parent report reply

> [−] **Mcnst** 3 points 7 days ago
>
> Which corporate interest was responsible for passing the laws with the 53k fines per each user that Meta now needs to deal with?
>
> permalink embed save parent report reply
>
> > [−] **Charming_Mark7066** 6 points 7 days ago
> >
> > competitors with proper AV solutions or those corpos that actually own them.
> >
> > permalink embed save parent report reply
> >
> > > [−] **inspectoroverthemine** 4 points 7 days ago
> > >
> > > Really? Which ones? The congressmen who voted for it are public record as are their 'donors'. Should be easy enough to match the companies who benefit with the donor list.
> > >
> > > permalink embed save parent report reply
> >
> > > [−] **VelvetElvis**   2 points 5 days ago
> > >
> > > In 1998? Probably the telecoms. AT&T/AOL/Time Warner.
> > >
> > > permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **KaosC57** 11 points 6 days ago

How is it legal for someone to dodge one law, by making a new law that doesn't modify the old one? Shouldn't that by definition be like, not legal?

Why is Meta being allowed to push the government around into making a new law to dodge a fine that they should 100% have to eat, and then go out of business from.

permalink embed save parent report reply

load more comments (4 replies)

[−] **thephotoman** 5 points 5 days ago

The Child Online Privacy Protection Act isn't silly. Meta is just uninterested in following that law and looking to foist its requirements on everybody else. They don't really care about what they break.

Meta should be making it harder for people to create accounts. But that would mean that Mark Zuckerberg can't get such ready access to our sweet, sweet data.

permalink embed save parent report reply

load more comments (5 replies)

[–] **Dr_Hexagon** 4 points 7 days ago

If you are correct then I'd expect zero enforcement of this for Linux devs. It's just not the aim of the law.

permalink embed save parent report reply

[–] **themirrazzunhacked** 3 points 7 days ago

> Age verification vendor **Yoti** ($210M raised, 1B+ checks performed) was found tracking users and sending data to ad networks

Do you have any sources for this? I couldn't find any links to it on the Wikiepdia page.

permalink embed save parent report reply

> [–] **aaronsb** [S] 14 points 7 days ago
>
> I should have linked the actual source instead of the Wikipedia page. The finding comes from a security investigation by Mint Secure, a German security research firm. They analyzed the Yoti Android app and found it was transmitting the Google Advertising ID, a unique device UUID, hardware fingerprint data, and other device identifiers to Adjust (an ad measurement and attribution platform) without user consent at app launch. Their website also loads Google Tag Manager and transmits IP addresses to third parties before any consent interaction. The researchers flagged both as likely GDPR violations.
>
> They also found a supply chain issue where Algorath, a subcontractor training Yoti's AI models, had improperly secured endpoints on Google Cloud that could allow unauthorized access to model training data.
>
> Source: https://mint-secure.de/dataprotection-it-security-risks-with-ageverificationapp-yoti/
>
> permalink embed save parent report reply
>
> > [–] **themirrazzunhacked** 2 points 7 days ago
> >
> > Thanks!
> >
> > permalink embed save parent report reply

[–] **sanjosanjo** 1 point 5 days ago

Were you able to find who wrote Template #2? I want to complain to my state representative and senator about this language being used in the Illinois bill.

permalink embed save parent report reply

> [–] **aaronsb** [S] 1 point 3 days ago
>
> I've created a follow up post here.
> https://www.reddit.com/r/linux/comments/1rr3f3n/followup_to_my_bill_text_comparison_i_traced_who/
>
> permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **RyzRx** 133 points 8 days ago

I think this (age verification) is in Pr0ject 2O25 somewhere.

permalink embed save report reply

[−] **AtomicTEM** 102 points 8 days ago

Yes, Page 876

"In addition, some of the methods used to regulate children's internet access pose the risk of unintended harms. For instance, age verification regulations would inevitably increase the amount of data collection involved, increasing privacy con- cerns. Users would have to submit to platforms proof of their age, which raises the risks of data breach or illegitimate data usage by the platforms or bad actors. Limited-government conservatives would prefer the FTC play an educational role instead. That might include best practices or educational programs to empower parents online."

permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **RyzRx** 47 points 8 days ago

Thanks! Now I wonder what PaIantir is up to as we see all of these in the works? Hmmm... Smells like fully optimized SurveilIance in high-octane!

permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **Celaphais** 25 points 7 days ago

This is arguing against age verification and for educating parents about potential harms, seems reasonable to me.

permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **stormdelta**   2 points 7 days ago

Yeah, broken clocks and all that

permalink embed save parent report reply

load more comments (6 replies)

load more comments (3 replies)

[−] **berickphilip** 11 points 7 days ago

Good education is always the answer, but is never in the interests of power abusers.

permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **Titdirt69420** 19 points 7 days ago

They've been pushing for privacy invasion tactics for many years. Well before Trump and 2025.

Besides, if this is a Trump masterplan why are all the democrats getting on board and driving this?

This isn't a party issue it's a "our government doesn't represent the people anymore" issu

permalink embed save parent report reply

[–] **jar36** 12 points 7 days ago

https://theintercept.com/2024/08/16/project-2025-russ-vought-porn-ban/

These age verification laws are a pretext for restricting access to porn more broadly.

"We came up with an idea on pornography to make it so that the porn companies bear the liability for the underage use," Vought said, "as opposed to the person who visits the website getting to just certify" that they are of legal age.

Vought called this a "back door starting with the kids" and offered the age verification laws as an example of an "immediate fight leverage point that we can win" that sets up "the next fight."

"We'd have a national ban on pornography if we could, right?" he added. Vought contributed a chapter to the Project 2025 manifesto, which argues in the foreword that all pornography "should be outlawed" and its producers "imprisoned."

permalink embed save parent report reply

[–] **wayzata20** 5 points 7 days ago

And that's why California and Colorado were the first states to pass the law, right? You know, two of the most liberal states in the country.

I swear you people just go "bad thing, must be tr*mp!!1!1!1!1"

permalink embed save parent report reply

> [–] **Braydon64**   3 points 4 days ago
>
> Welcome to Reddit. Red states pushed the porn regulations, but it's very blue states that are pushing the OS-level stuff - which idk about you but I find that infinitely more concerning.
>
> permalink embed save parent report reply

[–] **pit_supervisor** 5 points 7 days ago

Lmao. Why is EU pushing it too then?

permalink embed save parent report reply

> [–] **_ahrs**   1 point 6 days ago
>
> Unless I'm mistaken, I think the EU copied the UK with their laws. They want the liability to be on the side of the platform / service and not the platform owner / operating system.
>
> They didn't make it so you have to assert your age to download and use SUSE. That's just stupidity.
>
> permalink embed save parent report reply
>
> > [–] **pit_supervisor** 6 points 6 days ago
> >
> > They still want age verification
> >
> > permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **SheriffBartholomew**   4 points 7 days ago

And who do you think paid to put it there? People like Zuckerfuck and Elongated Muskrat, that's who.

permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **PaddyLandau**   134 points 8 days ago

This law is — I mean this literally — insane.

permalink embed save report reply

> [−] **newsflashjackass** 57 points 7 days ago
>
> > This law is — I mean this literally — insane.
>
> So is making everyone (including the pilot) take off their belt and shoes and put them back on before getting on the airplane but someone bribed a dipshit repub for a jobs program so now we all have to do that until Jesus comes back.
>
> Now you see the violence inherent in the system.
>
> permalink embed save parent report reply
>
> > [−] **PaddyLandau**   3 points 7 days ago
> >
> > I haven't flown for a long time. Is that a new thing? I presume that you're talking about the US?
> >
> > permalink embed save parent report reply
> >
> > > [−] **NotUniqueOrSpecial** 17 points 7 days ago
> > >
> > > It's such an old thing (immediately after 9/11) that it's now not even actually true in a lot of airports because of newer scanner tech.
> > >
> > > permalink embed save parent report reply
> > >
> > > [−] **UltraCynar**   10 points 7 days ago
> > >
> > > Yeah I've only had to do this in American airports
> > >
> > > permalink embed save parent report reply
> > >
> > > **load more comments** (2 replies)
> >
> > [−] **libra00** 3 points 5 days ago
> >
> > This is why I quit flying after 2001.
> >
> > permalink embed save parent report reply
> >
> > [−] **franklinwritescode** 1 point 4 days ago
> >
> > HELP HELP! I'M BEING REPRESSED!
> >
> > permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **FineWolf** 15 points 7 days ago*

The New York one requiring age verification through ID or biometric is. Yes.

The Colorado/Cali one, simply requiring operating systems to allow an administrator/machine owner to mark an account as a child/teen/adult, **is common sens that should have implemented decades ago as a basic feature**.

As a parent, we either have the choice to let our children roam free, or install nightmarish privacy disasters that are parental control apps like Qustodio; when that stuff should be built into any OS. It makes way more sense to be able, as a parent, to set up our children with children accounts.

The Colorado/Cali doesn't ask for verification, just **self declaration** from the machine owner. **That's the only privacy preserving way of handling that**. You own the computer, you can mark yourself as an adult. Easy. Problem solved.

But instead people are spreading FUD, ignoring that the alternative is having every privat business who serves up age restricted content ask for ID or biometrics like in the UK.

permalink embed save parent report reply

> [−] **troyvit** 30 points 7 days ago
>
> The thing is, this is how it starts, not how it ends. First will come attestation that anybody can get around. Then, after people have gotten around it for awhile the "think of the children" crowd starts freaking out some more and we clamp down some more. Afterall, the mechanism is there, why not put some teeth in it? For the poor children of course. Before you know it we've reached the end of general computing.
>
> As a dad of two teenage daughters I have enough experience to say this is bullshit. If people instead took a minute to actually *raise their own kids* there would be nothing to protect them against. Instead we want the state to do it for us and oligarchs like Meta are only too happy to show them how in a way that protects their interests. Not your interests, and certainly not your kids. Don't worry though: they'll still advertise to your kids in the same predatory ways, only now they have attestation that they are actually the kids they want to target.
>
> I'm glad I taught my kids to cheat on every detail they can when they make an online account.
>
> permalink embed save parent report reply

> [−] **porcinechoirmaster** 10 points 7 days ago
>
> The CA one is - at least as it stands now, without the shit Newsom wants - a privacy *improvement* over the existing state of affairs.
>
> It mandates that the user attest to an age category and that said category can be queried, but it *also* mandates that the listed age is the only mechanism that may be queried and that the results of the query cannot be shared with third parties, meaning companies like Persona that are running around getting pictures of faces or scans of IDs cannot legally ask for them in CA for age verification purposes, as age verification is covered by the attestation made by the user.
>
> permalink embed save parent report reply

> [−] **PaddyLandau** 8 points 7 days ago
>
> The UK wouldn't accept self-declaration. It's trivial for a motivated child to overcome the restriction on a platform like Linux, anyway.

permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **FineWolf** 1 point 7 days ago

> It's trivial for a motivated child to overcome the restriction on a platform like Linux, anyway.

Not if the child doesn't have `wheel`, and the system is locked down appropriately (LUKS+Secure Boot with custom keys+DeployedMode).

permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **Mysterious_Sugar3819** 3 points 6 days ago

They can just install a different OS

permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **FineWolf** 1 point 6 days ago

Not with Secure Boot in DeployedMode they can't.

Unless my child has my private key to either reset Secure Boot to Setup mode, or they somehow get hold of an install media with a bootloader signed with my key, it isn't happening.

DeployedMode also persists through a CMOS clear.

permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **_ahrs** 3 points 6 days ago

GNOME Boxes is in the Flathub store. You can run a VM, something multiple people have pointed out already now. Secure Boot doesn't prevent this. You'd have to lock down the OS to the point that the user can only run trusted binaries and can't install anything else, not even in their own home directory.

permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **blackcain** GNOME Team 1 point 6 days ago

Kids learn how to figure out what they want socially. I mean, parents at home don't act like they are at work and need to safeguard their computer at all times.

permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **FineWolf** 2 points 6 days ago*

The Internet today isn't the Internet of when we were young. For boys specifically, letting them roam free is a great way to have mini-Tates. For girls, there are other dangers.

My kids, all below the age of 15, are mostly free to do what they want, all they need is to ask permission, and 90% of the time the answer is yes.

permalink embed save parent report reply

[–] **laffer1** 2 points 6 days ago

If the law was limited to Microsoft, Apple, IBM and Canonical, sure. It's not. It includes hobby operating systems too

permalink embed save parent report reply

[–] **Mcnst** 5 points 8 days ago

But what else are they supposed to do when they're fined 53k per violation, and complying itself is a violation — per OP's own summary, no less.

permalink embed save parent report reply

[–] **PaddyLandau**   49 points 8 days ago

Don't write this into law, is what I expect the governments to do.

The law is insane.

I don't know how Linux distributors are going to be able to handle this. It's a nightmare.

permalink embed save parent report reply

[–] **DerfK** 8 points 8 days ago

> I don't know how Linux distributors are going to be able to handle this. It's a nightmare.

I propose that we designate an environment variable such as $AGEBRACKET to serve as the API providing this information to all applications downstream of the user's login. During account setup this environment variable could be set in the user's profile, requiring a small amount of development work to add this to the various account creation processes such as `adduser` `useradd` and any GUI ones out there as well as the distro installer scripts (when creating the root account and initial user) but every other application automatically receives "the signal" with no further development needed, which includes containers such as docker that can inherit environment variables.

And everyone that wants to, can just delete the variable from their profile.

permalink embed save parent report reply

[–] **PaddyLandau**   8 points 8 days ago

I hadn't even considered the multi-user nature of Linux, which of course applies to most operating systems. But, I think that the law apples to *installation only* and therefore to the initial user, not to subsequent users. That allows quite a bit of leeway, ha ha!

permalink embed save parent report reply

load more comments (4 replies)

[–] **Internet-of-cruft** 8 points 8 days ago

The trivial way is it's going to be a text box during install or first logon.

You're going to have this exposed as a field that must be populated to run automated installers.

Some people and organizations are going to start downloading the componer and ripping out the compliance check and building their own OS. FAANG companies already do this.

My bet is there's going to be a bare minimum effort that meets the letter of t law.

permalink embed save parent report reply

[–] **PaddyLandau**   5 points 8 days ago

I agree with you. I can't see any reasonable alternative.

permalink embed save parent report reply

[–] **Internet-of-cruft** 4 points 8 days ago

I pointed it out in another comment here: It does *nothing* to solve the problem of the "pre-existing install base".

It will take actual decades for this to be accurate.

permalink embed save parent report reply

[–] **ivosaurus** 8 points 7 days ago*

For any updated operating system, they mandate that the operating system be updated with an interface for the user to enter their declared age, by July '27.

Hilariously (or it would be if this weren't signed law), it does not make any provisions for what should happen if the user doesn't use that interface to enter their age.

Also there seems to be a part most people are missing: if you are a dev of *any application*, you are required to collect this age data, also by July '27. There's a couple of gaping edge cases not explained by this, but the wording is straight forward in its demands at the same time as being vague about who exactly it should apply to. It doesn't specify, for instance, "applications where an online account is centrally managed by the developer and is critical to the operation of said application" or anything similar. It just says applications.

permalink embed save parent report reply

[–] **Internet-of-cruft** 10 points 7 days ago

This is so hilariously bad.

I am genuinely curious how they intend on enforcing this. Internal and non-user accounts probably *vastly* outnumber real user accounts.

The EU puts some teeth on some of their regulation with actual enforcement and sizeable fines.

What are you going to do, fine the developer who makes no money on their video game and does it for fun?

permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **wtallis** 3 points 7 days ago

> I am genuinely curious how they intend on enforcing this. Internal and non-user accounts probably vastly outnumber real user accounts.

For California's law: they *don't* intend to enforce the law in those cases. Enforcement is limited to fines based on the number of affected children. If a user account belonging to an adult (or not belonging to a person at all) lacks the age bracket information, there's nothing to fine anybody over.

permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **PaddyLandau**   5 points 8 days ago

Absolutely. And, are they expecting the distributions to back-fix all of the archives?

For example, Ubuntu still supports version 20.04, but the installer is essentially fixed in time. Back-fixing that installer, which is no longer being used or maintained by newer versions, would be a huge undertaking.

And Ubuntu is just one of many distributions.

Additionally, how will the law affect distributions that aren't based in the US? Will the US expect everyone outside the US to block the US if they don't comply?

What an insane nightmare!

permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **Internet-of-cruft** 6 points 8 days ago

Doesn't matter if they even backport this "fix".

People are sitting on old installers that they are under zero obligation to delete.

FB is punting the problem, then they did their job.

"It's not their fault" if they're given bad signal information, it must be the OS provider's fault!

Pass the buck until it's held by entities that have no reasonable way of solving the problem.

You want a real resolution? Parents should take *actual responsibility* for their kids.

My own kids don't have social media access and I have no intention of them getting near it for many years.

permalink embed save parent report reply

[–] **RoadFrog999** 1 point 10 hours ago

> My own kids don't have social media
> access and I have no intention of them
> getting near it for many years.

One of the few sensible remarks in this
thread.

permalink embed save parent report reply

load more comments (5 replies)

load more comments (2 replies)

[–] **seminally_me**   1 point 8 days ago

and this will be limited to the US states that implement this not the
rest of the world. Which means americans will have the choice and
render all this a useless endeavor.

permalink embed save parent report reply

[–] **Old_Leopard1844** 1 point 7 days ago

Great, let's break some more software to meet demands of shitty
parents

permalink embed save parent report reply

[–] **Superb_Raccoon**   1 point 7 days ago

Easy: *dont set up users* on desktop instances. Everyone uses the default
User, everything else non interactive service accounts.

Servers can have non interactive service accounts, although corporations
could do age verification quite easily for additional users.

permalink embed save parent report reply

[–] **PaddyLandau**   1 point 7 days ago

Don't set up users? So, you are suggesting that we do away with
security and privacy, and have everyone use the same user account
on a shared computer?

Absolutely not!

permalink embed save parent report reply

[–] **Superb_Raccoon**   2 points 7 days ago

When would you need multiple users at home, on Linux
desktop?

Create a VM per user then.

permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **PaddyLandau**   1 point 7 days ago

Not necessarily multiple users. You are suggesting no users at all. That's not possible.

permalink embed save parent report reply

> [−] **Superb_Raccoon**   2 points 7 days ago
>
> > Easy: dont set up users on desktop instances. Everyone uses the ***default User,***
>
> User is the username. In the default password file installed on your system when you install it. It is not created, it is just there as part of the install when the file is copied from the media.
>
> permalink embed save parent report reply
>
> > [−] **PaddyLandau**   1 point 7 days ago
> >
> > How will not setting up extra users solve the problem? The vast majority of people already don't set up extra users. I don't, unless one of my children wants to use the computer, which hasn't happened in a long time.
> >
> > Not setting up an extra user won't magically nullify the law.
> >
> > permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **teleprint-me**   20 points 8 days ago

In a sane world where things actually work out as expected, they would accept the consequences of their decisions and take responsibility for their own actions instead of offsetting the blame and destroying entire communities IRL and IDL at the same time.

permalink embed save parent report reply

> [−] **Mcnst**   5 points 7 days ago
>
> But you're still not providing a solution for them.
>
> Per the summary of the OP, if they collect extra info to verify age, that's already a violation if they collect such info from someone they're not supposed to be collecting it from.
>
> I think the issue here is as old as time. Instead of fixing ridiculous laws we already have on the books, ***to address the root of the problem***, we instead let the lobbyists create ridiculous new laws to treat the ***symptoms and pass the buck*** to someone else.
>
> permalink embed save parent report reply
>
> > [−] **teleprint-me** 3 points 7 days ago

> We have parental controls in these devices! Its been there for
> decades! The solutions are there already! WTH!? lmfao. No solutions
> my ass.
>
> permalink   embed   save   parent   report   reply

load more comments (4 replies)

[−] **aaronsb** [S] 79 points 8 days ago

I just want to disclose that I am obviously using AI to clean up my text and make it legible.
Thanks.

permalink   embed   save   report   reply

> [−] **Internet-of-cruft**   41 points 8 days ago
>
> Do everyone a favor: Make this disclosure part of the very first thing in your posts (or
> last thing).
>
> Distrust of AI is wildly prevalent. You're not bad for using it, but you'll gain significant
> trust in being transparent about it.
>
> permalink   embed   save   parent   report   reply
>
> **load more comments** (2 replies)

> [−] **Mcnst**   20 points 8 days ago
>
> I dunno, I did this sort of writing (with proper headers and bolds) myself like 10 years
> ago. Yet Redditors usually downvote heavily when you use the header titles properly
> within your text, simply because it looks too different from the slop that others write.
>
> permalink   embed   save   parent   report   reply
>
> > [−] **aaronsb** [S] 11 points 8 days ago
> >
> > It's heavily mediated by myself personally, as well. It just feels like nowadays I am
> > compelled to disclose the "artificial ingredients" in my thinking when I post to
> > reddit.
> >
> > I know markdown well and pre language models would compose tables, emphasis,
> > and other prose but it takes too long sometimes.
> >
> > permalink   embed   save   parent   report   reply
> >
> > [−] **Shawnj2**   8 points 7 days ago
> >
> > AI was trained off of good writing so now writing well looks like ai slop.
> >
> > permalink   embed   save   parent   report   reply

> [−] **goldenroman**   13 points 8 days ago
>
> Thank you for acknowledging and for sharing the info.
>
> permalink   embed   save   parent   report   reply

[−] **aaronsb** [S] 61 points 8 days ago

The Copy-Paste Evidence: Verbatim Bill Text Comparisons

Template 1: App Store Accountability Act (Utah / Louisiana / Texas)

All three bills use identical invented age categories:

	Utah SB 142	Louisiana HB 570	Texas SB 2420
1	"**child**" — under 13	"**Child**" — under thirteen	under 13 = "**child**"
2	"**younger teenager**" — 13 to under 16	"**Younger teenager**" — thirteen to under sixteen	13 to under 16 = "**younger teenager**"
3	"**older teenager**" — 16 to under 18	"**Older teenager**" — sixteen to under eighteen	16 to under 18 = "**older teenager**"
4	"**adult**" — at least 18	"**Adult**" — at least eighteen	at least 18 = "**adult**"

"Younger teenager" and "older teenager" aren't standard legal terms. They were coined for these bills.

"App store" definition: - **Utah:** "a publicly available website, software application, or electronic service that allows users to download apps from third-party developers onto a mobile device" - **Louisiana:** "a publicly available website, software application, or electronic service that allows users to download applications from third-party developers onto a mobile device"

Word-for-word except "apps" vs "applications."

"Significant change" — Utah: "a material modification to an app's terms of service or privacy policy that (a) changes the categories of data collected, stored, or shared; (b) alters the app's a rating or content descriptions; (c) adds new monetization features, including (i) in-app purchase or (ii) advertisements; or (d) materially changes the app's functionality or user experience." Louisiana has the same sentence with "app" replaced by "application."

"Mobile device" — both Utah and Louisiana use an identical four-part definition: provides cellular/wireless connectivity, capable of connecting to the internet, runs a mobile operating system, capable of running apps. Same order, same words.

"Verifiable parental consent" — both states define it as authorization that (a) is provided by verified adult, (b) given after clear and conspicuous disclosure, (c) requires an affirmative choice to grant or decline. Same prose, different formatting.

The safe harbor — Utah §13-75-402: "A developer is not liable for a violation of this chapter if the developer demonstrates that the developer relied in good faith on personal age verification data provided by an app store provider." Louisiana §1774 has equivalent language. This is the clause that directly benefits Meta.

Template 2: Digital Age Assurance Act (California / Illinois)

"Operating system provider": - **CA AB 1043:** "a person or entity that develops, licenses, or controls the operating system software on a computer, mobile device, or any other general purpose computing device" - **IL SB 3977:** "a person or entity that develops, licenses, or control the operating system software on a computer, mobile device, or any other general purpose computing device"

Character-for-character identical.

"Signal": - **CA:** "age bracket data sent by a real-time secure application programming interface or operating system to an application" - **IL:** "age bracket data sent by a real-time secure application programming interface or operating system to an application"

Verbatim identical.

"Age bracket data" — both define four age ranges: under 13, 13-16, 16-18, 18+. Both use "nonidentifiable" / "non-personally identifiable" framing.

Core mandate — CA §1798.501 and IL §10(a) both require operating system providers to "provide an accessible interface at account setup that requires an account holder to indicate the birth date, age, or both" and provide a signal to applications. Same sentence.

Why this matters for Linux: The definition of "operating system provider" covers "any genera purpose computing device." That's Canonical, Red Hat, SUSE, Valve (SteamOS), and arguably anyone packaging a distro for download in California or Illinois. The law requires an age verification interface at account setup and an API that apps can query for age bracket data. California's law takes effect January 1, 2027.

Sources: Utah SB 142 | Louisiana HB 570 | Texas SB 2420 | CA AB 1043 | IL SB 3977

permalink embed save report reply

[–] **TinFoilHat_69** 57 points 8 days ago*

If you read any of my post in the last week on this sub Reddit, you would understand that it's actually a lobby group right now that formed between Meta, X and Snapchat to design framework to pass through state legislators so that all accountability ends up being deflected off those that have exploited minors for ad revenue.

They're trying to strong arm operating system providers to do their dirty bidding because Mark Zuckerberg argued in front jurors and judges/lawmakers that it's impossible for him to control what kids see with his algorithms and it will be much easier if it was handled through App Store like Google and Apple.

This was his basis to provide framework for child safety, designed and manufactured by meta's legal team. Let's not forget that Facebook changed their name so they wouldn't be as identifiable in the public legal system for all the dirty deeds recorded and held under Facebook, while Snapchat and twitter(x) joined the lobby. You searched dialogue or transcripts and documentation. So of course it's easy to see that this information is being templated and pushed you don't need to use AI to figure this out a couple of Google searches will send you the same results .

Though it's clear state legislators New York, Colorado and California are trying to push the same legislation at the same time, kind of suspicious. There's a lot of big money involved clearly but nobody's holding those that are breaking the law accountable. Instead they're trying to make force compliance by laying the ground work. The objective is to get their foot in the door because then they will be able to force further compliance controls, to keep making money, to exercise more control over your personal property. It's a clear ultimatum, pure isolation or no privacy at all.

permalink embed save report reply

[–] **Internet-of-cruft** 20 points 8 days ago

My favorite irony of this situation is that even if this gets *firmly legalized*, it will take decades for this to be a reliable signal.

People are still running old Operating Systems. People refuse to patch, much less upgrade their OS.

OS manufacturers can't blindly yank download media without potentially putting themselv at risk of violating contractual obligations.

The laws can force *new development* to require the age verification, but it does absolutely nothing against the entire installed footprint (and "passive, not installed media") that still exists.

Facebook is going to start complaining they're getting inaccurate information and it's goin to be a "no shit" moment.

permalink embed save parent report reply

> [–] **TinFoilHat_69** 5 points 7 days ago*
>
> I'll speculate right now and say that X 86 architecture is not safe because Intel and AMD have the abilities to lock down the firmware if they are required to do so. Unless you're using old x86 chips that do not have those security features. Just in new versions of the X 86 chips which, like you said it could take a while before they are fully deployed.
>
> Current chips actually have the locks in place, they use secure boot loaders, whether or not they're signed by the firmware would be a policy made by lawmakers.
>
> As of right now there are no laws that require bootloaders being signed by firmware, unless you have a developer license to unlock those parts that enterprise needs to run their specific boot loaders, that's where the control aspect comes from. It wouldn't take 10 years to turn into reality. The technology is already here, the question they're going to ask "did they go far enough with these laws" only time will tell unless we shut the door completely so they can't force compliance controls.
>
> This is the pathway they have without running in to regulatory hurdles that will compromise enterprise systems with their current architecture to protect against unauthorized access to Internet content..
>
> permalink embed save parent report reply
>
> > [–] **Zzyzx2021**   5 points 7 days ago
> >
> > There are already RISC-V SBCs that can run a browser.
> >
> > The big tech platforms will just lock themselves down away from users whose OSs/browsers don't send the age signal. So the only solution is to use alternatives.
> >
> > permalink embed save parent report reply

[–] **Aurelar**   55 points 8 days ago

Assuming it follows their rules, can you crosspost this to r/privacy? It seems relevant enough. Maybe I can do it myself but I thought I would ask.

permalink embed save report reply

[–] **XOmniverse**   31 points 8 days ago

Man I left that subreddit like a week after joining, not because I don't think data privacy is important (it very much is) but because of how insane half the people there are. It's full of wild speculation, weird conspiracies, etc.

permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **froli** 26 points 7 days ago

Or people moving from Chrome and Google to Brave and Proton and think they're as good as off the grid.

permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **sl0bbyb0bby** 14 points 7 days ago

My conspiracy theory is that discourse on that sub is manufactured to be very poor quality

permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **Overlord0994** 1 point 1 day ago

Do you realize the topic of the thread you're currently in? This is reality.

permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **XOmniverse**   1 point 23 hours ago

Reality is that there are serious privacy concerns, including this one. Reality is not random unproven conspiracy theories that confirm whatever biases the random redditor in question has.

permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **tooclosetocall82** 51 points 8 days ago

Unless Meta intends to only allow signups via apps that reasoning doesn't quite make sense. They'd still be liable for direct signups via a browser. The OS level verification would give them even more plausible deniability because presumably it would work in a browser as well.

permalink embed save report reply

[−] **aaronsb** [S] 32 points 8 days ago

The app store safe harbor doesn't cover browser signups, but the vast majority of minor usage of Instagram and Facebook is through mobile apps, not desktop browsers. The 1.1 million under-13 reports from the multi state AG complaint were largely app-based accounts. So killing app-level coppa liability handles most of the financial exposure even if browser signups are still a smaller risk.

I think Meta is hedging across both approaches; they fund the DCA pushing the app store bills but they've also joined OpenAge and launched AgeKey, which are cross-platform age verification systems that would work in browsers too. If OS-level age signals become standard, Meta can consume those on the browser side the same way they'd consume app store flags on the app side.

The two templates aren't really in conflict from Meta's perspective. The app store one handles the immediate coppa exposure on mobile. The OS one would cover the browser gap. They benefit most if both pass. They're just spending more aggressively on the app

store version because that's where the bulk of the liability sits and because conservative state legislatures are moving faster on those bills.

So yeah you're right that OS-level gives Meta more complete coverage. The app store approach just handles the bigger problem right now, which is why that's where the lobbyir money is going first.

permalink embed save parent report reply

[–] **SheriffBartholomew**   47 points 7 days ago

The fact that Meta is sponsoring the bill is no surprise. It was obvious from the get go that this law massively benefits data hoarding companies. And of course Zuckerfuck has found yet another way to make the world worse. One of the most destructive people of our lifetimes.

permalink embed save report reply

[–] **AmarildoJr** 43 points 8 days ago

And some Linux users are straight out spreading their legs for this law. If this happened in the early 2000's we would create a patch that would limit the bandwidth in the US to 5KB/s until the law was reverted.

permalink embed save report reply

> [–] **Aurelar**   31 points 8 days ago
>
> I'm not bending over for any of these corporate hacks. I don't use a mainstream distro and won't use any that forces this crap on me.
>
> permalink embed save parent report reply
>
>> [–] **seminally_me**   5 points 8 days ago
>>
>> Yeah, there's just so many ways this will either fail, or ways to completely avoid using any of these age restricted linux distros. This will not be applied to every flavour or distro that exists, so i don't see how they will enforce this in any meaningful way. Its so stupid.
>>
>> permalink embed save parent report reply
>>
>>> [–] **sparky8251** 13 points 7 days ago
>>>
>>> Once your banking website requires it to comply due to the law expanding in stages (via new laws ofc) youll basically have to capitulate...The attack of the OS is to eventually force application developers to use it too, which then means you basically cant use a computer for anything outside of a pure hobby in modern society. Cant file taxes, cant chat with friends unless you all self host, etc.
>>>
>>> This is a joke of a law, but its only intended to normalize and build the proper infrastructure imo. Once its in place for a bit and people are used to it, there will be new laws that are more restrictive until using a computer is harder to do than driving a car.
>>>
>>> permalink embed save parent report reply
>>>
>>>> [–] **maz20** 3 points 7 days ago
>>>>
>>>> Once your banking website requires it to comply due to the law expanding in stages (via new laws ofc) youll basically have to

> capitulate...The attack of the OS is to eventually force application developers to use it too, which then means you basically cant use a computer for anything outside of a pure hobby in modern society. Cant file taxes, cant chat with friends unless you all self host, etc.

You mean like keeping a VM around for "official" business (such as the "banking" you mentioned) while just using the host machine otherwise as usual for everything else?

permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **DoktorLuciferWong** 8 points 7 days ago

of course we could do that, but wouldn't you rather live in a world where you didn't have to do that shit? lol

permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **sparky8251** 6 points 7 days ago*

Its the same mentality that had people ok with Windows for so long... I left it in the Win 8 era when it was clear they had no care for the average person vs force it to be tolerable with ever more elaborate hacks and careful activity to ensure things I set off stayed off.

Same reason I ditched nvidia once amdgpu started back then too, as even when it was young it was better to support the right thing and not deal with the nvidia papercuts.

Now its just more boasting "I know computers, I'll work around it" to cope with the fact they refuse to fight the laws being pushed. Just like with Windows addicts and their refusal to properly fight MS... Bunch of people so used to being powerless they dont even realize when they are giving up now.

permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **AmarildoJr** 5 points 7 days ago

But that's not the main problem, the real problem is the number of users who are bending over, and this creates the pretense for distros like Ubuntu to actually cave in.

permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **seminally_me**   27 points 8 days ago

the Linux one, if it actually gets implemented will only apply to the US. No one else will download and install this crap. Americans can just download any other flavour of linux from the EU. There's also nothing to stop anyone from compiling their own linux port without this age code. I will pay more for a fairphone and install open source OS. There is just far too much government interference in our lives.

permalink embed save report reply

[+] *[deleted]* 8 days ago (8 children)

[–] **CondiMesmer**   8 points 7 days ago

That's hilarious that you think this will stay contained in the US, when the US isn't even the current worst offender for this. The EU is very much pushing for age verification as well. It's unfortunately a global problem at this point.

permalink embed save parent report reply

[–] **sloth_cowboy** 1 point 7 days ago

Wait until you find out they want to kill us, thats when all this sugar coating stops

permalink embed save parent report reply

[–] **ke151** 20 points 8 days ago

I don't have anything to add exactly but thanks for putting in the effort to dig into it and look behind the curtain to see it's a coordinated effort going on.

permalink embed save report reply

[–] **somatt** 16 points 8 days ago

how does a server prove an age? this is the dumbest shit I ever heard.

permalink embed save report reply

[–] **mmmboppe** 23 points 8 days ago

even a desktop Linux has accounts not tied to the human user(s)

permalink embed save parent report reply

[–] **curien** 15 points 7 days ago*

"Verification" is a misnomer in the "template 2" style, nothing about it involves *proving* an age. It's just an age *reporting* mechanism that just reports the age bracket based on information given at account setup.

permalink embed save parent report reply

[–] **somatt** 3 points 7 days ago

So a python script reports it is as old as Guido

permalink embed save parent report reply

[–] **Run-OpenBSD** 16 points 8 days ago

Govt compelling people and or companies to change their works is a constitutional violation in its self. Govt cannot compel speech. Open source code is speech as defined by law. No company should stand by or help with the trampling of our bill of rights under any threat.

permalink embed save report reply

[–] **WheatyMcGrass** 3 points 8 days ago

Absolutely not lmao. There's a few key wordings in what you're referring.

1. Source *Code*
2. *Can be*. Not *is always*. *Can be*

The overall case referenced the code itself. Nothing beyond that. After it's compiled, and shipped and in use in the world, it's not speech anymore. It's a product.

permalink   embed   save   parent   report   reply

[−] **Run-OpenBSD** 9 points 8 days ago

Current law: "Like music and mathematical equations, computer language is just that, language, and it communicates information either to a computer or to those who can read it."

permalink   embed   save   parent   report   reply

[−] **2rad0** 1 point 7 days ago

> After it's compiled, and shipped and in use in the world, it's not speech anymore. It's a product.

The assertion you make here would mean that no compiled binaries would be protected by copyright law. So we can resell hacked versions of macos or windows under your interpretation of long standing copyright law.

permalink   embed   save   parent   report   reply

[−] **Run-OpenBSD** 0 points 8 days ago

Per executive order signed Jan 20, 2025

It is the policy of the United States to: (a) secure the right of the American people to engage in constitutionally protected speech;

```
   (b)   ensure that no Federal Government officer, employee, or agent

   (c)   ensure that no taxpayer resources are used to engage in or fac:

   (d)   identify and take appropriate action to correct past misconduc
```

permalink   embed   save   parent   report   reply

[−] **sparky8251** 4 points 7 days ago

EOs arent law. They are the equivalent of those internal memos passed around at your company by out of touch execs. Its just the "leader" of the federal executive branch setting policies his employees should act towards. They can be illegal for this reason.

Federal EOs have no bearing on local or state executive branches OR any local, state or federal congressional or judicial branches. They will not stop this, at all.

permalink   embed   save   parent   report   reply

[−] **BashfulMelon** 0 points 7 days ago

Bundle ransomeware or spyware with an application and distribute it under your name. You'll find out pretty quickly that executable code doesn't have the same protections that

human-readable source code does.

When are you going to stop spamming these threads with this nonsense?

permalink   embed   save   parent   report   reply

> [−] **Run-OpenBSD** 0 points 7 days ago
>
> Microslop windows is the current leader in publishing spyware these days. Spelled M.I.C.R.O. S.L.O.P. and they do so under protection. If we can call windows ransomware is still up for debate.
>
> permalink   embed   save   parent   report   reply
>
> **load more comments** (4 replies)

[−] **nomaddave** 11 points 8 days ago

Has Linus chimed in on all these goings on? I haven't seen anything personally.

permalink   embed   save   report   reply

> [−] **TheOneTrueTrench**   16 points 7 days ago
>
> Why would he? This would all be implemented in user space, not kernel.
>
> permalink   embed   save   parent   report   reply
>
> > [−] **idiosyncraticRyugu** 11 points 7 days ago
> >
> > don't worry, it'll get there too.. take a look at brazils attempt..
> >
> > permalink   embed   save   parent   report   reply

[−] **Mcnst** 10 points 8 days ago

Do parents actually setup separate accounts for their kids? What happens if a parent logs into their own account on the kid's phone?

OTOH, given the 53k fine per violation, it's probably cheaper to just silently ban the parent! *Should have known better!*

permalink   embed   save   report   reply

[−] **DGolden** 12 points 8 days ago

American christo-fascist "heritage foundation" explicit and open policy goal ...they won't stop at individual states either https://archive.is/n7Rje

> Society ultimately needs federal legislation that requires age verification on platform and device levels.

(sic)

Any killing/maiming of Linux / Free Software / Open Source, used by us filthy freedom-loving hippies worldwide, would be a nice feature to them.

permalink   embed   save   report   reply

[−] **CortaCircuit** 10 points 8 days ago

One of the many hills to die on.

permalink   embed   save   report   reply

[−] **redd1618** 7 points 8 days ago

the idea of de-industrialization / de-computerization / microsloppification

permalink embed save report reply

> [−] **aaronsb** [S] 1 point 8 days ago
>
> DEVO was ahead of their time and saw it coming. (Probably)
>
> permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **TheJackiMonster**   7 points 7 days ago

Meanwhile the FTC deregulates the laws which actually aim to stop personal data collection from children.

permalink embed save report reply

[−] **Superb_Raccoon**   6 points 7 days ago

Account creation huh?

Fine. Every linux system comes with two users: root and user.

No creation occurs nor is it possible to create additional interactive users. They are pre-configured in the base file set.

permalink embed save report reply

[−] **SanityInAnarchy** 3 points 7 days ago

Oh, interesting. Looks like Congress is considering versions of both, but they do pretty different things. Maybe this is why I keep getting downvoted: I comment on template 2, and people are upset about template 1?

Of these, **Template 1 is obviously bad for all the reasons everyone says.** Here's the bill text:

> (B) verify the individual's age category using a commercially available method or process that is reasonably designed to ensure accuracy;

And, combined with an overly-broad definition of "APP STORE", this could amount to any website that has any software available to do age verification. In fact, as far as I can tell, this is required whether or not the app(s) in question are appropriate for children.

Meanwhile, **Template 2 seems fine.** At least, here's the California text, it's a reasonably quick read -- it literally just requires parental controls, you just have to enter your birthdate when making an account. That's both technically fairly easy (just an extra flag to `adduser`), and doesn't really have many privacy implications (this can be done entirely locally, you don't even have to *store* more than that age bracket). The federal bill is much longer, so I may have missed something, but it also makes it explicit:

> (c) Protections for privacy.—Nothing in this title, including a determination described in subsection (b), shall be construed to require—

> (1) the affirmative collection of any personal data with respect to the age of users that a covered platform is not already collecting in the normal course of business; or

> (2) a covered platform to implement an age gating or age verification functionality.

A reasonable person could object that it's setting us up for more later, which... kinda, it does set up a *study* of whether age verification would make sense:

> ...shall conduct a study evaluating the most technologically feasible methods and options for developing systems to verify age at the device or operating system level.

But that actually seems like a good thing to do -- in particular, the study is supposed to consider

> (4) how such a system or systems could verify age while mitigating risks to user privacy and data security and safeguarding minors' personal data, emphasizing minimizing the amount of data collected and processed by covered platforms and age verification providers for such a system;

If the study isn't totally compromised, it'd have to come back with something like "You can't do that, those are incompatible goals," which would *help* people pushing against further age verification.

Ideally we'd do neither. But I really think we should focus on opposing Template 1, and maybe pointing people towards Template 2 instead.

permalink embed save report reply

> [−] **porcinechoirmaster** 4 points 7 days ago
>
> The CA bill also has some nice provisions that enhance privacy, as well: It requires that the age attestation made by the OS be trusted unless proof to the contrary is given, it requires that third parties *not* get access to the results, and it requires that no other age verification take place.
>
> In terms of meaningful impact, the bill does three things:
>
> - It clears the various businesses scared of their exposure of their liability
> - It prevents companies like Persona from building huge databases of PII in the name of "age verification"
> - It puts a *very* low effort requirement on OS developers to accomplish the first two goals.
>
> permalink embed save parent report reply

> [−] **Sentmoraap** 3 points 5 days ago
>
> Finally, I had to scroll too far to read this reasonable take.
>
> The California law looks like a consumer protection against privacy-invasive age check such as upload your ID.
>
> permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **USMCamp0811** 5 points 7 days ago

Sounds like a good time to bring up GNU Linux is a kernel not an OS 🤣

But for real this is some bullshit that needs to stop!

permalink embed save report reply

[−] **BamBam-BamBam** 6 points 7 days ago

We knew this, right?! Meta is behind that.

permalink embed save report reply

> [−] **machacker89** 3 points 7 days ago

I figured it was Microsoft, Apple, Google.

permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **DL72-Alpha** 4 points 7 days ago

I am going to guess this is why Micros(*) has been pushing the 'no local accounts' issue. Why else would they force it. It'd be possible to outlaw any OS that refused to or couldn't do it. I wouldn't put it past that group. It's their MO.

permalink embed save report reply

[−] **archontwo** 5 points 7 days ago

Has anyone considered this push for age verification could be even more sinister? The Epstein Class are so involved maybe they really want to identify and target children on a massive scale not protect them?

These people sick on money and privilege so the thought they have society's best interests at heart is laughable

Just a thought.

permalink embed save report reply

[−] **OpabiniaRegalis320**   4 points 7 days ago

This is not age verification. This is *identity* verification. Its intent is not to protect the youth, it is to track people.

permalink embed save report reply

[−] **Ella-of-the-wood** 3 points 4 days ago

"Freedom only has meaning if it also liberates others." - Toni Morrison

permalink embed save report reply

> [−] **machacker89** 2 points 4 days ago
>
> "I know a traitor before he knows himself." **-Saddam Hussein**
>
> permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **LanderMercer** 4 points 2 days ago

People are here because they are against it. Now how do we organize and push back?

permalink embed save report reply

[−] **celeste00tine** 3 points 8 days ago

Interesting

permalink embed save report reply

[−] **rad2018** 4 points 8 days ago

Is it legal to insist that a proxy demand this from people to participate in a modern equivalent of a public square?

Let's be honest: they're scared of what Meta knows.

At the rate that this surveillance economy is growing, don't be surprised if people take to the streets to make the likes of social media and AI CEOs quite miserable.

And then there are other alternative communications which will bypass the Internet. Remember the days of FidoNet? BTW, they still exist (https://www.fidonet.org).

permalink embed save report reply

[−] **rad2018** 2 points 7 days ago

Can these laws be imposed retroactively on *OLDER* operating systems?

If so, I would imagine that there will be HUGE "gold rush" after everything and anything, and that OS manufacturers will temporarily "close their doors".

Or am I wrong? 🤨

permalink embed save report reply

> [−] **Paumanok** 10 points 7 days ago
>
> Without the age-gate API, users of systems without this API would be defaulted to the lowest age bracket iirc.
>
> So if you don't comply, you can't get any news about ongoing wars(violent), any information about human sexuality(sex, it's in the name! /s), and any foul language that the wife of a child molesting pastor might be offended by.
>
> permalink embed save parent report reply
>
>> [−] **rad2018** 1 point 7 days ago
>>
>> OK, so we're talking censorship of language within text messages? Emails? IRCs?
>>
>> permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **machacker89** 3 points 7 days ago

Short answer. Maybe It would be a huge overhaul and would take a immense amount of resources and developers to implement this change.

permalink embed save parent report reply

> [−] **rad2018** 7 points 7 days ago
>
> There's another way to end this nightmare, too. It's harsh, rather extreme, and very, very simple:
>
> Stop developing software...period.
>
> Don't support *ANY...THING* that's open source anymore. Stop supporting Apache, NGINX, LINUX (in general), etc, etc.
>
> The U.S. federal government RUNS on open source software. Many governments Worldwide RUN on open source software. Why??? It's free (or close to as free as possible). Corporate businesses will have to scramble to find ways of continuing and developing their products written ON TOP OF open source software.
>
> Oh, and let's not forget that most of open source is GPL, Apache, BSD, or some other free (or semi-free) license.
>
> Congratulations!!! Now - YOU - have to pay licenses for EVERYTHING!!!
>
> Oh, and IBM? Good luck on pushing Red Hat since 90%+ of your business model relies COMPLETELY on open source software...AND LINUX.

Shut it down...EVERYTHING. Shut it down.

Period.

Sit on the side and watch de-evolve into chaos.

Biggest caveat are that corporations with deep pockets will create splinter variants existing open source software, then claim it as theirs, right? This will become the fir stake at killing open software development for good...maybe.

I dunno. I know that thoughts like this are probably unwarranted, and could end up working against those who want to keep everything open and as free as possible. But, the thought of having some say, having the final f*** you does sound interesting, does it not?

permalink embed save parent report reply

> [−] **Negative-Permit-5121** 1 point 3 days ago
>
> It won't work. There will always be st*pid people who need to "prove" anyone how smart are they/what big ideas they have... etc. Always there will be some pricks that will do "coding"...
>
> This crap legislation is here to stay and it will be further expanded to ask the ID documents. unless a major incident will happen in the future, something like: [Insert Big Tech company here] was hacked / sold personal data that identifies chidlren and because this, some children were missing or worse
>
> permalink embed save parent report reply
>
> > [−] **rad2018** 1 point 2 days ago
> >
> > Soooo…we're basically f'ed as it will take either a corporate entity to loose names of all of the children, OR for SCOTUS to take 50 years to decide that this whole f'ing thing violates 1A big time, right?
> >
> > permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **themirrazzunhacked** 3 points 7 days ago

I expected as much from Meta, but CSM? I've filed a complaint, and am also going to contact Apple to have them remove CSM ratings from Apple TV. I assume that's a huge chunk of their revenue.

permalink embed save report reply

[−] **8BitGriffin** 2 points 7 days ago

The easy fix to this a to State in the License that the operating system is not for use in what ever specific state. California, Colorado etc. Done, shove your laws up your @$$

permalink embed save report reply

> [−] **GiantSquid_ng** 5 points 7 days ago
>
> Until all states have it.. or worse there is a federal law...
>
> permalink embed save parent report reply
>
> > [−] **Initial-Return8802** 2 points 7 days ago

Easy... not for use in The United States, United Kingdom and Australia. Then I can s
here in Madagascar and still use my OS as it should be without this shit

permalink embed save parent report reply

[–] **_zaphod77_** 1 point 3 days ago

As amusing as the though is, it is unlikely to actually work in any common law country.
Just putting a statement like that up without actually placing non trivial hurdles is likely
to get smacked down hard in court. The device gps or IP would need to be checked to
allow the download, and the os would ahve to refuse to run.

permalink embed save parent report reply

> [–] **8BitGriffin** 1 point 3 days ago
>
> That's the point, if we can get everyone behind just doing license mods. For all
> versions.Then ip based blocking it would be obvious that it would cripple the
> infrastructure. The law has nothing to do with protecting kids and everything to do
> with control.
>
> permalink embed save parent report reply
>
> **load more comments** (1 reply)

[–] **LilShaver** 3 points 7 days ago

In other words, this is absolutely NOT organic, not grass roots.

permalink embed save report reply

[–] **FlashFunk253** 3 points 6 days ago

The real question is - if Meta is funding this to pass the age verification responsibility (and any
subsequent penalties) off to the apps stores and OSs, why isn't Google, Apple, Microsoft, etc.
pushing back? Wouldn't they now be on the hook for age verification?

permalink embed save report reply

> [–] **aaronsb** [S] 1 point 3 days ago
>
> I did some more digging (template 2) and they're likely backing the OS level approach.
> https://www.reddit.com/r/linux/comments/1rr3f3n/followup_to_my_bill_text_compariso
> n_i_traced_who/
>
> permalink embed save parent report reply

[–] **sl0bbyb0bby** 2 points 7 days ago

Thank you for sharing your research, this is a really great and important contribution to the
community.

permalink embed save report reply

[–] **Neither_Reward4884** 2 points 6 days ago

Crazy- what happened to age verification on my driver's license or state ID or a birth certificate
original?

permalink embed save report reply

[−] **Marwheel**   2 points 5 days ago

I wish i could pass this along to u/lproven now…

Also illinois has become yet another casualty of this list of political stupidity.

permalink embed save report reply

> [−] **lproven** 1 point 5 days ago
>
> Any help?
>
> https://www.theregister.com/2026/03/06/os_age_verification/
>
> permalink embed save parent report reply
>
> > [−] **Marwheel**   1 point 5 days ago
> >
> > Thanks for telling me about the situation involving FreeDOS, i was not aware of that until now.
> >
> > permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **libra00** 2 points 5 days ago

Thank you for this thorough and detailed breakdown.

permalink embed save report reply

[−] **philosophical_lens**   2 points 3 days ago

Is there more info on the motivation and entities behind template #2, since that's the one that primarily impacts linux?

permalink embed save report reply

> [−] [deleted] 2 points 3 days ago
>
> I've filed public records requests in **Colorado** and **Louisiana** targeting Meta's lobbyist registrations and the template legislation. Responses (from Colorado) are due this week. Full sourced research: https://theseus-syllogism.github.io/ageattestation/
>
> permalink embed save parent report reply
>
> > [−] **philosophical_lens**   2 points 3 days ago
> >
> > There's already a lot of info in this thread about Meta and template 1. What's missing is the info on template 2.
> >
> > permalink embed save parent report reply

> [−] **aaronsb** [S] 2 points 3 days ago*
>
> In order to stay consistent, I created a new follow up post here. https://www.reddit.com/r/linux/comments/1rr3f3n/followup_to_my_bill_text_comparison_i_traced_who/
>
> permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] [deleted] 2 points 3 days ago

I'm a cybersecurity professional in Colorado. Thank you for this post. It has led me to look deeper into this issue.

The short answer: Meta spent $26.29M on federal lobbying in 2025 with "age assurance" as an active issue. They secretly fund the Digital Childhood Alliance, which pushes template bills in 20 states. A Louisiana legislator admitted on the record that a Meta lobbyist handed him the bill text. **Meta's Horizon OS** already implements the **exact model** these laws mandate. No FOSS exemption exists in any state.

I've filed public records requests in **Colorado** and **Louisiana** targeting Meta's lobbyist registrations and the template legislation. Responses (from Colorado) are due this week. Full sourced research: https://theseus-syllogism.github.io/ageattestation/

permalink   embed   save   report   reply

[–] **gendernihilist** 2 points 3 days ago

What a messy splatter of feces on the wall all this copypaste bill template stuff is, I can't believe (well I CAN believe) the projectile diarrhea from these corporations finds legislators trying to dodge INTO the stream instead of out of it, mouths wide open.

permalink   embed   save   report   reply

[–] **siodhe** 2 points 2 days ago

People need to **make Democratic legislators aware** of the real sources of these bills. Especially the Heritage Foundation, something the Democrats should be seriously allergic to at this point.

It's trivial, for example, to email everyone in the Colorado Senate. Here are their emails. Be sure to send them something intelligent, and keep in mind - they very probably don't know where these come from. They may just see voting for these as a way to boost votes by "Saving the Kids!" (tm). So just show them.

mark.baisley@senate.co.com,
matt.ball.senate@coleg.gov,
jeff.bridges.senate@coleg.gov,
scott.bright.senate@coleg.gov,
john.carson.senate@coleg.gov,
marc.catlin.senate@coleg.gov,
james.coleman.senate@coleg.gov,
lisa.cutter.senate@coleg.gov,
jessie.danielson.senate@coleg.gov,
lindsey.daugherty.senate@coleg.gov,
tony.exum.senate@coleg.gov,
lisa.frizell.senate@coleg.gov,
julie.gonzales.senate@coleg.gov,
nick.hinrichsen.senate@coleg.gov,
iman.jodeh.senate@coleg.gov,
cathy.kipp.senate@coleg.gov,
barbara.kirkmeyer.senate@coleg.gov,
chris.kolker.senate@coleg.gov,
william.lindstedt.senate@coleg.gov,
larry.liston.senate@coleg.gov,
janice.marchman.senate@coleg.gov,

kyle.mullica.senate@coleg.gov,
rod.pelton.senate@coleg.gov,
byron.pelton.senate@coleg.gov,
janicerichsd7@gmail.com, [dylan.roberts.senate@coleg.gov]
(mailto:dylan.roberts.senate@coleg.gov), [robert.rodriguez.senate@coleg.gov]
(mailto:robert.rodriguez.senate@coleg.gov), [cleave.simpson.senate@coleg.gov]
(mailto:cleave.simpson.senate@coleg.gov), [marc.snyder.senate@coleg.gov]
(mailto:marc.snyder.senate@coleg.gov), [tom.sullivan.senate@coleg.gov]
(mailto:tom.sullivan.senate@coleg.gov), [katie.wallace.senate@coleg.gov]
(mailto:katie.wallace.senate@coleg.gov), [mike.weissman.senate@coleg.gov]
(mailto:mike.weissman.senate@coleg.gov), [lynda.zamorawilson.senate@coleg.gov]
(mailto:lynda.zamorawilson.senate@coleg.gov)

permalink embed save report reply

[−] **elkcox13** 2 points 1 day ago

Where and when are we going to start seeing alternatives to this? Loopholes and ways around it?

permalink embed save report reply

[−] **NickelCoder** 2 points 1 day ago

Thanks for sharing! The legislators aren't thinking logically. Even if there was a reliable way to verify age at the time of installation, there's nothing preventing an underage person from using that device.

permalink embed save report reply

[−] **Meowie__Gamer**   2 points 1 day ago

i just want to use my fucking computer...

permalink embed save report reply

> [−] **akm76** 2 points 1 day ago
>
> the whole idea is that it's NOT YOUR computer any more, it's a SERVICE you have to pay for (preferably monthly, but per usage-hour would do too).
>
> See, it's like cloud, but it sits AT YOUR HOUSE and you pay electricity and telecom fees, but you can use it on demand, so it's a colocated AI-access terminal that corporations LEND to you. Oh you also liable for repairs. And insurance. And content fees.
>
> permalink embed save parent report reply

[−] **machacker89** 1 point 7 days ago

Shame on them and we should be shaming them in public.

permalink embed save report reply

[−] **Manarel** 1 point 7 days ago

The template thing is wild. Theyre not even trying to hide the astroturfing anymore. And yeah the Linux part is buried but if it passes it kills independent software distribution. This is about control not protection.< | end_of_thinking | >The template thing is wild. Theyre not even

trying to hide the astroturfing anymore. And yeah the Linux part is buried but if it passes it kills independent software distribution. This is about control not protection.

permalink embed save report reply

[–] **necrophasm616** 1 point 7 days ago

Can we fucking revolt yet, or are you all still busy being lazy and avoiding responsibility...? Still lazy? Kay, I'll come back when the world's on fire.

permalink embed save report reply

> [–] **aaronsb** [S] 1 point 7 days ago
>
> https://youtu.be/eFTLKWw542g?si=hqvPgl68vabJhRJZ
>
> I'm feeling old.
>
> permalink embed save parent report reply

[–] **Cr4zyG4mr** 1 point 6 days ago

https://www.reddit.com/r/DigitalPrivacy/s/vM5Ni0nPWH

permalink embed save report reply

[–] **maz20** 1 point 5 days ago*

Meta, Google, etc are all national security assets, and at a high-enough level are basically arms of (and controlled by) the federal government.

Any "fines" or legal action against them from the federal government is just pure political theater at this point.

Similarly the push for mass surveillance laws and regulations like these also comes from the government as well. Making these "companies" lobby for that is merely a diversion to draw the finger-pointing away from the federal government, just like making these laws publicly appear to originate from within "blue" states like CA/CO/NY/etc is as well.

Needless to say, getting rid of this court-wise would be just like getting rid of warrantless spying by certain three-letter agencies. In other words ---> *it ain't happening!!*

permalink embed save report reply

[–] **Ella-of-the-wood** 1 point 4 days ago

Wow! Great summary! I'm not really sure where things stand in Europe, and especially in France. Lots of discussions are ongoing. (I'll look into it.)

permalink embed save report reply

[–] **hotcornballer** 0 points 7 days ago

Laughs in nixos

permalink embed save report reply

> [–] **aaronsb** [S] 3 points 7 days ago
>
> I use Arch, by the way.
>
> permalink embed save parent report reply
>
> > [–] **hotcornballer** 1 point 7 days ago
> >
> > Im in europe btw

permalink   embed   save   parent   report   reply

load more comments (4 replies)

about

blog
about
advertising
careers

help

site rules
Reddit help center
reddiquette
mod guidelines
contact us

apps & tools

Reddit for iPhone
Reddit for Android
mobile website

<3

reddit premium

Advertise - technology

π