Hey Girls, Did You Know? Slut-Shaming on the Internet Needs to Stop

By EMILY POOLE*

Introduction

A VANDERBILT SORORITY DECIDES TO THROW A PARTY.¹ The girls in charge elect to rent a photo booth for the soirée.² The rental company informs them that the booth has a special feature where the photos can be automatically uploaded to Facebook.³ “Great,” say the girls.⁴ The night of the party arrives, and everyone is drinking alcohol from red plastic cups.⁵ As the hours go by, inhibitions fade away.⁶ A boy and a girl start kissing, and passion moves them to look for a private place.⁷ They find the photo booth.⁸ Clothes come off.⁹ The camera flashes.¹⁰

Bam! The photos hit the Internet and Facebook goes crazy.¹¹ The pictures make their way to Reddit,¹² to Autoadmit,¹³ and to personal
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¹. The following story is based on real-life events that occurred to a student at Vanderbilt University in December of 2012. See Heather Rose, The Vandy Photo Booth Scandal, DESPERATE FOR SOMETHING BLOG (Dec. 11, 2012, 12:37 PM), http://desperateforsomething.blogspot.com/2012/12/the-vandy-photo-booth-scandal.html.
². See id.
³. See KD Formal at Vanderbilt. They Had a Photo Booth That Uploaded Directly to Facebook, REDDIT (Dec. 8, 2012), http://www.reddit.com/r/nsfw/comments/14ibop/kd_formal_at_vanderbilt_they_had_a_photo_booth/ [hereinafter KD Formal].
⁴. See id.
⁵. See id.
⁶. See id.
⁷. See Rose, supra note 1.
⁸. See id.
⁹. See id.
¹⁰. See id.
¹¹. See KD Formal, supra note 3.
¹². Reddit is a news and entertainment website where users submit posts, photos, and videos that are rated on interestingness by other users. See REDDIT, http://www.reddit.com (last visited June 15, 2013).
email accounts. Instantly, the entire world has access to drunken sex pictures of a college couple. And then the comments start. “You ignorant slut.” “I don’t really think shame is in this chick’s vocabulary.” “She’s so screwed.” Internet users learn the girl’s name; that she recently applied to law school; and someone sends the photos to the law schools. “This is a blessing in disguise. Law school is a waste of time and money for women, anyways.” The girl gets kicked off the cheerleading squad and kicked out of her sorority. All of a sudden her future is in jeopardy, and she is subject to humiliation and ridicule.

And the boy? What hardships did those photos cause him? None.

When it comes to sexual expression, females are denied the freedoms enjoyed by males. It is the norm rather than the exception that females are shamed for acting on their sexual desires. Even though sexual acts often take both a male and a female, it is the girl that faces society’s judgment when her behavior is made public. The

15. KD Formal, supra note 3 (“In four hours this image has been viewed 10,508 times. Again, that’s only in four hours. Also, that’s only on imgur, by reddit.”) (comment by Happycrabeatsthefish); id. (“6 hours later, 89,000 views on imgur alone.”) (comment by ThunderBuss).
17. Id. (comment by Moxin24).
18. Id. (comment by Debaser).
20. See Rose, supra note 1.
21. Id.
22. Id.
23. See id.
24. See KD Formal, supra note 3 (“A frat boy at Vanderbilt? I’m pretty sure he’s going to land on his feet.”) (comment by knifegash); id. (“He is a legend now.”) (comment by leshake).
27. Id.; see Rose, supra note 1.
Internet has created a forum for such slut-shaming to occur on a whole new level. Now, when a girl is attacked for her sexuality, her attackers can be spread across the United States, or even the world. They may be classmates and neighbors or complete strangers. The Internet is an incredible resource for sharing and gaining information, but it is also allowing attacks on female sexuality to flourish.

While slut-shaming can and does occur to females of all ages, this Article focuses on its prevalence among teen and preteen girls. At these young ages, females are at their most impressionable. As such, the consequences of slut-shaming are more pronounced in youth. However, this impressionability can also be used for good—to make positive changes. If young boys and girls are educated about the importance of treating everyone equally and with respect, their liberal attitudes can help alleviate the discriminatory attitude that still permeates our society.

The online shaming that occurs to young women falls under the umbrella of the malicious practice known as cyberbullying. Cyberbullying is defined as “willful and repeated harm inflicted through the use of computers, cell phones, and other electronic de-

28. Frequently Answered Questions, Finally, A Feminism 101 Blog, http://finallyfeminism101.wordpress.com/2010/04/04/what-is-slut-shaming/ (Apr. 4, 2010) [hereinafter Finally, A Feminism 101 Blog] (“Slut-shaming . . . is the idea of shaming and/or attacking a woman or a girl for being sexual, having one or more sexual partners, acknowledging sexual feelings, and/or acting on sexual feelings.”); see discussion infra Part II.


33. See Sameer Hinduja & Justin W. Patchin, Bullying Beyond the Schoolyard: Preventing and Responding to Cyberbullying 5 (Corwin Press 2009) (defining cyberbullying).
Because actions and legislation that address cyber slut-shaming can also remedy other types of cyberbullying, the problems and proposed solutions elaborated in this Article can be expanded to include all types of cyberbullying. This Article addresses a specific and pervasive harm—that caused by sexual shaming—to help bring attention to both the repercussions of cyberbullying and the broader gender inequality that persists in forums and social networking sites across the Internet. By bringing attention to the issue, this Article attempts to accomplish the first step in solving a problem—recognizing and understanding the harm.

The United States has recently begun to acknowledge the harmful nature of cyberbullying on teens. Unfortunately, the conversation about online bullying has yet to include a focus on the unique harms faced by females; namely, attacks on female sexuality. Cyberbullying and cyber slut-shaming are still trivialized in courtrooms and discussion groups as “puerile attempts by adolescents to outdo each other.” Current legislation is not sufficient in preventing and remedying these harms. First, § 230 of the Communications Decency Act (“CDA”) currently grants complete immunity to Internet Service Providers (“ISPs”) and websites for defamatory, private, or offensive content posted by third parties on their sites. Such online intermediaries, therefore, have no incentive to monitor the bullying that occurs on their sites, offering teens an unregulated forum for cyberbullying. Second, the anti-bullying statutes of most states do not grant schools clear power to punish or reprimand cyberbullies who attack their victims while off-campus, nor do they provide sufficient guidance about how administrators should address cyberbullying. Finally, victims are often unable to find relief though tort claims, such as

34. Id.
38. See infra Part III–V.
40. See infra Part III.
41. See infra Part IV.
defamation and intentional infliction of emotional distress, when choosing to pursue a cyberbully in court.42

Part I of this Article opens with a discussion of teen Internet use and the emergence of online social networking sites. Part II defines slut-shaming and examines its prevalence on various sites and forums across the Internet. Additionally, Part II describes the impact of cyber slut-shaming and cyberbullying on young females and explains why online shaming and bullying are worse than their “traditional” face-to-face counterparts. Part III describes how the CDA protects service providers from liability for cyberbullying that occurs on their sites and proposes an amendment that would make providers responsible for removing bullying content upon request from the victim. Part IV discusses state and national anti-bullying statutes and argues for more guidance and clarity. Finally, Part V explains why tort law is not a good option for teenaged cyber-bullying victims.

The legal system can respond to these critiques in the following ways: First and foremost, Congress should amend the CDA to impose liability on ISPs and websites for, upon notification, failure to remove defamatory or bullying content about children seventeen years of age and younger.43 Second, every state should amend its anti-bullying statute, or, alternatively, the federal government should pass an anti-cyberbullying statute.44 Such statutes should define the power and responsibilities of schools when dealing with cyberbullying and clearly grant schools the authority to address on-campus and off-campus cyberbullying. Finally, courts should recognize the real and harmful effect of cyberbullying on victims and allow tort claims to proceed against cyberbullies.45 The courtroom route, however, is not practical for most victims; it should be reserved for only the most egregious forms of cyberbullying and should be considered the absolute last resort.

It is important to note that cyber slut-shaming is not the only type of cyberbullying occurring among youth. Young, homosexual men feel the effects of cyberbullying based on sexuality just as much as young women.46 In fact, anyone who is seen as “different” is suscepti-
ble to attacks by cyberbullies. This Article does not mean to trivialize the harms felt by people who are bullied on a basis other than female sexuality or purport to argue that cyber slut-shaming is the worst form of bullying. All forms of cyberbullying are offensive. The purpose of focusing on one particularly cruel type of bullying is to call attention to both the severity of cyber slut-shaming and the pervasiveness of gender inequality on the web.

I. The Internet: The New Digital Hangout

The Internet has become this generation’s hangout. Teens and preteens no longer need their parents or older siblings to cart them back and forth between their homes, movie theatres, or shopping centers to meet up with their peers. Face-to-face interactions are being replaced with computer screens. These days, a teen need only pull a phone out of his or her purse or back pocket, and, with a few clicks, he or she can link up with both friends and strangers through various websites and social networks.

One would be hard-pressed to find a teenager not connected to the digital world in some fashion. Reports from the Pew Research Center show that 97% of teens aged twelve to seventeen access the Internet and that 75% do so through a mobile device. This ease in connectivity has shifted the way teens interact by decreasing the amount of time teens communicate in person. The Internet allows for immediate, widespread, and ever-present communication—which can be both a blessing and a curse.

47. Risk Factors, supra note 36 (describing children that “[a]re perceived as different from their peers” as at risk for bullying).
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51. The Internet is a great resource for quickly and easily learning vast amounts of information. However, when the shared information is meant to defame, harass, or hurt an
A. Facebook

Since its inception in 2004, Facebook has exploded into the social networking website. In 2012, Facebook hit one billion active users. That same year, Facebook also captured the title of number one U.S. mobile app and ranked as number one in app engagement. At the end of 2012, 680 million active users were signed into Facebook mobile apps. Facebook app usage currently accounts for 23% of users’ time spent on mobile apps. This means that when you see someone on his or her phone, there is a near one in four chance that person is browsing Facebook!

Facebook allows users to connect through updates, photos, messages, and pages. Not only can users share information with other Facebook friends, depending on their privacy settings, it is incredibly easy to share posted information with strangers. Even if an individual user chooses not to share personal photos and updates, there are few restrictions in place to prevent others from uploading and sharing photos and comments containing that individual’s name or image. While users can alert Facebook to undesirable or abusive information that they wish to be removed, Facebook’s user policy individual, the speed and effortless manner in which the information is disseminated is less desirable.

57. Lipsman, supra note 55.
58. See id.
61. See id. ("[Y]our friends and others may share information about you. They may share photos or other information about you and tag you in their posts. If you do not like a particular post, tell them or report the post.").
gives the site considerable discretion in deciding whether to actually remove the offending material.62

For instance, classmates of fourteen-year-old Alex Boston created a fake Facebook page using Alex’s information.63 The page made it appear that Alex used drugs, left obscene and sexual comments on others’ pages, and spoke a language called “Retardish.”64 Upon learning about the page, Alex and her parents contacted Facebook and requested the page be removed. Facebook, however, did not take down the page.65

B. Tumblr

Tumblr is a microblogging and social networking site where users can post “text, photos, quotes, links, music, and videos” from a “browser, phone, desktop, email or wherever [one] happen[s] to be.”66 Unlike more traditional blogging sites,67 Tumblr users are not expected to post full-length articles but rather can post short quips or a single photo.68 This feature has attracted younger users who do not want to expend the time or energy on the upkeep of a blog, preferring to post or repost sporadic quotes or photos.69

Founded in February 2007, Tumblr has over ninety-eight million blogs and forty-four billion posts.70 Users can follow friends or other bloggers that have set their privacy settings to public and can allow friends or strangers to follow their own blog.71 The site is largely used by teens and college-aged persons with users under twenty-five repre-

64. Id.
65. Id.
67. Traditional blogs tend to consist of text-based content posted daily, or almost daily, by the blog owner.
70. Id.
71. See How to Make a Private Tumblr Blog, HOW-TO GEEK (July 23, 2010), http://www.howtogeek.com/howto/22806/how-to-make-a-private-tumblr-blog/ (“By default, Tumblr blogs are available for all the world to see.”).
senting over half of all total users. Teens aged fourteen to seventeen are two times as likely to visit Tumblr when compared to the average Internet user.

Tumblr offers “Community Guidelines” to its users, one of which states, “Don’t bully minors, even if you are one. Life as a teenager is hard enough without the fear, anguish, and isolation caused by online bullying.” A violation of these policies could result in an email notification and, subsequently, account suspension or a blocked IP address. Although Tumblr reserves the right to monitor undesirable content, it does not have a clear system in place where users can request removal of offending content. Similar to Facebook, users can contact Tumblr and ask that Tumblr remove offensive content, but Tumblr does not have to honor the request.

C. Formspring and Ask.fm

Formspring and Ask.fm are digital question and answer platforms—the latest trend in websites popular among teens and preteens. These sites allow users to sign up using their names, photos, and bios—which then become publicly available information—and ask (often controversial) questions. Other users browse the site and respond to posted questions. Responses can be submit-

---

72. Lipsman, supra note 69.
73. Id.
75. Id.
76. See id.
77. See id. For a discussion of Tumblr staff ignoring removal requests, see Dion Beary, Racial Abuse on Tumblr Goes Ignored by Support Staff, BLACK KIDS TABLE (July 30, 2012), http://theblackkidstable.wordpress.com/2012/07/30/racial-abuse-on-tumblr-goes-ignored-by-support-staff/.
78. Formspring began as a social question and answer site but was recently relaunched as a site designed for users with shared interests to connect and discuss those interests. Sarah Perez, Formspring Relaunches as an Interest-Based Social Network, TECHCRUNCH (June 19, 2012), http://techcrunch.com/2012/06/19/formspring-relaunches-as-interest-based-social-network/; About Formspring, FORMSPRING, http://www.formspring.me/about/ (last visited June 23, 2013).
82. See Vaknin, supra note 81; see also ASK.FM, supra note 79.
ted anonymously. Ask.fm currently has more than fifty million users worldwide.

Formspring was thrust into the spotlight when user Alexis Pilkington, a seventeen-year-old high school student in Suffolk County, New York, committed suicide after being severely bullied online. Formspring was similarly implicated in the cyberbullying-related suicide of fifteen-year-old U.K. student Natasha MacBryde. Natasha ended her life by jumping in front of a railway train.

Question and answer sites such as Formspring and Ask.fm are a growing concern, as each can essentially act as a platform for anonymous bullying. While both sites retain the right to monitor or amend content, neither site states that it will monitor the content on the site or screen its users.

Online social networking has become the norm for teens in the past decade. More than 80% of teens on the Internet aged twelve to seventeen use social networking sites with most logging in daily to check their pages. Essentially, social networking has become central to many teenagers lives. In fact, asked to choose between their sense of smell or access to technology, 53% of youth aged sixteen to twenty-two would pick their laptops over their noses.

Social networking sites currently face zero legal consequences when third parties post offensive, bullying, or defamatory content. While users of some platforms can request the removal of offensive content, the sites’ terms of service generally grant the sites broad dis-

83. See Vaknin, supra note 81; see also Ask.fm, supra note 79.
85. Vaknin, supra note 81.
86. Teenager in Rail Suicide Was Sent Abusive Message on Social Networking Site, TELEGRAPH (July 22, 2011), http://www.telegraph.co.uk/technology/social-media/8653867/Teenager-in-rail-suicide-was-sent-abusive-message-on-social-networking-site.html (”[Natasha’s] parents . . . said they believed anonymous messages on Formspring had played a significant role in the events leading up to her death.”).
87. Id.
88. Van Grove, supra note 80.
91. Leslie Horn, Majority of Kids Would Rather Lose Their Sense of Smell Than Lose Facebook, PCMag (May 20, 2011), http://www pcmag.com/article2/0,2817,2385960,00.asp.
92. See infra Part III.
cretion in deciding whether to actually remove the material. As such, social networking sites can act as unregulated havens for bullies to attacks their victims.

II. A New Age of Harassment: Cyber Slut-Shaming

Slut-shaming is the act or idea of attacking a female for being sexual. The purpose of slut-shaming is to make a woman feel guilty or inferior for acting in ways that do not conform with traditional gender expectations, such as having more than one sexual partner, acting on sexual feelings, or wearing revealing clothing.95

In the United States, women have long been judged by their sexuality. Historically, as a culture that held men out as the breadwinners and women as the homemakers, women were expected to be pure and submissive.96 It was not until the 1960s and 1970s that the modern women’s sexual liberation movement finally emerged.97 With strong feminist writers and leaders like Betty Friedan,98 Gloria Steinem,99 and Kate Millett,100 women began to embrace their sexuality openly and in public.101 Birth control use increased, as did the number of women who had sex outside of marriage.102

93. See, e.g., Ask.fm Terms of Service, supra note 89; Formspring Terms of Service, supra note 89; Facebook Community Standards, supra note 62.
94. Finally, a Feminism 101 Blog, supra note 28.
95. See Tanenbaum, supra note 25, at xiv–xv.
While the past forty years have seen the United States adopt a more accepting view of women’s sexuality, slut-shaming remains a tremendous problem. Although society might now accept and expect a woman to engage in sex outside of marriage, we still expect women’s sexual behavior to be tied to feelings of love. In other words, a female can have sex with a man she has emotional feelings for, but casual meaningless sex is still taboo.

Women are not only judged on sexual activity but also on the clothes they wear and their own attitudes about sexuality. Women who wear tight shirts, short skirts, or bare their cleavage open themselves up to slut-shaming. As do women who are deemed sexually aggressive or too forward in their sexual advances. Ironically enough, women who do not have sex or act sexually can still be subjected to slut-shaming. We live in an era where the word “slut” is tossed around anytime a woman does something that another person does not like.

Slut-shaming not only demeans women, but it also highlights the sexual double standard still rampant in our society. This double standard is the belief that men can freely engage in sexual behavior, but that women should engage in such behavior only when in love or in a committed relationship. When a woman acts outside of this norm, she will be stigmatized and shamed. The emotional harms caused by slut-shaming can follow a woman around for years, damage her self-perception, and possibly cause her to either dismiss her own feelings.
sexuality or be labeled as easy, thus becoming a target for further harassment or even rape.\textsuperscript{113} Women’s sexual histories and sexual expression are still used against them in harassment or rape instances. In March of 2013, two Steubenville, Ohio football players were sentenced to juvenile jail for sexually assaulting a sixteen-year-old girl.\textsuperscript{114} Online responses to the sentences focused on the fault of the girl.\textsuperscript{115} In Twitter posts, users called her “drunk,” “loose,” and “slutty,” claiming that she was to blame for the rape.\textsuperscript{116} At the same time, a similar story unfolded across the country in Torrington, Connecticut, where authorities arrested seventeen-year-old and eighteen-year-old male athletes for sexually assaulting thirteen-year-old girls.\textsuperscript{117} After the arrests, social media users blamed the girls for hanging around with older guys.\textsuperscript{118} Users called the girls “sluts” and “whores” and faulted them for “ruining” the lives of the male rapists.\textsuperscript{119} Even an eleven-year-old girl, who was gang raped by eighteen young men in Cleveland, Texas, experienced such victim blaming when, in breaking the story, the media seemed to justify the men’s assaults by focusing on the girl’s behavior: “[S]he dressed older than her age, wearing makeup and fashions more appropriate to a woman in her 20s. She would hang out with teenage boys at a playground.”\textsuperscript{120}

Slut-shaming is a serious problem. It harms women’s self-perceptions, breeds gender inequality, and perpetuates the rape culture.\textsuperscript{121} These days, one has to go no further than the Internet to see the prevalence of slut-shaming.

\textsuperscript{113} Id. at 229.
\textsuperscript{115} Tweets of Privilege, \textit{PUBLIC SHAMING} (Mar. 17, 2013), http://publicshaming.tumblr.com/day/2013/03/17.
\textsuperscript{116} Id.
\textsuperscript{119} Id.
\textsuperscript{121} \textit{See} \textit{FINALLY, A FEMINISM 101 BLOG, supra note 28} (discussing “[t]he effects of slut-shaming and what we can do about it”).
A. Slut-Shaming on the Internet: “Hey Girls, Did You Know?”

The entire planet is connected through a worldwide network of computers. The Internet has opened the floodgates on instant and widespread communication. Send an email from California; a recipient in Beijing can open it in a number of seconds. Post a photo to Facebook; that picture will be almost instantaneously available to any one of your Facebook friends. However, because no one entity controls the Internet, anyone and everyone can post anything that he or she wants. There is no omniscient being editing our posts or nixing offending material. A user simply decides to post something, clicks submit, and that content is on the Internet for the world to see. Of course, there is the risk of posting something that will later be deemed illegal or taken down by a service provider, but that is an after-the-fact risk. There are no boundaries to an initial posting. And that means some online communications will be undesirable, even harmful.

In June 2012, Tumblr user @officialsabrina_xo posted what would soon become the next Internet craze among teens: the “Hey Girls, Did You Know?” meme. An Internet meme is a video, image, catchphrase, or other viral phenomenon that is shared person-to-person over the web. This particular meme featured four sequential pictures of a teenage girl with four different captions that read, “Girls, did you know . . . . That uhm, Your boobs Go inside your shirt.” Tumblr removed the post, but not before it had been seen and reblogged by numerous users.

The four-panel meme went viral and inspired numerous spin-offs and response posts. The spin-offs ranged from cruel—“Hey girls. Did you know? That you spread Nutella. . .Not your legs,” and “For the girls that say . . all guys are the same — nobody told you to try them all . . SLUT” to positive—“Hey Girls, did you know that uhm. . .Your boobs. . .Can go wherever they want. . .Because it’s YOUR body,” and “Girls, did ‘ya know. . .That, uhm. Your Boobs Are

125. Id.
something to be proud of!" These memes have been compiled into a “Hey Girls, Did You Know” Facebook page that currently has over 45,500 likes. While arguably humorous, these memes are, nonetheless, a digital form of slut-shaming. They exacerbate harmful gender stereotypes, espousing the idea that there is something wrong or shameful with a girl who embraces her sexuality and that it is okay to attack a female when she wears a short skirt or a low-cut top.

Further troubling is the existence of a Facebook page named “12-year-old sluts.” The page contains pictures of young girls who dress “too sexy,” and the page operators encourage visitors to post cruel comments under the photos in order to “put these sluts in their place.”

It is important to note that these attacks on females and female sexuality are not led solely by males. For instance, the posters behind the Hey Girls, Did You Know meme are overwhelmingly female. In the patriarchal culture of the United States, which “defines women’s worth by their physical attractiveness and limits their ability to distinguish themselves by other means,” women slut-shame other women to compete for male approval. Females also participate in slut-shaming as a way to feel powerful. “If you feel insecure or ashamed about your own sexual desires, all you have to do is call a girl a ‘slut’ and suddenly you’re the one who is ‘good’ and on top of the social pecking order.”

Sadly, the most severe psychological harms caused by cyber slut-shaming can be described through the tragic stories of girls like Amanda Todd, Felicia Garcia, Rehtaeh Parsons, and Hope

128. About Hey Girls, Did You Know. . ., supra note 122.
132. See About Hey Girls, Did You Know. . ., supra note 122.
134. Id.
135. Tanenbaum, supra note 25, at 238.
136. Id.
137. See infra Part II.A.1.
138. See infra Part II.A.2.
139. See infra Part II.A.3.
All four of these girls were victims of cyber slut-shaming. All four of them turned to suicide to end the harassment.

1. **Amanda Todd**

When Amanda Todd was twelve years old she began using a video-chatting site that connected her with strangers. One of these strangers told Amanda that she was “stunning” and asked her to flash her breasts, and she did. The stranger captured a photo while Amanda was topless. A year later, he found Amanda on Facebook and told her that he would send the topless image to her friends and family unless she “put on a show” for him over a web cam. She did not, and so he sent the photo.

Amanda only discovered that the photo had been shared when the police showed up at her house one night at four a.m. to tell Amanda and her parents that the topless photo was circulating the web. Unfortunately, it was too late to do anything, and the photo made its way to the computer screens of her classmates. Then the cyberbullying began. The man continued posting the topless photo around Facebook. Amanda’s classmates turned against her, circulating the photo and calling her names. Amanda switched schools three times, but she could not evade harassment because the Internet connected her new classmates to her old classmates. She had no escape.

A few years after the incident, a boy from Amanda’s first high school convinced her to engage in sexual activity with him while he had a girlfriend. Afterward, the boy told his friends and girlfriend,

140. See infra Part II.A.4.
143. Grenoble, supra note 141.
144. Id.
145. Id.
146. Ng, supra note 142.
147. See id.
148. ChiaVideos, Amanda Todd’s Story: Struggle, Bullying, Suicide, Self Harm, YouTube (Oct. 11, 2012), http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ej7afkypUsr.
149. Id.
150. See id.
151. Id.
and a mob physically attacked Amanda at her new school. The shaming increased. Amanda tried to kill herself by drinking bleach. She survived, but the tormenting did not stop. Bullies began making fun of her for the suicide attempt, posting memes like, “Make a mess out of life? Don’t worry! Bleach has you covered!” and comments like, “Sick of seeing Amanda Todd on my news feed, let’s focus our attention on more important matters, like cats. [T]hey’re not whores.”

Feeling hopeless and ashamed, Amanda hanged herself in October of 2012. Before she took her life, Amanda posted a video to YouTube. In the video, Amanda shared her heartbreaking story through a series of note cards. The video currently has over sixteen million views. Sadly, even after her death, people still attack Amanda’s sexuality. Posts on “R.I.P. Amanda Todd” Facebook pages claim that a girl who is willing to expose her breasts over the Internet got what she deserved. Other posts contain pictures of a girl hanging herself, comments on drinking bleach, and hateful messages like, “Posts her own tits online then kills herself. Gets Internet sympathy for suddenly not being responsible for her own actions.”

2. Felicia Garcia

Felicia Garcia jumped in front of a train in a Staten Island subway station in October of 2012 after facing unrelenting bullying at her school.
high school. Felicia, fifteen years old, was the victim of a major online and offline slut-shaming and bullying campaign for having sex with four football players at a party. Felicia’s classmates, notably the football team, tormented her in the hallways and classrooms of their school for her sexual behavior. Unfortunately, when the day was over, Felicia could not leave these hurtful comments on school property because her classmates continued the bullying over Facebook. Felicia tried to complain to school authorities, but no action was taken to stop the bullying or address Felicia’s emotions, and the situation resulted in tragedy.

3. Rehtaeh Parsons

Rehtaeh Parsons was a seventeen-year-old high school student in Nova Scotia who hanged herself in April of 2013. When Rehtaeh was fifteen, she was raped by four teenage boys while passed-out drunk at a party. Someone took a photo of the rape and shared it through social media. The photo quickly made it to her classmates’ cell phones and spread around her community. Rehtaeh went to the police, but officers determined that there was insufficient evidence to either file charges for rape or for distribution of the nude photo.

Rehtaeh’s classmates did not support her after the horrifying event. Rehtaeh was called a “slut” and was bullied relentlessly both online and offline. Boys began texting Rehtaeh and sending her Facebook messages, harassing her and asking for sex. Rehtaeh’s

164. Id.
165. Id.
166. See id.
167. See id.
170. Id.
171. Id.
172. Id.
174. Id.
175. Id.
family was forced to relocate when the bullying became unbearable.\footnote{176} Rehtaeh wound up switching high schools four times in one year and was hospitalized for psychiatric care due to suicidal tendencies.\footnote{177} Two years of torment plus a lack of legal recourse ultimately led Rehtaeh to take her own life.\footnote{178}

4. Hope Witsell

Hope Witsell was only thirteen when she hanged herself with her favorite scarf.\footnote{179} When Hope was twelve, she sent a topless photo to her boyfriend as a text message.\footnote{180} A classmate got a hold of the boy’s phone and sent the photo to other students.\footnote{181} The photo quickly went viral throughout six different schools in the area.\footnote{182} Bullies anonymously attacked Hope on a MySpace page entitled Shields Middle School Burn Book, writing cruel and hateful things about her.\footnote{183}

Hope’s parents knew that she was upset, but they had no idea about the extent of the bullying.\footnote{184} School officials could see that something bad was going on, but it is unclear whether they tried to contact Hope’s parents.\footnote{185}

B. The Impact of Slut-Shaming

The stories of the girls mentioned above show the painful impact of cyber slut-shaming. These girls did not only suffer due to cyberbullying, they were also victims of the vicious and pervasive sexism still existent in our culture.\footnote{187} Each one of them was made to feel
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ashamed for acting on natural sexual impulses. It is important to realize that their behavior was not outside of the norm—they were just a few of the unlucky girls to have their pictures reach the Internet. Sadly, many more females than those mentioned here have experienced such online shaming and, like Amanda, Felicia, Rehtaeh, and Hope, chose to end their lives through suicide.


The thread that ties each one of these girls’ stories together is that each was shamed, in one form or another, based on female sexuality. One would be hard pressed to find examples of heterosexual boys in the same age group getting called out for sharing provocative photos or having sex with girls. The lives of the four girls above ended in the most tragic of ways, all because of slut-shaming. However, suicide is by no means the only harm endured by females who are attacked based on sexuality. Shaming a girl into feeling negatively about her body or sexual expression leads to emotional and physiological distress. In our culture, females are expected to be pretty and dress nicely. They are expected to be sexy, but not too sexy. It is a difficult, if not impossible, standard to achieve. Ultimately, it is an undesirable standard because it is unhealthy for females to focus so much on looks and perfection, especially young females.

These young girls are receiving mixed messages about sex. Media and culture tell them that they have to be sexy and skinny, but when they go too far, they are harassed for being too sexy and too skinny. This leads to uneasy and anxious feelings about sexuality. As a result, adolescent girls may carry problems with intimacy and sexual expression well into the adult phases of their lives, if not forever. Girls may be unsure how to act because of society’s competing expectations—they must be sexually attractive, while still maintaining an aura of purity and virginity. This creates an uncertainty about having sex, about not knowing when or how to say “yes” or “no.” Many girls end up engaging in sexual acts that they did not really want to.
engage in. They may feel guilty or afraid to disappoint. These shameful feelings and beliefs all exacerbate the negative sexual stereotypes society imposes on females.

It is also of great concern that slut-shaming reinforces society’s double standard and traditional gender roles, thereby elongating the road toward equality. Slut-shaming perpetuates the idea that there are differences between males and females—that men should be applauded for their sexual exploits, while women should feel ashamed.

Finally, slut-shaming has a severe impact on the way our culture treats rape. When a female steps forward and reports that she was raped, one of the first questions raised is: Was it her fault? Peers, adults, media, and courts all give attention to how much make-up a girl uses, the type of clothing she wears, how late she stays out, and how she acts toward males. These factors should have no part in the rape analysis. There is nothing a female might do, say, or wear that could ever justify someone raping her.

When bullies shame a girl who comes forward after being raped, they trivialize the female’s trauma and blame her for the rapist’s behavior. These bullies not only harm the victim, but their actions also adversely affect other females. Every female is a potential victim of sexual assault. When girls are exposed to a culture where rape victims are shamed, the fear of such shaming acts to silence other victims from disclosing sexual assaults.

C. Why Slut-Shaming and Bullying Are Worse Online

Slut-shaming has been around much longer than the Internet. Unfortunately, the Internet has provided a platform for the shaming to be publicized in a manner never before possible. Shamers can attack females in a global forum that can be seen by anyone with access to a computer, and they can do it without revealing their identity.
The Internet has expanded the power and scope of shaming. This is due to (1) anonymity and the lack of consequences; (2) the allowance of instant and widespread communication; (3) the near impossible removal of harmful material; (4) the availability of a forum that is often beyond the reach of parents’ and teachers’ eyes; and (5) a lack of respite from torment.

1. Anonymity and Lack of Consequences

On the Internet, we are free to be whoever we want to be. Computer screens shield our faces and voices from recognition. This anonymity offers users the freedom to do or say what they might not otherwise for fear of embarrassment or retribution. The anonymity of the Internet gives cyberbullies courage and free reign to attack others because they know they will not be detected.207 Before the Internet, victims knew who their attackers were because the bullying occurred face-to-face; now, pseudonyms and nameless posts can make it nearly impossible for victims to know the source of an online threat.208 The inability to punish cyberbullying as we would traditional face-to-face bullying makes it very appealing for today’s bullies to use the Internet to attack their victims.209

2. Instant and Widespread Communication

Another significant factor that changes the scope of bullying is that the Internet allows for instant and widespread communication. Cruel and embarrassing content “can be sent to a large number of people in a short period of time.”210 Whereas before, if a student posted a humiliating picture on a girl’s locker, it would only be seen by whoever walked by the locker. These days, all it takes is a post on one website, and that picture can be seen and shared by hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of people.211 Amanda Todd, for instance, attempted to distance herself from bullying by switching schools.212

---
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But the Internet is not confined to a single locale, and the bullying followed her because her former classmates informed her new classmates of Amanda’s situation, gave them access to the offensive online content, and incited them to continue the bullying.213

3. Impossible to Take Down

Similarly, once a picture or comment is posted, it is there to stay. The Internet does not have an instant removal button. Unlike the locker scenario where the girl can immediately take down the offending picture, embarrassing content posted online cannot be easily removed.214 It is possible to entreat a service provider to take down offending material,215 but, more likely than not, the material will have already been seen and shared by many. Trying to get the content taken down is like playing a game of whac-a-mole.216 Take a photo down on one webpage, and it is likely to immediately appear again on another.

4. Lack of Supervision

Additionally, there is a lack of supervision in the cyber world. It is hard for parents and teachers to see or hear someone being bullied when those adults may not have access to the digital space where the bullying occurs. In many of the female suicide cases, the girls’ parents and teachers did not realize the extent of the bullying that lead to the death of their daughter or student until they obtained access to her social media accounts after her death.217

5. Lack of Respite

Finally, online bullying is different than face-to-face bullying because the attacks follow the victim around every hour of the day. Victims cannot escape their attackers by simply leaving the school grounds. Phones, laptops, and home computers are the forum for the bullying, and those forums are with the victims throughout the day.
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The home is no longer a place of refuge for someone who is being victimized.

Telling kids to simply stay off the Internet to avoid being bullied is not the solution. Even if the victim avoids viewing the hurtful posts and comments, the content is still disseminated to friends and classmates, which can incite further offline bullying. Additionally, the Internet has become an indispensable part of life—used for communication, homework, and entertainment. Expecting someone to avoid logging onto such a system is asking her to forgo a valuable and essential resource.

III. Addressing the Issue—Intermediary Liability

Section 230 of the CDA currently protects online service providers—both ISPs and websites—from liability for content posted by third parties. This means that service providers have no obligation to remove bullying content from their sites. Cyberbullying has become a serious threat to the safety and emotional well-being of teens and preteens. It is time to amend § 230 and scale back the immunity provided to these intermediaries.

Congress passed § 230 of the CDA in 1996. At that time, the Internet was radically different from what we know it as today. The web was used for sending and receiving email or for browsing the handful of news sites that had web publications—there was not much other content available. In fact, in 1996, the average American with Internet access spent less than thirty minutes a month surfing the web. This means that teens and preteens did not communicate with each other over the Internet in the way they do today. The social networking boom had yet to hit; there was no Facebook or Tumblr. Without forums in which it could occur, cyberbullying was not yet a problem—it was not even a word.
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The rapid expansion of the Internet has changed all of this. Cyberbullying is now a serious, recurring issue that can and does lead to tragedy.\footnote{See discussion supra Part II.} While § 230 might have made sense in 1996, the harms created by granting service providers immunity for third-party content now outweigh the benefits.\footnote{See id.} It is time for service providers to be held accountable for cyberbullying that occurs on their sites.

A. History of Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act

For the reasons described in Section II.C—namely, the anonymity of the Internet and the ability to quickly and easily post or repost online content—it is often too hard or impractical for victims to discover the identity of, or reprimand, a cyberbully.\footnote{See discussion supra Part.II.C.} As such, a victim may be tempted to hold the ISP or website liable for the defamatory or harassing content posted on its site. These providers are, in fact, supplying the platform on which the bullying occurs. Section 230 prevents this option by providing a safe harbor for online intermediaries so long as they are not the creators or developers of the bullying, defamatory, or other tortious content.\footnote{47 U.S.C § 230(c)(1).}

Congress passed § 230 in response to \textit{Stratton Oakmont v. Prodigy Services Company}.\footnote{No. 031063/94, 1995 WL 323710 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. May 24, 1995).} In that case, Prodigy, an ISP, was sued over defamatory content posted by an anonymous user on Prodigy’s online bulletin board.\footnote{Id.} Labeling Prodigy a “publisher,” the court held Prodigy liable for defamation.\footnote{Id.} The court deemed Prodigy a publisher (as opposed to a distributor—which only faces liability if it knew, or had reason to know of defamatory content) because, rather than disclaim control over the content on its site, Prodigy purported to regulate and edit its message boards.\footnote{Id.} Since Prodigy retained some amount of editorial discretion over the posts on its site, the court decided that Prodigy—and other such sites—would be treated similar to publishing houses and, therefore, liable for any defamatory content posted by its users.\footnote{See id.}

After Prodigy, online service providers lacked incentive to regulate content because they did not want to be treated as publishers and thus
expose themselves to greater liability than an ISP or website without editorial control.\footnote{234} The effect of \textit{Prodigy} was that a site would either take a completely hands-off approach and not monitor any content, or it would choose to edit content and remove any and all posts that could potentially open it up to liability.\footnote{235} Neither option was considered desirable because either the service provider would not remove any offensive postings for fear of liability, or it would remove too much content for the same reason, thereby chilling speech.\footnote{236}

As a solution, § 230 of the CDA was passed to encourage service providers to take a proactive stance and remove offensive material from their sites without fear of liability for not removing all defamatory or offensive content.\footnote{237} Section 230 was meant to protect websites and ISPs who acted in good faith when editing their sites.\footnote{238} However, today, intermediaries use it more like a shield from certain types of liability.\footnote{239} Since the law does not require service providers to remove offensive content, the providers tend not to remove content—thus, the prevalence of cyberbullying posts and victims’ struggles in getting ISPs and websites to remove those posts.\footnote{240}

The first case to implicate § 230 involved an anonymous user—claiming to be someone named Ken Zeran—posting offensive messages on AOL about the Oklahoma City Bombings of 1995.\footnote{241} The user posted Zeran’s actual phone number alongside the messages.\footnote{242} The real Ken Zeran soon began receiving abusive phone calls and even death threats.\footnote{243} Zeran notified AOL, who eventually removed the posts.\footnote{244} The anonymous user, however, set up new accounts and continued to post messages as Zeran. Ken Zeran sued AOL for negligence, claiming that AOL had a duty to promptly remove the offend-
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ing content, post a retraction, and screen future content from the anonymous user.\textsuperscript{245} The court, however, ruled that § 230 provided absolute immunity to AOL, regardless of whether it was aware of the defamatory content.\textsuperscript{246}

In \textit{Zeran}, the court was afraid that requiring online service providers to honor take down requests would impose an impossible burden on ISPs and websites.\textsuperscript{247} In deciding whether the request was legitimate, the service provider would have to conduct "a careful yet rapid investigation of the circumstances surrounding the posted information, a legal judgment concerning the information’s defamatory character, and an on-the-spot editorial decision whether to risk liability by allowing the continued publication of that information."\textsuperscript{248} The sheer number of posts on the Internet would make these inquiries near impossible.\textsuperscript{249} Therefore, service providers would have a tremendously strong incentive to remove all postings upon notification without an inquiry into its defamatory status, thereby chilling online speech and implicating the right to free speech.\textsuperscript{250}

\textbf{B. Amending the Communications Decency Act}

It is time to reconsider whether granting online intermediaries total discretion and immunity when dealing with defamatory, hateful, or bullying content posted by third parties is logical. The growing number of teenage suicides caused by online bullying shows that the current system needs a make-over; it is time to amend § 230 and hold service providers liable for the cruel and hateful messages on their sites that are directed at youth.

Unarguably, such an amendment raises concerns. The Internet is an incredible, continually evolving information-sharing resource. By holding intermediaries liable for third-party content, there is a risk of stifling Internet growth and development.\textsuperscript{251} The fear is that, in the face of liability, service providers would remove more content than necessary.\textsuperscript{252} Similarly, there is a debate about whether it is fair or
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practical to hold the intermediaries liable. The Internet allows posts to occur immediately. Unlike the traditional editor or publisher, ISPs and websites cannot reasonably review content before it goes up. Is it fair to require service providers to edit content when, unlike publishing houses, they did not have any say in what was posted? Also, because there is so much content continually posted on the Internet, at all hours of the day, is it practical, or even possible, for service providers to monitor all of this material?

While these questions and concerns are very worthy, they must be balanced against the harms felt by those who are attacked on the Internet. ISPs and websites host the forums where ugly, offensive speech can be rapidly and widely disseminated. When that speech is targeted at one particular person, such as Amanda Todd or Felicia Garcia, it can lead to tragedy. In the cases described above, the girls who were attacked online had only one option to get the posted material off of the Internet: ask the ISP or website to take it down. But since there is no law mandating that service providers abide by, or even take notice of such a request, the offensive content remained on the Internet.

Online service providers are in the best position to remove harmful content. In fact, other than the poster, the providers are often the only ones who can remove this content. It is not unreasonable to require that an entity with the power to erase cyberbullying content delete the content or face a penalty. When ISPs and websites are responsible for removing harmful content, victims no longer face the insurmountable problems associated with attempting to identify online bullies. Cyberbullies can hide behind fake user names or post anonymously, making filing a complaint against them incredibly burdensome, if not impossible. If victims are able to file a complaint against the entity on which the cyberbullying posts occur, identification is no longer an issue. Furthermore, it is reasonable to hold service providers responsible for cyberbullying that occurs on their sites—rather than the teenage bullies themselves—because the providers are
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run by adults who are old enough to understand the effects of cyberbullying. Children and teens are in a transitory period, still learning about the causes and effects of their actions and not always able to appreciate the harms their words or behavior may create. When the burden of regulating cyberbullying shifts to the online intermediaries, courts may be more comfortable allowing victims redress since the defendants would be websites and ISPs run by adults—individuals with the critical thinking skills to understand the effects of malicious bullying.

When cyberbullying adversely affects teens and preteens, service providers should have a duty to act. To prevent the cyber attacks to which teenagers like Amanda, Felicia, Rehtaeh, and Hope have been victim, § 230 of the CDA should be amended to require ISPs and websites to remove bullying or defamatory content about children. The least imposing way to do this would be to implement a notice and takedown system similar to the Digital Millennium Copyright Act ("DMCA"). The DMCA protects online intermediaries from secondary copyright infringement liability, so long as the entities, upon notice from the copyright holder, remove the copyrighted material from their sites.

When an ISP or website is notified that a child aged seventeen or younger is being bullied or attacked on its site, the service provider should be obligated to remove the offending post and/or cut off the offender’s access to the site. The notifier should have to certify that he or she is either the person or parent of the person being bullied and that the content being requested for removal is bullying, defamatory, or intentionally causes emotional distress. The service provider will then have a reasonable amount of time, perhaps forty-eight hours, to remove the material.

Keeping in mind that the Internet is like a game of whac-a-mole and new posts can pop up by different users and on different web pages, the law should also grant a “good faith” exception from liability for ISPs and websites who act to remove offending content, but because of the nature of the Internet, cannot remove it all. Similar to the take-down policy in the DMCA, once a service provider is properly
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notified of offending material regarding a child under the age of eighteen, the provider should remove it or face liability.

IV. Addressing the Issue—State and Federal Cyberbullying Laws and Policies

The increase in cyberbullying nationwide has elicited governmental response. Many state governments have passed legislation regarding how schools should deal with the issue, and a federal anti-cyberbullying statute was proposed in Congress.\textsuperscript{264} While these actions are a move in the right direction, state and national governments need to improve anti-bullying laws and policies and clearly grant schools the authority to address online bullying.

A. State Laws and Policies

Currently, every state except Montana has an anti-bullying statute.\textsuperscript{265} However, of these forty-nine state statutes, only sixteen specifically address cyberbullying.\textsuperscript{266} As explained in Part II, cyberbullying is different than face-to-face bullying;\textsuperscript{267} therefore, it should be treated as a separate problem. Students, parents, and school administrators need to be aware of the unique and harmful nature of cyberbullying and of the effects a cyberbullying campaign can have on a youth. One way to help achieve this is to call attention to the behavior by having a state statute specifically banning cyberbullying. Rather than prohibiting bullying generally, statutes should address cyberbullying separately, in its own section, and clearly defining the meaning of the term.

Additionally, of the forty-nine state statutes that address bullying—all of which require schools to implement anti-bullying policies—only ten state laws give schools clear guidance on how to address the behavior.\textsuperscript{268} This means that many administrators ignore cyberbul-
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lying because they feel ill-equipped to deal with the problem. Furthermore, many of the statutes do not define or specify the types of programs or policies that the schools should enact to prevent bullying, leaving substantial discretion to administrators regarding which policies might make a difference. This ambiguity presents significant problems when schools attempt to punish cyberbullies, most notably First Amendment concerns, Due Process concerns, and lack of clear guidance for implementing anti-bullying polices.

1. First Amendment Implications

The First Amendment is almost always implicated when a school attempts to punish a student for off-campus speech. Schools generally have the authority to discipline student speech and behavior that occurs on the school grounds or during a school related-activity (on-campus speech) but speech and behavior which occurs at home or after school hours (off-campus speech) is generally outside of a school’s jurisdiction. Cyberbullying is often off-campus speech since the Internet allows teens to bully at all hours of the day and from any location.

The determination of when the off-campus, online speech sufficiently makes its way onto campus is a grey area. Since the effects of off-campus cyberbullying are not confined to off-campus locations—the harms follow victims around throughout their daily lives—schools need to be able to discipline students for cyberbullying that is disseminated while out of the classroom. To determine when and if a school can regulate speech that was not made on school grounds or at a school-sponsored event, courts apply the Tinker substantial disruption test: Schools can regulate speech if it “materially and substantially interfe[s] with the requirements of appropriate discipline in the operation of the school.” The Tinker test was announced in the 1969 Supreme Court case Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School District in which a school principal violated students’ First Amendment
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rights by banning them from wearing black armbands to protest the Vietnam War.\footnote{273 Id.}

While \textit{Tinker} is still applicable in some student speech instances, it arguably has not caught up with the advent of the Internet. Online activity blurs the line between on-campus and off-campus behavior. While a bully may post a hurtful comment from his or her bedroom, the post remains online for other students to view while either on-campus or off-campus. Further, effects of the post on the victim will likely spill over onto the school grounds. Forced to rely on an outdated standard that does not take online student behavior into account, administrators do not know when they can address cyberbullying without violating the First Amendment.\footnote{274 See generally Goodno, \textit{supra} note 270.} Courts face similar uncertainties in attempting to apply the \textit{Tinker} test when cyberbullies challenge a school’s disciplinary response to their online behavior.\footnote{275 See \textit{J.S. ex rel. Snyder v. Blue Mountain Sch. Dist.}, 593 F.3d 286 (3d Cir. 2010), \textit{vacated}, \textit{reh'g granted en banc}, No. 08-4138, 2010 U.S. App. LEXIS 7342, at *1 (3d Cir. Apr. 9, 2010), \textit{rev'd en banc}, 650 F.3d 915, (3d Cir. 2011) (finding that a school could not discipline a student for creating, from home, an offensive MySpace page about the school principal—seven judges of the en banc court joining the majority, five judges concurring, and six judges dissenting).}

Many state anti-bullying statutes do not give schools sufficient guidance on how to address cyberbullying.\footnote{276 See Goodno \textit{supra} note 270, at 682–84.} The lack of guidelines leads to students getting away with posting hateful and bullying speech, so long as they post outside of school grounds, because schools simply ignore the behavior. For instance, in \textit{J.C. v. Beverly Hills Unified School District},\footnote{277 \textit{J.C. ex rel. R.C. v. Beverly Hills Unified Sch. Dist.}, 711 F. Supp. 2d 1094 (C.D. Cal. 2010).} the plaintiff posted a YouTube video recorded outside of school grounds in which a group of friends call a classmate, C.C., a “slut,” “spoiled,” “the ugliest piece of shit I’ve ever seen in my whole life” and mocked C.C. for talking about “boners.”\footnote{278 Id. at 1098.} The court first addressed whether there was a “sufficient nexus” between the off-campus speech and the school to allow the school to discipline the bully.\footnote{279 Id. at 1107–10.} A nexus generally exists when off-campus behavior is brought onto the school grounds, or where it is reasonably foreseeable that content made while off-campus would make its way into the class-
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The Beverly Hills court found that there was a sufficient nexus because the video had been shared among five to ten students; therefore, it was reasonable to expect the students to discuss it the next day at school. Also, C.C. had informed school officials of the video, which the officials then watched while on campus, further satisfying the nexus test. The court then applied the *Tinker* test and found that although there was a sufficient nexus between the off-campus speech and the school, the video had not substantially disrupted school activities. The court felt that the video was neither threatening nor violent; rather it had merely caused C.C. to feel hurt and embarrassed. For the Beverly Hills court, a substantial disruption “must equate to something more than the ordinary personality conflicts among middle-school students that may leave one student feeling hurt or insecure.”

Although there is no Supreme Court case on the issue, lower courts seem willing to allow schools to punish off-campus behavior (cyberbullying) so long as it causes a substantial disruption. However, proving that the speech caused such a disruption appears to be no easy feat. Shameful, embarrassing, or cruel comments made online that only substantially affect one student and do not disrupt teachers’ and administrators’ abilities to run the school will not always suffice.

### 2. Due Process Concerns

The second problem with current anti-bullying legislation is that schools in states whose anti-bullying laws and polices do not mention off-campus speech may face Due Process challenges when punishing cyberbullying. For example, in Beverly Hills, the poster of a bullying YouTube video challenged her two-day suspension on Due Process grounds (as well as First Amendment grounds). In a separate, inter-
locutory decision, the California court agreed with the poster that her Due Process rights had been violated because she was not given notice that she could be disciplined for her off-campus actions.291 Neither the state’s statute nor the school’s student handbook had included language that the school could punish bullying that occurred outside of school grounds.292

Although California has since amended its anti-bullying laws to allow schools to discipline off-campus cyberbullying,293 forty states are susceptible to Due Process challenges when addressing online posts, emails, or texts that are made when a bully is not on school grounds or at a school-sponsored function.294 It is crucial that these forty states update their statutes to include language that grants school officials the authority to address off-campus cyberbullying that spills onto the school ground. Otherwise, bullies can evade disciplinary action by claiming lack of notice.

3. Lack of Guidance for Policy Implementation

Another problem with current anti-bullying laws is that many do not address the causes of cyberbullying or mandate specific anti-bullying policies for schools to enact. Bullies use the Internet to perpetuate gender stereotypes and attack females based on their sexuality. While these attacks fall under the category of bullying, state statutes that delineate the specific type of prohibited behavior would help focus attention on the harm to be prevented. The Supreme Court “has found that ‘enumerating’ personal characteristics is the ‘essential device used to make the duty not to discriminate concrete.’”295 Rather than using broad language such as “bullying will not be tolerated,” anti-bullying statutes should specifically state that harassment based on sexuality, or other similar traits, is prohibited. This approach will open the door to a conversation about the causes and effects of gender stereotypes or other discriminatory beliefs.
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The anti-bullying policies should also specify certain acts a school must take to prevent cyberbullying. For example, students should be required to take an Internet education course to learn about the effects of online posts and conduct. Schools should also be required to bring parents into the conversation about cyberbullying by hosting informational sessions that lay out the harms of cyberbullying, giving parents advice on monitoring their child’s Internet behavior, and explaining how to recognize if their child is a perpetrator or victim of cyberbullying. The policies should mandate that the schools appoint a counselor to whom students can turn to if they believe they, or someone they know, is being bullied online. Additionally, the counselor should be required to investigate the bullying and contact the parents of the children involved.

B. Federal Laws and Policies

Currently, there is no federal anti-bullying statute. In 2009, after Megan Meier was bullied on MySpace by a classmate’s mother—ultimately leading to Megan’s suicide—296—the Meier Cyberbullying Prevention Act was proposed in Congress.297 The act would have subjected anyone who “transmit[ted] . . . with the intent to coerce, intimidate, harass, or cause substantial emotional distress to a person, using electronic means to support severe, repeated, and hostile behavior,” to a fine or up to two years imprisonment, or both.298 Ultimately, the bill did not pass, but it opened the door to the possibility of federal action against cyberbullying.

A federal law would bring national attention to the problem of cyberbullying. However, rather than impose criminal liability for bullies under the age of eighteen, a federal law should grant schools the authority to discipline cyberbullying that occurs on-campus and off-campus, and require schools to implement educational programs that promote tolerance and teach students about the effects of cyberbullying.300 Additionally, the federal government should provide funds for schools to comply with such requirements.

Whether it be state or federal government that modifies or creates anti-cyberbullying laws and policies, such laws and policies should
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give schools explicit authority to regulate and discipline off-campus cyberbullying behavior. The laws should also require schools to implement specific anti-bullying policies such as tolerance programs, Internet education and awareness courses, and informational sessions for parents, and should mandate that schools assign a specific counselor to deal with instances of cyberbullying.

V. Addressing the Issue—Tort Law

As discussed previously, schools are not always able or willing to act when it comes to cyberbullying. As such, some victims may choose to turn to the courts for relief. The two most applicable and common tort theories used for cyberbullying harms are defamation and intentional infliction of emotional distress. The requirements of these tort claims are strict; and thus, cyber-bullied victims have not had much success in the courtroom. While some argue that victims should seek relief through civil actions against the bully, the courtroom is not the place to fix the problem. A legal battle is time-consuming, expensive, and emotionally draining. Furthermore, cyberbullies are generally teens and preteens—people whose minds are still growing and developing. The court system should be reserved for adults—those with the capacity to make informed choices and decisions and understand the consequences of their actions. Pursuing litigation against a teen is a waste of courts’ resources when the school system can address the issue. Cyberbullying should be dealt with in the school system or in the home. Dealing with a bully in the courtroom should be a victim’s last resort.

A. Defamation

Cyberbullying victims can attempt to bring claims against their attackers for defamation. To plead defamation, a plaintiff must generally demonstrate that (1) the defendant made a false statement that harmed the plaintiff’s reputation, (2) the statement was published to
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a third party, (3) the defendant acted with some degree of fault, and (4) the plaintiff was actually harmed by the statement. Only statements of fact are actionable, leaving opinion statements—no matter how offensive or derogatory—free from liability. Typically, even the cruelest Facebook opinion post is protected by the First Amendment.

Recently, a New York trial court denied a defamation claim when the bullies had posted statements on Facebook that the plaintiff used drugs and had contracted HIV by having sex with various animals and/or a prostitute. The court dismissed the suit, finding that a reasonable person would not believe these statements to be fact, classifying them as merely “puerile attempts by adolescents to outdo each other.” Since bullying statements are generally not stated as fact, a defamation claim is not practical for most victims of cyberbullying.

B. Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress

Victims can also make a claim for intentional infliction of emotional distress (“IIED”). The Second Restatement of Torts, adopted by a number of jurisdictions, reads, “[o]ne who by extreme and outrageous conduct intentionally or recklessly causes severe emotional distress to another is subject to liability for such emotional distress.” Essentially, the conduct complained of must be "so outrageous in character, and so extreme in degree, as to go beyond all possible bounds of decency, and to be regarded as atrocious, and utterly intolerable in a civilized community." There must also be (1) intent to cause or reckless regard in causing severe emotional distress, (2) a connection between the conduct and the injury, and (3) actual emotional distress suffered by the victim.

Scholars and courts agree that the IIED tort should be limited to the severest cases. “[L]iability . . . does not extend to mere insults, indignities, threats, annoyances, petty oppressions, or other trivialities.” This is a relatively difficult standard to meet, both because it is difficult to quantify and prove the severity of emotional distress and because it is difficult to show that a defendant’s conduct was extreme.
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and outrageous. As a result, only the most egregious cases of cyberbullying can be successfully litigated under IIED.

C. Tort Reform Is Not the Solution

Expecting tort law to sufficiently remedy the harms felt by cyberbullied victims is unreasonable. Beyond the problems mentioned previously, it is often difficult to discover the identity of an attacker. The Internet allows people to post and criticize anonymously, and social networking sites do not have to turn over the name of cyberbullies when asked. Additionally, cyberbullying often takes place at the hands of numerous bullies. There is a mob mentality on the Internet—one person starts bullying and another jumps on board, and then another, and another. Victims may have a hard time singling out a single attacker or figuring out against whom to bring a claim. It is logistically and jurisdictionally difficult to sue a large group of bullies who are spread out across the country or the world. Even if a victim is able to identify and single out a cyberbully, that bully may not have the resources to adequately compensate a victim for any damages awarded. Furthermore, it is often hard to find an attorney who will take a case that revolves around kids being mean. Bullying is still seen by many as an unavoidable part of growing up. Not all attorneys are willing to take the case of a bullying victim. Finally, some judges will not acknowledge a bullied victim’s injury as reaching the level of a tort and/or do not want to impose liability on a child who does not yet have the critical thinking skills to understand the repercussions of his or her actions.

While courts should be more receptive to tort claims for egregious bullying, such civil suits against bullies are not sufficient as a solution to cyberbullying or shaming attacks. A female who is strong

---

314. Id.
315. See Grant, supra note 208, at 200 (describing how a plaintiff must usually meet the “summary judgment” standard before a court will require a service provider to reveal the identity of an anonymous defamer).
318. See id.
320. See id.
and brave enough to take a case to court should have the chance to proceed under a tort theory against her attacker, but it should not have to be her only option.

**Conclusion**

We are in a perpetual state of adapting to an ever-changing, technological world. The Internet, while continuing to expand, remains largely unregulated—a characteristic that can, and does, lead to tragedy. Cyber slut-shaming has proven to have devastating psychological and physical effects on young girls. Schools, courts, and service providers need to work together to prevent and remedy the harms caused by cyberbullying. Congress should amend the CDA to impose quasi-liability on ISPs and websites who, upon notification, do not remove bullying content directed at children. State and federal government should create or improve anti-cyberbullying laws and polices to give schools the power to address cyberbullying, as well as clearly define the anti-bullying polices that schools should adopt. Finally, in the case of particularly egregious cyberbullying, courts should recognize cyberbullying as a true injury, deserving of judicial relief.