

Richard [REDACTED]

05 August 2024

Linda Yaccarino
Chief Executive Officer
Twitter, Inc.
1355 Market Street, Suite 900
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Ms Yaccarino

RE: Suspended Account - Consentuality

(A) On 19 July X suspended my account for the following tweet

@holte @ChrisGPackham There is nothing peaceful about holding people hostage and affecting their livelihood. If you try and stop me from getting to work, picking up my kid or going to hospital by sitting in the road, I will drive over you. If that is the peace you want, I'll give it to you.

Your email stated that I could make an appeal by following a link which I attempted to do and within a few minutes received what appears to be an automated response. Even though I requested for clarification on certain points which were never forthcoming.

This was in stark contrast to the incident that happened on 2nd July when you locked my account, I contested that incident and never received a response.

The nature, speed and manner of your responses on the 19th make me think that it is an AI system making these decisions and since I have no recourse online to get clarification I now write to you in person and present my case.

My core assumption is that the incident on 2nd July, June 23 and 27 directly affected the suspension on the 19th and since the one on the 2nd was considered a strike I was automatically suspended permanently on the 19th.

I believe this to be in error and a failure by your staff or more likely the AI you deploy to make these decisions, which I did point out to @elonmusk and @X and @Support using the phrase “Your AI is more A than I”

Addressing the issue on the 19th.

The tweet is very obviously conditional. It states “if you try and ...” and then presents the consequence for this attack on my person by stating what the response will be for using force which will impact my medical, employment or family status.

The original poster asserts that they are not using force, which is false. Someone who walks in the road waving banners forces others to slow and ultimately come to a stop. Their actions rely on the road user's desire not to apply greater force to go about their lawful business. This is indicated by the threat to commit and actually do actual harm to society at large presented below.

https://x.com/JustStop_Oil/status/1589677767461072897

In this tweet Just stop oil threatening the public and this incident resulted in “People missed flights, medical appointments and exams. Two lorries collided, and a police motorcyclist came off his bike during one of the protests on 9 November 2022 while trying to bring traffic to a halt in a “rolling road block”. <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/c880xjx54mpo>

The law in this regard, <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2022/32/section/78>, clearly indicates that the actions taken by the protestors are not peaceful and as such are forceful.

You have suspended my account for indicating the actions that I would take, which may or may not be justified depending on the level of force I would apply in making them. In doing so you have not taken into account the condition required for me to take action, which is an illegal force used against my person.

It stands to reason that if my account is suspended for threatening to use force to protect myself then the posters account should be too, as you and they have accepted the conditions for me having to protect myself.

In addition there are numerous examples of people retaliating to Just Stop Oil protestors on your platform.

<https://x.com/GBNEWS/status/1653445083864203264>

Just stop oil purposely getting themselves run over

<https://x.com/itvnews/status/1681662058465558528?lang=en-GB>

Just Stop Oil protester attacked for holding car crash victims hostage

I do not believe I have made a direct threat to any person. It may be argued that my phrasing is bad or ambiguous however the message is clear. If you threaten me I have the right to defend myself. If anything this should open up a discussion as to what rights people do have to defend themselves against the force these protesters exert on the public.

In addition your own policy <https://help.x.com/en/rules-and-policies/enforcement-philosophy> states that you allow speech that “ ... points out hypocrisy or contradictions, **warns of offline or online consequences**, denounces hateful or dangerous speech ...”

My tweet, I would argue, does just this, it points out the hypocrisy of the OP stating that their actions are not forceful when in fact it causes financial and physical real life harm to millions of people. In addition my tweet warns of consequences to the actions the OP supports. These are consequences that are playing out in the real world, consequences that he and other readers should be aware of when they take it upon themselves to prevent pregnant women from attending hospital, parents collecting their children from school and affecting the ability of hard working people to make a living to support themselves and their loved ones.

Upon reflection I now wonder if the prior incidents where I was flagged as having violated your policies played a role in my permanent suspension. As indicated by your policy <https://help.x.com/en/rules-and-policies/enforcement-options> “... if we determine that a user has engaged in repeated violations of our policies ...” it appears that those prior events played a role even though it can be argued that those events have all been incorrectly flagged by your staff or AI as I shall demonstrate below.

(B) Tuesday, July 2nd, 2024 at 5:25 AM - Violent speech

@TRHLOfficial You are underpaid & wasted national resource I suggest this is due to @JoeBiden administrations distain for redheads. Everyone knows if you were a black beauty or a womanly man he would have created a post just for you I'd suggest you die your hair blue, but that's crazy talk

It should be apparent to any human that the tweet above does not contain any violent speech and is nothing more than a typo.

(C) Sunday, June 23rd, 2024 at 8:01 AM - Hateful conduct

@TRHLOfficial Doesn't appear to be anything wrong with it unless some sexual deviants have claimed this as their preferred symbol too. Like being gay and burning faggots is not something straight people are allowed to do anymore.

This is a clear play on words and how the meaning has changed over time. According to a simple google search on the words gay and faggot once finds the following definitions

Gay: 4. (old-fashioned) happy and full of fun

https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/gay_1

Faggot: 3. a bunch of sticks tied together, used for burning on a fire

<https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/faggot>

I fail to see where the hateful conduct in this tweet is. It clearly states straight people are not allowed to be happy and burn sticks, which is a common pastime many people engage in while camping. This was merely a humorous manner in opening a conversation on how language has changed over time. There is no threat to anyone in the message and is a blatant oxymoron as how can a straight person be gay, that is if one assumes homosexual to be the meaning of the word gay, which it is not.

(D) Thursday, June 27th, 2024 at 8:11 AM - Hateful conduct

@JamesEsses Trans women are not women. If they were there would be no need to distinguish them with the word trans. I have no idea what cis is, you are a man or a woman.

This is a straightforward statement about how trans women are not the same as women, this should be obvious as indicated by the distinguishing adjective trans which differentiates the two.

Many take offense at being called cis. For 1000's of years we have conversed with great understanding as to what meaning these words convey. The words "men" and "women" are clearly defined, adding trans to them gives additional clarification and changes the underlying premise of what the biological makeup of the subject is. There is absolutely no reason to muddy the water by labeling people cis, unless of course the idea is to remove the word trans and have cis women and women.

It turns out that the distinction which I mentioned is now widely recognised and many sports governing bodies ban trans women from competing against women.

According to <https://www.thepinknews.com/2024/04/17/sports-ban-trans-athletes/#page/5> swimming, athletics, cycling, angling and rowing are but a few named sports that recognise trans women and women as being different. Ironically I would argue that there need not be any gendered categories in angling, unfortunately no one will hear that argument as you have silenced my voice. I have made this argument for pool and darts, evidence which has now too been destroyed.

I do not believe that your permanent suspension of my account is warranted if it is based on these strikes, as none of them should exist and I believe are the result of faulty AI or a poor lack of understanding of the English language by your staff. The third option is that my account was banned due to my right leaning views. I do hope this is not the case as it would be of great

disappointment to discover that all the work and resources Mr Musk has put into providing a free speech platform be undermined by some rogue elements within his organization.

The consequences of this ban have been devastating to me. In the first instance I have been excluded from the town hall discussion. My ethos was to call out liars, point out falsehoods and act as an independent fact checker. Your ban and subsequent actions have erased 3 years of this activity leaving the wider public with only one conclusion, I am a right wing anarchist hell bent on doing others harm. Of course the evidence against this notion has all been deleted by yourselves and the only narrative that exists is the assumptions the wider public will make based on my account status.

It is your right to set the rules for those that use your platform, it is also your right to exclude anyone from it. I do believe that when you decide that one voice is allowed to be heard and another not you should be able to justify your decision, and so far no one has been willing or able to justify why my account has been suspended.

I would like clarification on the following points as to me it appears that you have made an error in suspending my account.

1. Can you please specify how B, C and D violated your policies.
2. Did the events B, C and D play a role in my account being permanently suspended.
3. Was it an AI or a member of staff that made the decision to ban my account.
4. Why is it that I am banned for expressing how I would defend myself but the OP is not banned for threatening to cause harm to my person.
5. To what end do you purge the list of followers, the account one follows as well as bookmarks of interests.
6. To what end do you purge the account history and evidence of the accounts true nature. How is it that you ban an account without this evidence?

Points 5 and 6 above seem to be purely vindictive and punitive in nature, and appear to be in place so as to destroy any evidence that may contradict the decision your organization has made to suspend an account. This appears to go against the tenets of a fair judgment and reasonable punishment on your part.

It would be much appreciated if you could reply to the following email address

[REDACTED]

Yours Sincerely

Richard [REDACTED]