Twitter Thread by Gustavo Turner

Gustavo Turner
@GustavoTurnerX

https://t.co/Q4HqU5GtQa



For those who are asking: Twitter froze my account for 12 hours and penalized me with "a warning" because of my reporting on a religious organization (initials E.C.) who is behind the current anti-Pornhub campaign. (1/2)

If you google public record information on the leader of that campaign (initials L.M., a public figure) plus the words "Justice Defense Fund," you can take a guess as to why I was "reported."

Twitter punished me for literally doing my job.

Religious groups are already abusing the "reporting" system WITH SECTION 230 IN PLACE.

Imagine the future of journalism once Section 230 is repealed or reformed.

(Yes, I have receip†s.)

(No, I won't be using this platform as I have been. I've been "admonished" on the word of a religious lobby.)

Also: @Twitter @TwitterComms make a big show of being more "transparent" than Facebook/Instagram, but in my work as a journalist I haven't had any issues getting replies from FB/IG reps. I have never gotten a single reply from a Twitter rep.

Opaque to even get a contact person.

I actually have academic credentials in the history of censorship (no, really). What @Twitter @TwitterComms did to me yesterday is EXACTLY what censorship is meant to do: to confuse reporters as to what the public/private guidelines are, so I have to censor myself.

I was put on notice by @Twitter merely for doing my job: I reported on publicly available information about a public figure within my beat.

What they want is for me to "check myself" before reporting. They got it.

This is WITH SECTION 230 IN PLACE.

Now imagine post-repeal.

And @Twitter (as opposed to FB/IG) has no easy-to-find spokesperson to ask for comment about this. By design.

I hate to agree with Trump on anything, but his rants about Twitter's deliberate opacity and arbitrary doling out of punishment are not incorrect.