



# Overly Broad Stonewalling

September 7, 2023

## How specific do requests for records of unconstitutional activity have to be?

In February, the Federal Bureau of Investigation pretended an inability to fulfill America First Legal Foundation's freedom-of-information request for documents about the FBI's pre-election efforts to censor Twitter users. The agency declared the request to be "overly broad."

What's been "overly broad" is the policy of censorship, disinformation, and more by the Deep State using private partners. Meaning their real problem is doubtless that the requested documents are "overly incriminating," too unmistakably what AFL wanted.

So the FBI stonewalled.

And AFL has [sued](#), in its [complaint](#) concluding that the

agency's "blanket denial of AFL's FOIA request is contrary to law and should not stand."

Thanks to evidence [brought to light](#) by other litigation and by [Matt Taibbi's reporting on Twitter's internal records](#), none of us is just guessing that the FBI has acted to censor constitutionally protected discourse. We know that the FBI's National Election Command Post flagged at least 25 Twitter accounts for "misinformation."

But the only party to the censorship revealing relevant information voluntarily is Twitter itself, thanks to decisions by Twitter's new management under Elon Musk.

With respect to everybody else colluding to censor social media — the FBI, the DOJ, the White House, Google, Facebook, etc. — looks like it'll have to be lawsuits every step of the way.

The First Amendment's stricture upon Congress to "make no law" abridging our "freedom of speech, or of the press," does not allow the FBI, the CIA, the NSA, and other agencies to simply subcontract. Nor are they free to mold public opinion.

A government-controlled "press" is not a free press.

This is Common Sense. I'm Paul Jacob.