

The Taylor Lorenz Twitter File

 cnav.news/2023/05/19/editorial/talk/taylor-lorenz-twitter-file/

By Terry A. Hurlbut

May 19, 2023



Yesterday, Paul D. Thacker dropped yet another Twitter Files installment – unnumbered, actually. His subject was Taylor Lorenz, an infamous *Washington Post* “journalist” and advocate for on-line censorship and information policing. As his thread shows, Taylor Lorenz not only advocated for such censorship – she facilitated it.

Taylor Lorenz – a history

Any regular reader of CNAV should remember the name of Taylor Lorenz. She is, or was, a correspondent for *The Washington Post* and exhibited the leftist bias typical of that organ. Readers will recall her “doxxing” of the owner of the Libs of TikTok account. (And that Gov. Ron DeSantis, R-Fla., offered her shelter in the Governor’s Mansion after that incident.) They might also recall the influencer, having the same name as the Libs of TikTok owner, reporting bullying and harassment. When the Department of Homeland Security shut down the Disinformation Governance Board, she broke that story.

That happened one year to the day before Paul Thacker dropped his thread – May 18, 2022. For reasons Taylor Lorenz herself best knows, she deleted her tweet. *The Wayback Machine refused to archive it or process it*. That is a special privilege; tweets from most other accounts will archive as usual. Bear this in mind when reading one of Mr. Thacker’s allegations – that a relative of hers *owns* The Wayback Machine. In fact Elon Musk, hearing of the family relationship, asked:

Was the Internet Archive manipulated for nepotistic reasons? <https://t.co/YS6j979nUu>

— Elon Musk (@elonmusk) May 18, 2023

CNAV's discovery suggests that the answer is Yes.

Six months later, CNAV noted her criticism of her own paper for reporting adversely on the lockdowns in China and the civil disorder they provoked.

Bear all this in mind as we examine Paul Thacker's thread about Taylor Lorenz and her connection to Twitter. This turned out to be a highly privileged connection indeed.

Thread and reaction

Herewith the thread, as the odd-numbered tweets:

1. Twitter Provided Privileged Access to Banning Queen, Taylor Lorenz [#TwitterFiles](#)

Twitter engineer walking me through their reporting system, "Wow! She's a heavy user." pic.twitter.com/z7Y7q5OEyi

— Paul D. Thacker (@thackerpd) [May 18, 2023](#)

3. The month prior, Taylor Lorenz got this tiny account banned. Surprise!

The account detailed Lorenz as a Manhattan rich girl, who attended Swiss boarding school, and whose uncle owns Internet Archive, thus erasing her past.

pic.twitter.com/uzCCzExu9B

— Paul D. Thacker (@thackerpd) [May 18, 2023](#)

5. Nonetheless, Twitter suspended the account because it "violates the Twitter Media Policy."

The account then deactivated. pic.twitter.com/9ZMh2mAQYv

— Paul D. Thacker (@thackerpd) [May 18, 2023](#)

7. Bragman played this all up on Twitter of course to call attention to himself, retweeting Bhattcharya's tweet, before people made fun of him for "doxing himself."

Manhattan rich kids playing at journalist are easily bruised, it seems.

pic.twitter.com/CxflaMDjts

— Paul D. Thacker (@thackerpd) [May 18, 2023](#)

9. Several of Lorenz's past reporting targets tell me she seems to work in concert with her sources. After Lorenz doxed [@libsoftiktok](#) in the Post, Alejandra Caraballo sent Twitter a "private letter" to remove Libs of TikTok.

Lorenz quoted Caraballo in the Post that next month. pic.twitter.com/JOdywLyVvC

— Paul D. Thacker (@thackerpd) [May 18, 2023](#)

11. I asked Caraballo what came of the meeting w/ Twitter and to see the letter they sent. But got no response. I also don't know if Libs of TikTok was successful in getting Caraballo suspended for harassment.

— Paul D. Thacker (@thackerpd) [May 18, 2023](#)

13. Lorenz had more than special reporting access to get accounts banned. When Tucker Carlson did a piece ridiculing her, Twitter put out an alert—"We need to be careful with her."

I couldn't evidence that Twitter provided this support to other reporters. I never got it. pic.twitter.com/Fz55XU0oiZ

— Paul D. Thacker (@thackerpd) [May 18, 2023](#)

15. Lorenz has incredibly unorthodox (is that the right word?) reporting tactics. Here's an affidavit signed by someone she quoted in the article about [@littlemissjacob](#)

FYI: this person was a minor. pic.twitter.com/nHULPdEvFV

— Paul D. Thacker (@thackerpd) [May 18, 2023](#)

17. Toufania told me he sued Lorenz over the article, and she then began sending messages to gin up a DOJ investigation against him.

This email Lorenz is sending around is for an Assistant US Attorney in NY. pic.twitter.com/5iRztxHsaN

— Paul D. Thacker (@thackerpd) [May 18, 2023](#)

19. Neither Lorenz nor Cameron Barr with the Post responded to questions.

Thanks so much to [@TexasLindsay_](#) for helping to collect/organize these [#TwitterFiles](#). pic.twitter.com/32dXHcJdax

— Paul D. Thacker (@thackerpd) [May 18, 2023](#)

Come join this Twitter Spaces to discuss <https://t.co/66apeGdD79>

— Paul D. Thacker (@thackerpd) [May 18, 2023](#)

The revelations of yesterday shocked Elon Musk:

This is the most embarrassing thing to come out of The Twitter Files!

— Elon Musk (@elonmusk) [May 18, 2023](#)

Someone else posted a screencap of the Wikipedia article on her – showing her birthday as “October 21, *circa* 1984-1987.”

Maybe Some day a reporter will find out what year she was born. She was born sometime between 1984-1987 it's a mystery <pic.twitter.com/1szATHxoKX>

— Patrick (@patricksp71) [May 18, 2023](#)

At time of writing, that birthday remains a mystery, according to Wikipedia itself. They cite what they consider a solid source for the month and date. But “year arithmetic” yields three different birth year results from three different sources.

Another user pointed out that any questioning of Taylor Lorenz’ conclusions, sources or methods risked a shadowban.

Anyone that ever took the time to call out taytay over the blatant misinformation she frequently posts almost immediately felt the sting of a shadow ban or worse. It is nice to have confirmation of what we all knew.

I guess it wasn't about 'making better tweets' after all, eh?

— PhotographicFloridian (@JackLinFLL) [May 18, 2023](#)

Three more users mocked her as “dangerous when provoked.”

Careful... she’s dangerous when provoked: <pic.twitter.com/gxxebTEucX>

— WeWerePromisedZombies! (@JeromehartIF) [May 18, 2023](#)

Better to eat you with, my dear. 😊 <pic.twitter.com/d0E4ykSdiq>

— SULLY🇺🇸🇺🇸 (@SULLY60820250) [May 18, 2023](#)

Still another made a slightly more realistic, but still unflattering, comparison.

This is behavior you expect from a teenage bully. She seems so petty, vindictive, and manipulative. On second thought, perhaps that's why she's such a great fit with today's corporate media.

— Alpharabius (@Alpharabius870) [May 18, 2023](#)

This user summed up perfectly her motives and those of her allies:

Her and all her ilk are on a mission to save the world just for her and her ilk by destroying the rest.

— Steve Bodie (@smbodie3) [May 18, 2023](#)

Analysis

CNAV knew, as far back as April of 2022, that Taylor Lorenz was a collaborator with the Censorship Industrial Complex. (That was before we even learned that name.) Which is to say, we knew that she supported the censorship of anyone who disagreed with the political left. But CNAV did not know, until yesterday, just how dangerous – and well-connected – she really was (and might still be). Remember: Neville the Cat revealed that her uncle *owns* the Wayback Machine. That could explain why a Taylor Lorenz tweet will not process. If she deletes a tweet, *no one* can recover it – a privilege very few enjoy. (Unless it is a burden that someone imposes on one who reveals embarrassing facts.) Not long after that, Neville the Cat disappeared – his account remains suspended to this day.

More embarrassing still for Twitter is the special access she enjoyed – access she used to make life miserable for others.

Her attack on Jay Bhattacharya involves more than a vindictive alliance with Walker Bragman. Far more important than that association, are his skepticism about COVID vaccines. Recall that he is a plaintiff in *Missouri v. Biden*, the great “State actors” case.

All her targets, except for Neville the Cat, seem to have gotten their accounts back. More to the point, many of the narratives and opinions she espouses, are falling out of favor. But Sun Tzu would certainly agree: knowing the enemy is the most important part of planning to fight him. (Or her.)