December 6, 2021

Via FedEx to

Ms. Vijaya Gadde
Secretary of Twitter, Inc.
Twitter, Inc.
1355 Market Street
Suite 900
San Francisco, California 94103

Dear Ms. Gadde,

I hereby submit the enclosed shareholder proposal ("Proposal") for inclusion in the Twitter, Inc. (the "Company") proxy statement to be circulated to Company shareholders in conjunction with the next annual meeting of shareholders. The Proposal is submitted under Rule 14(a)-8 (Proposals of Security Holders) of the United States Securities and Exchange Commission's proxy regulations.

I submit the Proposal as the Director of the Free Enterprise Project of the National Center for Public Policy Research, which has continuously owned Company stock with a value exceeding $2,000 for at least 3 years prior to and including the date of this Proposal and which intends to hold these shares through the date of the Company's 2022 annual meeting of shareholders. A Proof of Ownership letter is forthcoming and will be delivered to the Company.

Pursuant to interpretations of Rule 14(a)-8 by the Securities & Exchange Commission staff, I initially propose as a time for a telephone conference to discuss this proposal December 21, 2021 from 2-5 p.m. eastern. If that proves inconvenient, I hope you will suggest some other times to talk. Please feel free to contact me at sshepard@nationalcenter.org so that we can determine the mode and method of that discussion.

Copies of correspondence or a request for a "no-action" letter should be sent to me at the National Center for Public Policy Research, 20 F Street, NW, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20001 and emailed to sshepard@nationalcenter.org.

Sincerely,

Scott Shepard

Enclosure: Shareholder Proposal

Civil Rights and Non-Discrimination Audit Proposal

Resolved: Shareholders of Twitter, Inc. ("the Company") request that the Board of Directors commission an audit analyzing the Company's impacts on civil rights and non-discrimination, and the impacts of those issues on the Company's business. The audit may, in the Board's discretion, be conducted by an independent and unbiased third party with input from civil rights organizations, public-interest litigation groups, employees and other stakeholders – of a wide spectrum of viewpoints and perspectives. A report on the audit, prepared at reasonable cost and omitting confidential or proprietary information, should be publicly disclosed on the Company's website.

Supporting Statement: Tremendous public attention has focused recently on workplace and employment practices. All agree that employee success should be fostered and that no employees should face discrimination, but there is much disagreement about what non-discrimination means.

Concern stretches across the ideological spectrum. Some have pressured companies to adopt "anti-racism" programs that seek to establish "racial/social equity," which appears to mean the distribution of pay and authority on the basis of race, sex, orientation and ethnic categories rather than by merit.[1] Where adopted, however, such programs raise significant objection, including concern that, e.g., "anti-racist" programs are themselves deeply racist and otherwise discriminatory.[2]

Many companies have been found to be sponsoring and promoting overtly and implicitly discriminatory programs, including Bank of America, American Express, Verizon, Pfizer and CVS.[3] New Twitter policies and CEO comments raise similar concerns.[4]

This disagreement and controversy create massive reputational, legal and financial risk. If the Company is, in the name of equity, diversity and inclusion, committing illegal or unconscionable discrimination against employees deemed "non-diverse," then the Company will suffer in myriad ways – all of them both unforgivable and avoidable.

---

[1] https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1048911/000120677421002182/fdx3894361-def14a.htm#StockholderProposals88; https://www.sec.gov/divisions/corpfin/cf-noaction/14a-8/2021/asyousownike051421-14a8-incoming.pdf; https://www.sec.gov/divisions/corpfin/cf-noaction/14a-8/2021/nyscrfamazon012521-14a8-incoming.pdf; https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1666700/000119312521079533/d108785ddef14a.htm#rom108785_58

[2] https://www.americanexperiment.org/survey-says-americans-oppose-critical-race-theory/; https://www.newsweek.com/majority-americans-hold-negative-view-critical-race-theory-amid-controversy-1601337; https://www.newsweek.com/coca-cola-facing-backlash-says-less-white-learning-plan-was-about-workplace-inclusion-1570875; https://nypost.com/2021/08/11/american-express-tells-its-workers-capitalism-is-racist/; https://www.city-journal.org/verizon-critical-race-theory-training

[3] https://www.city-journal.org/bank-of-america-racial-reeducation-program; https://www.city-journal.org/verizon-critical-race-theory-training; https://nypost.com/2021/08/11/american-express-tells-its-workers-capitalism-is-racist/; https://www.foxbusiness.com/politics/cvs-inclusion-training-critical-race-theory; https://www.msn.com/en-us/money/other/pfizer-sets-race-based-hiring-goals-in-the-name-of-fighting-systemic-racism-gender-equity-challenges/ar-AAOiSwJ

[4] *See, e.g.*, https://victorygirlsblog.com/twitters-new-safety-rules-endanger-free-speech/; https://thenationalpulse.com/news/twitters-new-ceo-parag-agrawal-has-disturbing-anti-american-anti-white-tweet-history/.

In developing the audit and report, the Company should consult civil-rights and public-interest law groups – but it must not compound error with bias by relying only on left-leaning organizations. Rather, it should consult groups across the spectrum of viewpoints. This includes right-leaning civil-rights groups representing people of color, such as the Woodson Center[5] and Project 21,[6] and groups that defend the rights and liberties of *all* Americans, not merely the ones that many companies label "diverse." All Americans have civil rights; to behave otherwise is to invite disaster.

Similarly, when including employees in its audit, the Company must allow employees to speak freely without fear of reprisal or disfavor, and in confidential ways. Too many employers have established company stances that themselves chill contributions from employees who disagree with the company's asserted positions, and then have pretended that the employees who have been empowered by the companies' partisan positioning represent the true and only voice of all employees. This by itself creates a deeply hostile workplace for some groups of employees, and is both immoral and likely illegal.

[5] https://woodsoncenter.org/
[6] https://nationalcenter.org/project-21/