Anti-Restrict Act Email to Senators and Representatives

[Required section 1]
Hello Senator/Representative [Their Name],

My name is [Your Name], and I am one of your constituents.
Phone Number:
Address:

I'm emailing you to voice my opposition to the DATA Act (H.R. 1153), RESTRICT Act (S.686), and standalone bill authored by Senator Josh Hawley to ban TikTok. In general, these bills propose government overreach, limits on free speech, lack of privacy, and unregulated censorship to tackle the rapidly changing digital landscape. I appreciate the sentiment. However, these four things directly threaten the stability and autonomy of American citizens, infringing upon our rights.

[insert optional section here]

[Required Section 2]
The people are not the scapegoats for the government's past inability to keep up with the digital times. Our privacy, right to information, and right to free speech are directly at stake. You already failed the people at large by failing to codify the backbone to the right to privacy and autonomy, Roe v. Wade. Do not fail us again. If any of these bills pass, Congress will turn a large chunk of this country against them for good.

Do the right thing.
Sincerely,
[Your Name]

[optional section below: opposition specifics]
To begin, I'll get specific on why I oppose the **DATA Act (H.R.1153)**.
This bill does not represent checks and balances, giving the executive branch too much power to sanction anyone they feel is a national security threat without, as what Gen-Z would call it, receipts. The previous congressional hearing on this bill with TikTok's CEO, Shou Zi Chew, was a place where these receipts could be displayed; but instead, we were met with contradictory, incompetent, and propaganda-like lines of questioning that embarrassed our country on the global stage.

For example, when Texas representative Randy Weber had his time, he said "TikTok is indoctrinating our children with divisive, woke, and pro-CCP propaganda." This statement is a dog whistle to the rising number of Christian nationalists and conservative extremists in our country; where woke refers to anyone that thinks outside of Christian societal norms, or in a liberal way. This is not surprising, as TikTok's rise directly contributed to historic voting turnouts from Millennials and Gen-Z due to uncensored access to information — that voting was overwhelmingly liberal/progressive.

Plus, we can't forget the now iconic "does TikTok connect to my wifi?" line of questioning from NC Rep. Richard Hudson, displaying how incompetent some of our congresspeople are in grasping what role technology plays in people's day-to-day.

Additionally, this bill unfairly targets TikTok — the people's favorite. The digital world is a wide place with lots of perspectives. That's why algorithms help guide people to find their community within this expansive landscape. This bill, and the recent congressional hearing, seems to disapprove of this type of personalization, but only from a company not started in the US. In my opinion, there are other more pressing matters — such as Meta and Google voluntarily giving away user data to law enforcement in states where there is an abortion ban present and Meta allowing election interference to take place on its platforms via propaganda directly from Russian actors.

There is a better way to address privacy and national security that doesn't breach free speech and the right to access information via targeted bans or sanctions. Cooperation, educated 3rd party reviews, and proper regulation are better alternatives.

—

This brings me into my next specific grievance/opposition point regarding the **RESTRICT Act (S.686)**.
To be very honest, I can't believe someone could write this bill and think it's okay. Upon first glance, one would think "oh okay, they're just trying to ensure no one spies on us and gains intel that could destroy our country and the people within it". However, once you take some time to read this bill, it becomes jarring — nearly dystopian.
I understand that we want to be proactive when it comes to protecting ourselves from foreign adversaries, but we have to do it in a way where peoples' rights aren't infringed upon. From the wording in this bill, any technology that is housed or was created in a different country that falls under our foreign adversaries list is subject to surveillance, review, and banning — this includes hardware, software, and even quantum elements. For a country whose major businesses outsource production to some of these countries, namely China, this just means that consumers will be getting surveilled and censored. This is absolutely unacceptable.
I'm sure you've read this bill, but I just want to list off some of the things that would be monitored that made my jaw drop:

- ☑ wireless local area networks
- ☑ mobile networks
- ☑ cable access points
- ☑ internet hosting services
- ☑ content delivery services
- ☑ data science products
- ☑ applications (desktop, mobile, payment, web, gaming)
- ☑ e-commerce technology and services

As a longtime marketer, this screams to me job instability. With our debt ceiling literally hanging in the balance, this is worrisome that this is a priority instead of taking care of urgent matters within our country first.
To top it off, an unelected official would be the head of this initiative, which doesn't adequately position this person with the level of regulation needed to hold this amount of power over the people.

This bill does not need to go any further than it is right now. Please urge your colleagues throughout Congress to think of a different way to identify and tackle national security threats. We live in a time where there's so much technology available to leverage to accurately identify red flags. I suggest leveraging those resources and knowledgeable experts to develop that framework.