

# That anyone can edit

© 30 April 2020 Norbert de Jonge (mail@norbertdejonge.nl); CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

An open letter to the Wikimedia Foundation.

Online encyclopedia Wikipedia has various legal policies, including "Child protection".<sup>1</sup> The lead of the article on this policy states:

"Wikipedia regards the safety of children using the site as a key issue. Editors who attempt to use Wikipedia to pursue or facilitate inappropriate adult–child relationships, who advocate inappropriate adult–child relationships on- or off-wiki (e.g. by expressing the view that inappropriate relationships are not harmful to children), or who identify themselves as pedophiles, will be blocked or banned indefinitely."

Human beings who self-identify as pedophiles on-wiki or engage in pro-pedo activism off-wiki cannot edit Wikipedia. Wikipedia, (once known as) an encyclopedia anyone can edit,<sup>2</sup> preemptively disallows any and all contributions from such people.

Wikipedia has userboxes,<sup>3</sup> small rectangular boxes that Wikipedians can add to their user pages to express themselves.<sup>4</sup> All kinds of userboxes are in use, including hundreds related to sexual orientation,<sup>5</sup> mental health,<sup>6</sup> and politics.<sup>7</sup> For example, various userboxes with the text "This user identifies as gay." are used by hundreds of Wikipedians.<sup>8</sup> I self-identify as a pedophile. Even if I would refrain from making myself known as such on Wikipedia, I'm not allowed to edit the encyclopedia, because I'm also a pro-pedo activist off-wiki. Wikipedia has three core content policies: neutral point of view, verifiability, and no original research.<sup>9</sup> Convicted criminals who abide by these policies are welcome to contribute to Wikipedia, even from jail. I am not, because of my off-wiki activist activities. Some of my non-pedophile acquaintances aren't either, for the same reason.

Where does Wikipedia's "Child protection" policy come from, does it help - as its name implies - protect (the safety of) children, and is that even its goal?

In July 2005, a thread was created on Wikimedia's "WikiEN-I" mailing list, with the

---

1 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Child\\_protection](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Child_protection)

2 <https://www.technologyreview.com/2013/10/22/175674/the-decline-of-wikipedia/>  
<https://www.nytimes.com/2006/06/17/technology/17wiki.html>  
[https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/The\\_Free\\_Encyclopaedia\\_that\\_Anyone\\_can\\_Edit%EF%BC%9A\\_The\\_Shifting\\_Values\\_of\\_Wikipedia\\_Editors](https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/The_Free_Encyclopaedia_that_Anyone_can_Edit%EF%BC%9A_The_Shifting_Values_of_Wikipedia_Editors)

3 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Userboxes>

4 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:User\\_pages#Userboxes](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:User_pages#Userboxes)

5 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Userboxes/Life/Sexuality>

6 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Userboxes/Health/Mental>

7 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Userboxes/Politics>

8 <https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Special:WhatLinksHere/User:UBX/gay&limit=500>

[https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Special:WhatLinksHere/Template:Userbox\\_Gay&limit=500](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Special:WhatLinksHere/Template:Userbox_Gay&limit=500)

[https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Special:WhatLinksHere/User:Krako/Userboxes/User\\_gay&limit=500](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Special:WhatLinksHere/User:Krako/Userboxes/User_gay&limit=500)  
9 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Core\\_content\\_policies](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Core_content_policies)

subject "Shouldn't we kick paedophiles off Wikipedia?".<sup>10</sup> The discussion is brief, and the suggestion is rejected. Some of the participants' comments:

"I don't think we should throw anyone out for what they \*are\*."

"People are allowed to be themselves, so long as it doesn't break a rule."

"Anyone can make a good wikipedian as long as they abide by our policies."

"Many people state their bias on their user page, be it religious, political or more personal. This is sometimes useful for other editors - it can help to know where someone is coming from."

It's interesting to me that the discussion initiator states:

"At the very least they are encouraging others to commit crimes (by arguing that paedophilia is perfectly acceptable)."

This is similar to what the Dutch Public Prosecution Service is currently arguing, that some of my writings advocating the legalization of pedosexuality may have been seditious. In 2014, the Supreme Court of the Netherlands banned pro-pedo association Martijn for more or less the same reason. These expressions of mine may be an offense that is punishable by up to five years jail time. Apparently, I'm 'picking quarrels and provoking trouble'.<sup>11</sup>

On 5 February 2006, Wikipedian Paroxysm created userbox (template) "User pedophile", with the wording: "This user identifies as a pedophile." He "thought it might be useful".<sup>12</sup> There is no complete, publicly accessible revision history for this - now deleted - page, but evidence of its creation is still available.<sup>13</sup> The userbox was deleted and restored several times.<sup>14</sup> Later that day, the same userbox re-created by Paroxysm under the name "User paedophile", was also deleted and restored several times.<sup>15</sup> Multiple Wikipedia administrators reversed other administrators' actions, a process known as "wheel warring".<sup>16</sup> This particular incident, known as the "pedophilia userbox wheel war",<sup>17</sup> culminated when Wikipedia co-founder Jimmy Wales stepped in with his (then) 'ultimate authority'.<sup>18</sup> Wales also wrote: "I have temporarily desysopped everyone who in any way was 'wheel warring' tonight over the stupid trolling template."<sup>19</sup> And: "This is a rather historic moment. I believe with some degree of certainty that I have never personally desysopped anyone."<sup>20</sup> The result of an

---

10 <https://lists.wikimedia.org/pipermail/wikien-l/2005-July/thread.html#26093>

<https://lists.wikimedia.org/pipermail/wikien-l/2005-July/thread.html#26099>

11 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Picking\\_quarrels\\_and\\_provoking\\_trouble](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Picking_quarrels_and_provoking_trouble)

12 [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Wikipedia:Administrators%27\\_noticeboard&diff=prev&oldid=38362445](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Wikipedia:Administrators%27_noticeboard&diff=prev&oldid=38362445)

13 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Requests\\_for\\_arbitration/Pedophilia\\_userbox\\_wheel\\_war/Evidence](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Requests_for_arbitration/Pedophilia_userbox_wheel_war/Evidence)

14 [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Template:User\\_pedophile&action=history](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Template:User_pedophile&action=history)

15 [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Template:User\\_paedophile&action=history](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Template:User_paedophile&action=history)

16 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Administrators#Wheel\\_war](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Administrators#Wheel_war)

17 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Requests\\_for\\_arbitration/Pedophilia\\_userbox\\_wheel\\_war](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Requests_for_arbitration/Pedophilia_userbox_wheel_war)

18 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Special:Log?type=&user=Jimbo+Wales&page=&wpdate=2006-02-05&tagfilter=&wpfilters%5B%5D=patrol>

19 [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Wikipedia:Administrators%27\\_noticeboard&diff=prev&oldid=38429973](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Wikipedia:Administrators%27_noticeboard&diff=prev&oldid=38429973)

20 [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Wikipedia:Administrators%27\\_noticeboard&diff=prev&oldid=38394059](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Wikipedia:Administrators%27_noticeboard&diff=prev&oldid=38394059)

ongoing debate of the proposed deletion of the controversial userbox was (therefore) "Speedy delete by User:Jimbo Wales".<sup>21</sup> That same day, Wikipedian Carbonite wrote:<sup>22</sup>

"I plan on indefinitely blocking any user who includes this template. [...] I can't even imagine the PR nightmare that the Wikimedia Foundation would face if articles were being written by self-identified pedophiles."

In March 2007, Wikipedian, and then member of the Arbitration Committee,<sup>23</sup> Fred Bauder states that matters regarding self-identified pedophiles should be addressed by email.<sup>24</sup> In December 2007, a discussion about a pedophile userbox is closed with the message: "Further discussion of this issue by private email to Arbcom only please."<sup>25</sup> Also in December 2007, Wales writes a Wikipedian that they "may not include in your user space material that is likely to bring the project into disrepute".<sup>26</sup>

On 25 April 2010, an edit of the "Lolicon" article by Wikipedian Despondent2,<sup>27</sup> led to a discussion about Wikipedia's policy regarding editors who self-identify as pedophiles and pro-pedo activism.<sup>28</sup> On 27 April 2010, Wikipedian MZMcBride adds to the discussion that "if this is the standard practice (and it appears to be), there's no need to be so damn coy about it", and creates an essay article that would eventually become the "Child protection" policy.<sup>29</sup> In the months that follow, the article's status changes frequently, particularly between "information page" and "policy". In the period 29 June 2010 until 2 July 2010, Wikipedian Georgewilliamherbert changes the protection level of the article several times, in an attempt to keep the policy status in place.<sup>30</sup> Once again its status changes, and Wales steps in to re-add the policy tag on 5 July 2010.<sup>31</sup> In 2013, Wikipedian Alison adds the phrase "on or off-wiki" after "who advocate inappropriate adult-child relationships".<sup>32</sup> Wikipedian The Devil's Advocate removes the phrase several times, but their edits are reverted.

The creation of the "Child protection" policy in 2010 did not take place in a vacuum. No, sirree, it certainly did not. Early April 2010, the other Wikipedia co-founder, Larry Sanger, reported Wikipedia's parent organization Wikimedia Foundation to the FBI,

---

21 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Templates\\_for\\_deletion/Log/2006\\_February\\_5#Template:User\\_paedophile](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Templates_for_deletion/Log/2006_February_5#Template:User_paedophile)

22 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Administrators%27\\_noticeboard/Archive29#Blocking\\_self-identified\\_pedophiles](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Administrators%27_noticeboard/Archive29#Blocking_self-identified_pedophiles)

23 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Arbitration\\_Committee/History#Current\\_and\\_former\\_members](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Arbitration_Committee/History#Current_and_former_members)

24 <https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Wikipedia:Arbitration/Requests&diff=111890354&oldid=111887366>

25 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Administrators'\\_noticeboard/IncidentArchive344#Pro\\_pedophile\\_advocacy\\_userbox](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Administrators'_noticeboard/IncidentArchive344#Pro_pedophile_advocacy_userbox)

26 <https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=User:Mcrazychick&diff=178618986&oldid=17860080>

27 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Special:Contributions/Despondent2>

28 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Administrators'\\_noticeboard/IncidentArchive610#Pedophilia\\_advocacy\\_on\\_Lolicon](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Administrators'_noticeboard/IncidentArchive610#Pedophilia_advocacy_on_Lolicon)

29 [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Wikipedia:Child\\_protection&oldid=358570794](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Wikipedia:Child_protection&oldid=358570794)

30 [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Wikipedia:Child\\_protection&diff=370761799&oldid=370752210](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Wikipedia:Child_protection&diff=370761799&oldid=370752210)

[https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Wikipedia:Child\\_protection&diff=370916961&oldid=370916649](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Wikipedia:Child_protection&diff=370916961&oldid=370916649)

[https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Wikipedia:Child\\_protection&diff=371423736&oldid=371422838](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Wikipedia:Child_protection&diff=371423736&oldid=371422838)

31 [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Wikipedia:Child\\_protection&diff=371848719&oldid=371845302](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Wikipedia:Child_protection&diff=371848719&oldid=371845302)

32 [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Wikipedia:Child\\_protection&diff=548714991&oldid=548543035](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Wikipedia:Child_protection&diff=548714991&oldid=548543035)

saying their Wikimedia Commons "may be knowingly distributing child pornography".<sup>33</sup> Sanger also claimed that "Eric Moeller, a high-level Wikipedia manager, is well known for his views in defense of pedophilia"; which Moeller denies.<sup>34</sup> (Moeller was on Wikimedia Foundation's Board of Trustees<sup>35</sup> and once wrote "What is my position on pedophilia, then? It's really simple. If the child doesn't want it, is neutral or ambiguous<sup>[sic]</sup>, it's inappropriate. This excludes most adult/child sexual contact, but only little child/child contact."<sup>36</sup>) On 27 April 2010, Fox News reported on Sanger's claims.<sup>37</sup> A day later, the Wikimedia Foundation publicly responded to Fox News.<sup>38</sup> On 6 May 2010, Wales announces on Wikimedia Commons that he suggests "immediate deletion of all pornographic images",<sup>39</sup> and the next day he starts deleting such images.<sup>40</sup> His actions were incredibly poorly received by the Wikimedia Commons volunteer community.<sup>41</sup> On 9 May 2010, Wales decided to give up - remove and have removed - all his special editing privileges.<sup>42</sup> A discussion to limit or remove the rights connected to his founder-flag was already ongoing since 25 March 2010.<sup>43</sup> On 25 June 2010, Fox News publishes the article "EXCLUSIVE: Pedophiles Find a Home on Wikipedia".<sup>44</sup> On 28 June 2010, Wales re-states about pedophile advocacy and self-identification that "both are banned, full stop".<sup>45</sup>

Wales, Wikipedia's co-founder no longer has 'ultimate authority' on Wikipedia as a result of his poor judgment and actions he took when he feared certain things would bring the encyclopedia into disrepute. Wales, who used his 'ultimate authority' to definitively disallow a userbox he deemed a "stupid trolling template", whose 'ultimate authority' was (ab)used to close an ongoing debate of the proposed deletion of said userbox, and who used his 'ultimate authority' to definitively confirm the status of the "Child protection" article as policy.

---

33 <https://web.archive.org/web/20160303235542/http://h-net.msu.edu/cgi-bin/logbrowse.pl?trx=vx&list=EDTECH&month=1004&week=a&msg=oh60TKAnthvEwBjcWNxxSg>  
[https://www.theregister.co.uk/2010/04/09/sanger\\_reports\\_wikimedia\\_to\\_the\\_fbi/](https://www.theregister.co.uk/2010/04/09/sanger_reports_wikimedia_to_the_fbi/)

34 <http://intelligentdesigns.net/my-defamation-2-0-experience/>

35 [https://meta.wikimedia.org/wiki/History\\_of\\_the\\_Wikimedia\\_Foundation\\_Board\\_of\\_Trustees/en](https://meta.wikimedia.org/wiki/History_of_the_Wikimedia_Foundation_Board_of_Trustees/en)

36 <https://web.archive.org/web/20141206152004/www.kuro5hin.org/comments/2001/3/30/4410/84525/72>

37 <https://www.foxnews.com/tech/wikipedia-distributing-child-porn-co-founder-tells-fbi>

38 <https://blog.wikimedia.org/2010/04/28/wikimedia-foundation-responds-to-fox-news/>

39 [https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?title=User\\_talk:Jimbo\\_Wales&diff=prev&oldid=38806204](https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?title=User_talk:Jimbo_Wales&diff=prev&oldid=38806204)

40 <https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?title=Special%3ALog&type=delete&user=Jimbo+Wales>

41 [https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Commons:Village\\_pump/Archive/2010/05#Cleanup\\_policy](https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Commons:Village_pump/Archive/2010/05#Cleanup_policy)

[https://meta.wikimedia.org/wiki/Petition\\_to\\_Jimbo](https://meta.wikimedia.org/wiki/Petition_to_Jimbo)

[https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Commons\\_talk:Sexual\\_content/Village\\_pump/2010-5-7#Jimbo\\_the\\_vandal](https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Commons_talk:Sexual_content/Village_pump/2010-5-7#Jimbo_the_vandal)

[https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/User\\_talk:Jimbo\\_Wales/Archive\\_4#Note](https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/User_talk:Jimbo_Wales/Archive_4#Note)

42 <http://lists.wikimedia.org/pipermail/foundation-l/2010-May/058095.html>

<http://lists.wikimedia.org/pipermail/foundation-l/2010-May/058158.html>

<https://lists.wikimedia.org/pipermail/foundation-l/2010-May/058160.html>

<http://meta.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?title=Special%3AGlobalUsers%2Ffounder&year=2010&month=5&day=9>

<http://meta.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?title=Special%3ALog&type=gblrights&user=&page=User%3AJimbo+Wales&year=2010&month=5&day=9&limit=1>

43 [https://meta.wikimedia.org/wiki/Requests\\_for\\_comment/Remove\\_Founder\\_flag](https://meta.wikimedia.org/wiki/Requests_for_comment/Remove_Founder_flag)

44 <https://www.foxnews.com/tech/exclusive-pedophiles-find-a-home-on-wikipedia>

45 [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=User\\_talk:Jimbo\\_Wales&diff=370690347&oldid=370690032](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=User_talk:Jimbo_Wales&diff=370690347&oldid=370690032)

People who publicly self-identify as pedophiles are not automatically advocating for age of consent reform. Such people simply state their politically incorrect sexual orientation. Many pedophiles, such as members of Virtuous Pedophiles,<sup>46</sup> believe - and state publicly - that pedosexual acts are wrong. It is (therefore) ridiculous to claim that aforementioned self-identification on Wikipedia is advocacy in and of itself. Preemptively disallowing contributions from human beings who self-identify as pedophiles on-wiki or engage in pro-pedo activism off-wiki is an expression of moral panic that goes against Wikimedia Foundation's non-discrimination policy<sup>47</sup> and code of conduct.<sup>48</sup> (It is discrimination based on "sexual orientation" and/or "medical status" and/or "mental disability" and/or "medical condition"; take your pick.) It could be against Wikimedia's founding principles,<sup>49</sup> but in April 2011 a non-registered Wikipedian added "almost" in the sentence "The ability of almost anyone to edit (most) articles without registration." for the reason that "the official Child protection policy of wikipedia bans some people from editing from the start".<sup>50</sup> The only edit performed by this Wikipedian, and uncontested until this day.

The reason self-identification as pedophiles by Wikipedians has occasionally been disruptive is because of reactions from other editors and instigation by maleficent, polarizing mass media that are looking to fling mud. Because of its core content policies, allowing self-identified pedophiles to edit Wikipedia is not dangerous or *intrinsically* disruptive. And, as Wikipedian Stevage wrote, Wikipedia is not a morality brigade.<sup>51</sup> Wikipedia should allow its editors to be themselves, so long as their contributions abide by the content and civility rules and are aimed towards improving the encyclopedia. Experiencing certain attractions is different from engaging in criminal conduct.

The "Child protection" policy does not distinguish between pro-pedo activism on-wiki and such activism off-wiki. Perhaps in the assumption that anyone who engages in pro-pedo activism anywhere must be a pedophile, but this is a misguided view.<sup>52</sup> Besides, in many countries, including the United States,<sup>53</sup> being a pro-pedo activist is not an illegal activity. Off-wiki opinions should not impact people's ability to edit Wikipedia.

The offending passages of this discriminatory policy do not protect children either. Pedophiles can still edit Wikipedia. Wikipedia's "don't ask, don't tell"<sup>54</sup>-like stance

---

46 <https://www.nytimes.com/2014/10/06/opinion/pedophilia-a-disorder-not-a-crime.html>

47 [https://foundation.wikimedia.org/wiki/Non-discrimination\\_policy](https://foundation.wikimedia.org/wiki/Non-discrimination_policy)

48 [https://foundation.wikimedia.org/wiki/Code\\_of\\_conduct\\_policy](https://foundation.wikimedia.org/wiki/Code_of_conduct_policy)

49 [https://meta.wikimedia.org/wiki/Founding\\_principles](https://meta.wikimedia.org/wiki/Founding_principles)

50 [https://meta.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?title=Founding\\_principles&diff=2482851&oldid=2292971](https://meta.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?title=Founding_principles&diff=2482851&oldid=2292971)

51 [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Wikipedia:Administrators\\_noticeboard&diff=prev&oldid=38356235](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Wikipedia:Administrators_noticeboard&diff=prev&oldid=38356235)

52 e.g. <https://www.folia.nl/actueel/111821/gert-hekma-gaat-met-pensioen-pffff-iedereen-is-zo-preuts-en-braaf-geworden> <https://www.volkskrant.nl/columns-opinie/hoge-raad-verbied-vereniging-martijn-niet~b25e1f06/>

53 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/North\\_American\\_Man/Boy\\_Love\\_Association](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/North_American_Man/Boy_Love_Association)

54 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Don%27t\\_ask,\\_don%27t\\_tell](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Don%27t_ask,_don%27t_tell)

merely means pedophiles will hide their sexual orientation, hide their possible bias, and possibly edit under false pretenses; all under less watchful eyes. The openness of Wikipedia and its public recording of communication protects children, making it an unlikely place for grooming to occur. As for its email functionality, which allows registered users to exchange emails privately (off-wiki):<sup>55</sup> self-identification or not, it makes no difference when it comes to child protection. In fact, the MediaWiki engine could be modified to allow for disabling - or better control of - the email functionality of self-identified pedophiles. If necessary, this and other tools (such as Section 230<sup>56</sup>) can be used to further avoid liability.

The policy was created in response to fear of disrepute and fear of liability if an incident occurs, build on arguments from authority and other fallacies. It was an emotional response. Let's re-approach the subject, this time with logic and reason. Wikipedia can simultaneously be a respectable volunteer organization *and* accept contributions from self-identified pedophiles such as myself and from off-wiki activists. Wikipedia already has sufficient tools to stop pedophilia activism and harassment, including WP:SOAPBOX,<sup>57</sup> WP:RIGHTGREATWRONGS,<sup>58</sup> WP:NOTFREESPEECH,<sup>59</sup> and WP:HARASS.<sup>60</sup>

I urge the Wikimedia Foundation to scrutinize the "Child protection" policy, and to allow me to edit Wikipedia despite my controversial feelings and off-wiki opinions.

---

55 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Emailing\\_users](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Emailing_users)

56 <https://www.eff.org/issues/cda230>

57 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/WP:SOAPBOX>

58 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/WP:RIGHTGREATWRONGS>

59 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/WP:NOTFREESPEECH>

60 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/WP:HARASS>