CHAPTER 4

Media Democracy in Action

Compiled by Andy Lee Roth and Mickey Huff, with contributions by Steven Wishnia (Dissent NewsWire), Alexander Reid Ross (Earth First! Newswire), and Sue Udry (Defending Dissent Foundation); Beatrice Edwards (Government Accountability Project); Adam Jonas Horowitz (Nuclear Savage); Ian Thomas Ash (A2-B-C); Arlene Engelhardt and Mary Glenney (From a Woman’s Point of View); Crystal Bedford, Lisa Davis, Darian Edelman, Lauren Freeman, and Ellie Kim (Project Censored student interns); and Jyarland Daniels, and Rebekah Spicuglia (Race Forward/Colorlines)

We are what we do, and above all what we do to change what we are: our identity lies in action and struggle. That is why the revelation of what we are implies denunciation of what prevents us being what we can be. We define ourselves through defiance and through opposing obstacles.

—Eduardo Galeano (September 3, 1940–April 13, 2015)

_Censored 2004_ was the first volume in which we featured a chapter titled “Media Democracy in Action.” Documenting a growing media democracy movement that offered a sharp contrast to the top-down corporate model, the chapter’s authors framed it as “a report on the everyday activism of grassroots media groups all across the nation.”

Subsequent _Censored_ volumes have continued and expanded this coverage to include organizations and individuals whose work fosters more informed publics, promotes direct participation in political decision making, and contributes to a more robust civil society.

The contributors to this year’s chapter continue that tradition.
Engaged in the action and struggle that Eduardo Galeano identified as crucial to positive social change, the issues and organizations represented here deserve your keen attention and support.

MOBILIZING INDEPENDENT MEDIA TO HALT FBI HARASSMENT IN CASCADIA

Steven Wishnia, Alexander Reid Ross, and Sue Udry

On December 19, 2014, Idaho environmental activist Helen Yost received a text message from a Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) agent named Travis Thiede. “Helen, I am trying to get a hold of you to speak with you,” he wrote. “An issue has come up, and I need to speak with you. Please give me a call. I am an FBI agent.”

The text followed several phone calls from an unfamiliar number that she’d ignored. Yost, whose response was “NO!,” had her ideas about why she was being sought out. She was active in Wild Idaho Rising Tide (WIRT), which had been fighting “megaloads,” giant trucks that haul equipment for processing tar-sands oil and can be longer than a football field, since 2011. On the day the first calls were placed, she had just returned to her home in Moscow from a weekend organizing trip.

Yost wasn’t the only activist being bothered.

The development of Alberta’s tar-sands oil—the massively polluting oil slated to be shipped through the planned Keystone XL pipeline—has drawn a strong response from environmentalists in the Pacific Northwest, also known as the Cascadia Bioregion. In 2013, a coalition of settler-descendants and Native Americans blocked megaloads traveling through the Nez Perce reservation in Idaho. In turn, the FBI and local police have begun reviving the surveillance and infiltration tactics used on a larger scale in the “Green Scare” operations of the late 1990s and early 2000s.

In October 2014, FBI agents had visited Herb Goodwin, a Rising Tide activist who often worked with Yost, at his home in Bellingham, Washington, questioning him about another environmentalist group. Idaho anti-fracking activist Alma Hasse was jailed for a week without being charged after her questions at a public meeting annoyed members of a county commission.
Alexander Reid Ross, who had broken stories about the megaloads as a writer for *Earth First! Journal*, approached Dissent NewsWire in November with an idea for a story on government harassment of activists in Cascadia. Devoted to dissent and civil liberties news, Dissent NewsWire was started in 2014, but its publisher, the Defending Dissent Foundation, has a long history; it was founded in 1960 by Frank Wilkinson, a Los Angeles activist who’d helped organize a working-class Chicano neighborhood that was about to be evicted in order to build the Dodgers stadium. At the time, Wilkinson was about to go to prison for contempt of Congress: when the House Un-American Activities Committee asked him its perennial question—“Are you now or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?”—he’d responded by taking the First Amendment instead of the Fifth.

We launched Dissent NewsWire to provide authoritative, comprehensive coverage of the repression of dissent in the United States. It complements our advocacy work by ensuring that stories of repression are made public. When you put it all together in one place—police cracking down on protesters of every stripe, the FBI infiltrating activist groups or harassing activists without any reasonable suspicion, and the government collecting data on everyone’s phone calls, along with government secrecy and the war on whistleblowers—the scope of the problem is evident.

Udry passed Ross’s query on to Dissent NewsWire editor Steven Wishnia. They both agreed it was a good story, but not yet ready for publication.

At the time, all we had was a couple of FBI visits, Alma Hasse’s arrest, and a lot of background information on Green Scare. There was smoke there, but not enough solid information yet for us to go with it. We wanted to document more specific instances of government harassing activists.

We were working on the story for about a month when it seemed as though it had gone cold. Ross recalled frustratedly putting down his pen for a day or two when suddenly his friend Helen received the postmodern equivalent of a knock on the door.

The FBI phone calls and texts to Helen Yost gave the story the hook it needed. Ross reworked the article, and Wishnia and Udry combed the burrs out of the verbiage. Dissent NewsWire published it on January 5,
2015, under the headline “Why Is the FBI Harassing Activists in Cascadia?” Ross, using relationships he’d developed as both a journalist and an activist, got it reposted immediately by the Ecologist, CounterPunch, the Global Justice Ecology Project, GreenIstheNewRed.com, Earth Island Journal, and more.

Meanwhile, Yost had e-mailed Spokane Spokesman-Review reporter Becky Kramer in late December, trying to get her interested in doing a story. Kramer was interested enough to begin reporting it, but got “sidetracked” by the breaking news of a northern Idaho woman being fatally shot by her two-year-old son, who’d pulled her gun out of her purse.

Yost kept reminding her, sending her a copy of Ross’s Dissent NewsWire article, and putting her in touch with Bellingham lawyer Lawrence Hildes, who in turn put her in touch with Herb Goodwin. Eventually Kramer got back on the story.

The Spokesman-Review article ran on January 23, 2015. It got picked up by the Associated Press, through which it was disseminated to Oregon Public Broadcasting, the Houston Chronicle, the Washington Times, and other newspapers around the nation. In early February, it got picked up by the Canadian Press news agency, which recast it with a more Canadian orientation. From there, it made its way to the Toronto-based Globe and Mail and other international sites.

Since the article was published, activists have not reported any additional FBI visits. “I haven’t heard of any contact in at least the last month—at least since the story broke,” Hildes, who has represented Northwestern environmental activists for twenty-five years, told Ross in February. “The FBI’s only comment is ‘We don’t contact people unless there’s a criminal investigation,’ which they kept telling me there wasn’t. I think at this point . . . they slunk back off into the corner they came out of.”

It’s a small victory, but we’ll take it.

For more on the Defending Dissent Foundation and its Dissent NewsWire, see defendingdissent.org.

Follow the Earth First! Newswire at earthfirstjournal.org/newswire.
STEVEN WISHNIA is a New York–based journalist who has written extensively on civil liberties, housing, labor, and drug policy issues. Currently editor of Dissent NewsWire (defendingdissent.org), national reporter for LaborPress (laborpress.org), and editor of the New York City housing monthly Tenant/Inquilino (metcouncilonhousing.org), he has won two New York City Independent Press Association awards for his coverage of housing issues. His work has appeared in the Nation, In These Times, Daily Beast, AlterNet, Salon, the Indypendent, Gothamist, and numerous others, and he has worked as an editor at High Times, PC Magazine, and Junior Scholastic. He is also the author of two novels, When the Drumming Stops and Exit 25 Utopia, as well as The Cannabis Companion, and he coedited the anthology Imagine: Living in a Socialist U.S.A. Bassist in the 1980s punk band False Prophets, he still plays music quasi-professionally.

ALEXANDER REID ROSS, MA, is a cofounding moderator of the Earth First! NewsWire. His master’s thesis, “Politics and the People,” and his latest book, Against the Fascist Creep, are both due out in 2015. He edited the anthology Grabbing Back: Essays Against the Global Land Grab, featuring Noam Chomsky and Vandana Shiva, and his work has been featured in the Cambridge University Strategic Initiative in Global Food Security, Climate and Capitalism, CounterPunch, Defending Dissent, the Ecologist, Green Social Thought, Third World Resurgence, Toward Freedom, and Upping the Anti. Updates and links to his writing can be found at alexanderreidross.com.

SUE UDRY, executive director of the Defending Dissent Foundation, won her high school’s “Best Citizen” award in 1978 and has been working to earn that title ever since. She played a leadership role in her campus peace group, and after graduate school, she began knocking on doors in neighborhoods around the country as a canvasser for SANE, the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, now Peace Action. Prior to joining the Defending Dissent Foundation, she served as the executive director of the Chicago Committee to Defend the Bill of Rights and as an organizer for the Coalition for New Priorities and the Day Care Action Council of Illinois. She was the legislative coordinator for United for Peace and Justice, a coalition of over 1,600 groups opposing the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Sue currently serves on the board of the National Coalition to Protect Civil Freedoms and the National Coalition to Protect Student Privacy, as well as the advisory board of the Charity and Security Network. She is a cofounder of the Montgomery County Civil Rights Coalition and treasurer of the Washington DC chapter of the National Lawyers Guild.

THE GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY PROJECT

Beatrice Edwards

Nearly forty years ago, the Institute for Policy Studies (IPS) created the Government Accountability Project (GAP) in response to whistleblowers such as Daniel Ellsberg, who approached IPS for help releasing the Pentagon Papers. In the years since then, as the US has privatized what were once basic public services and then deregulated
the private sector, whistleblowers have come to be the last voice of the public interest in an increasingly secretive and undemocratic government/corporate complex.

Since 1977, GAP has grown to over twenty lawyers and investigators who work to promote occupational free speech. While protecting whistleblowers from retaliation, GAP helps them release crucial information that serves the public interest and the common good—information that, in the absence of whistleblowers, the public would never know.

Working through Congress, the courts, and the press, GAP has developed a method of exposing government and corporate secrets responsibly. We support our whistleblowing clients in creating an advocacy agenda surrounding their concerns, and developing, then implementing, broad whistleblower protection policy reforms both domestically and internationally. Over the course of the past thirty-eight years, we have represented over 5,000 whistleblowers and achieved highly public results.

In the aftermath of the Enron meltdown in 2001, GAP worked to include whistleblower protection provisions in the reform legislation known as Sarbanes-Oxley. Similarly, GAP ensured that the Dodd-Frank Wall Street reforms, adopted after the financial crisis of 2008 and 2009, included strong whistleblower protection provisions so that whistleblowers in banking would not have to fear reprisal if they reported illegal risk and trading by their employers.

Because of GAP’s work with Congress, comprehensive whistleblower protections now apply to federal workers, private sector employees, and nearly all federal government contractors. In addition, food production facilities regulated by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), manufacturing or retailing companies that make products regulated by the federal government, health insurance companies, airline and surface transportation companies, and any firms receiving federal stimulus funds are all obliged to afford their workers protection from retaliation should they lawfully disclose corruption, fraud, illegality, abuse of authority, or danger to the public health and safety.

In recent years, GAP has become especially active in protecting whistleblowers who disclose crimes and misdemeanors in the envi-
ronmental sphere, where corporate and government secrecy intersect. For example, since 2001, we have brought to the world’s attention White House efforts to allow oil lobbyists to rewrite scientific reports on climate change to make the government’s own empirical research appear tentative and dubious. With a former client, the late whistleblower Rick Piltz, GAP launched Climate Science Watch in 2005, and since then, CSW has become a compelling voice in opposing those who claim climate change is a hoax or not man-made. Our program has expanded to include scientists and policy makers who monitor and expose the contradiction between effective climate policy and accelerated fossil fuel development. Put simply, GAP and its environmental program whistleblowers highlight the collision course between current climate change mitigation efforts and overt efforts to expand fracking, tar-sands extraction, and deepwater oil drilling.

Of course, the intelligence community and the national security state are at the heart of government secrecy and overreach, and GAP is working there to secure whistleblower protections for both federal workers and intelligence community contractors. As unconstitutional government programs have obliged American taxpayers to fund the surveillance operations that illegally seized their private communications, we represent a group of National Security Agency (NSA) whistleblowers, including Edward Snowden. We are working to obtain legislative protection for national security whistleblowers that would allow them to mount a public interest defense when they are charged as criminals for exposing the clandestine corruption of the military–surveillance complex.

Deregulation has also become an increasingly serious issue in food production, especially as corporate food producers have successfully transferred routine food safety inspections to the industry itself. We are working with whistleblowers in poultry and hog production facilities to expose the dangers of high-speed meat inspection and the reality behind bogus “humane handling” claims. With guidance from whistleblowers, GAP is submitting targeted Freedom of Information Act requests to secure information about inadequate food safety safeguards and to publicize the documents that the government is forced to release.

Internationally, GAP has worked to secure and then strengthen whistleblower protection policies at intergovernmental organiza-
tions, where senior management typically operate beyond the reach of national legal systems. At the United Nations, the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank, where management enjoys legal immunities similar to those of the diplomatic corps, an atmosphere developed where fraud flourished, until staff members could claim protection from reprisal when they report illegality and abuse. High-level abuse of authority became routine in this climate, but guided by whistleblowers, GAP demonstrated that even the most influential senior officials could be held accountable. In May 2007, Paul Wolfowitz, then president of the World Bank, was attempting to engage the Bank in Iraq, in violation of institutional operating principles that prohibited projects in countries at war. Before he could reach this goal, however, Wolfowitz was forced to resign when whistleblowers helped GAP expose his personal corruption.

In 2015, although much has been accomplished to protect whistleblowers and reveal their disclosures, much remains to be done. As managers find it more difficult to retaliate in the face of stronger free speech rights in the workplace, they are increasing their use of a forceful new method of retribution: referring whistleblowers for criminal investigation and prosecution when they make what should be protected disclosures. Although most of these retaliatory criminal investigations find no wrongdoing by the whistleblower, the chilling effect is real. While under investigation, whistleblowers’ reputations can be irreparably harmed and they can accumulate ruinous legal costs. To combat this form of career-wrecking reprisal, GAP is now promoting measures that provide whistleblowers with an affirmative defense to challenge criminal charges. As employees of conscience work to ensure that the public interest is protected, even behind the veil of government and corporate secrecy, GAP is actively working to establish that it must never be a crime to report a crime.

Beatrice Edwards is the executive director and international program director of GAP. As executive director, she heads the organization’s efforts to defend whistleblowers in Congress, the media, and the courts. She has thirty years’ experience working on labor issues, anticorruption measures, and public-service reforms within both domestic and international frameworks. Bea is a previous contributing writer for the Texas Observer, and holds a master’s degree in Latin American studies from the University of Texas and a PhD in sociology from American University.
In early May 2013, I opened a bottle of champagne to celebrate the long delayed national broadcast of my documentary film, *Nuclear Savage: The Islands of Secret Project 4.1.* The Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) in the US announced in advertisements across the country that the film that I had written, directed, and produced, would be aired on May 28 by PBS flagship station WGBH’s broadcast division World Channel, on PBS affiliate stations from New York to California. PBS held exclusive US broadcast rights to the film, and by then had already had the finished film in its hands for more than a year and a half. PBS had already scheduled and then abruptly canceled another broadcast of the film in 2012, and I feared the film might be permanently shelved. So I was elated to see that the film had actually been advertised widely on the websites of individual PBS affiliate stations. My sister in California had seen large Web advertisements for my show on KQED San Francisco, and indeed I found similar advertisements on other PBS affiliate stations in California, Oregon, Washington, New Mexico, Vermont, and elsewhere. The broadcast was official, and it was public.

But on the advertised day and time, I switched on KNME, my local affiliate station, and the film was not there. It had been replaced by another program. The same thing had happened on KQED San Francisco, and all across the country. The broadcast had been killed, apparently from the top, without notice or explanation.

The reason for the cancellation was unstated but obvious. *Nuclear Savage* is “controversial”—the euphemism for telling an unpalatable and inconvenient truth in the mainstream media. The film tells the story of American Cold War nuclear testing in the Marshall Islands of the South Pacific, and how US government scientists deliberately exposed populations of local islanders to massive fallout radiation, in top secret human guinea pig experiments that lasted for more than three decades. The nuclear testing permanently contaminated dozens of islands, and resulted in deadly cancers and horrendous birth defects that continue to this day. It’s a shocking tale of US gov-
ernment–sanctioned human rights abuse, and it’s all true, proven by reams of declassified official government documents, direct survivor testimony, and formerly top secret motion picture films.

*Nuclear Savage* also reveals the devastating human impact of ongoing US nuclear and strategic missile testing in the Marshall Islands on Kwajalein Atoll, which the Pentagon has renamed Ronald Reagan Ballistic Missile Defense Test Site, a division of the US Army Space and Missile Defense Command/Army Forces Strategic Command.

*Nuclear Savage* was partially funded by PBS and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting’s “Minority Consortia” member, Pacific Islanders in Communications (PIC), in exchange for exclusive US public media broadcast rights. The film was delivered to PIC in October 2011, the same month it had its world premiere at the Amsterdam International Documentary Film Festival, where it was nominated for Best Environmental Film. PIC immediately asked me for permission to cut the film down to fifty-six minutes specifically to meet “PBS broadcast standards,” and I agreed to let them do the 35 percent content cut, on the condition that PBS could remove material, but could not add anything without my approval. The recut was completed under PIC’s sole supervision using their own editor. To any reasonable observer, PBS now had a final version of the show that met their own specific editorial standards, because they alone supervised and produced the new fifty-six-minute version.

American Public Television (APT), another division of PBS, selected the film for their national series called “Pacific Heartbeat,” but then asked me for narration changes, which they never sent, and instead decided to cancel *Nuclear Savage* from their series altogether. APT’s final series lineup for that season included shows about hula dancing, Tonga, and one about Royal Hawaiian Music, but they had no place for the subject of Pacific Island human radiation experiments.

Since then, *Nuclear Savage* has become a hit on the international film festival circuit, and has received impressive reviews from numerous sources. *Chicago Tribune*’s Robert Koehler said it was “one of the most disturbing documentaries I have ever seen,” and that it “does a stunning job juxtaposing our smug ignorance of South Sea culture with the reality of what we did to it.” *Variety* writer Richard Kuipers said that the film was “highly charged and well assembled” and “assumes the
qualities of a detective thriller with massive moral and political implications. . . Few will be left unmoved.” Variety also wrote that “the TV-hour version is sure to trigger discussion when broadcast on PBS in 2013.”

The film went on to win top jury prizes and audience awards in places such as Paris, Chicago, Rio de Janeiro, Tahiti, Berlin, and Mexico City, and has now been screened in more than twenty-six countries.

Nuclear Savage was also screened by special invitation at the Film Society of Lincoln Center in New York City, and in spring 2015 was given an official screening at the United Nations’ Dag Hammerskold Auditorium at the United Nations Headquarters complex, hosted by the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, in conjunction with the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty conference in New York in April 2015.

PBS was not impressed. PBS executive Cheryl Hirasa wrote to me: “We all recognize the success the film has had (and still has) in festivals and the reception it’s gotten from festival goers. Having said that, the public television audience is quite a different animal. With public television, viewers expect a high level of authenticity and trust in regards to fair and balanced storytelling. . . While this isn’t a news piece the same level of journalistic integrity is of the utmost importance.”

While implying, or rather, stating, that Nuclear Savage lacks “journalistic integrity” and “accuracy,” PBS has still not identified a single fact or journalistic claim in this film that is wrong or incorrect. They promised the producer lists of “fact-check” issues after both the APT broadcast cancellation in 2012, and the last-minute WGBH World Channel cancellation in 2013, but they have never found or identified a single questionable fact, let alone a list, in the three and a half years that PBS has been suppressing the broadcast of this film.

In May 2013, PBS sent me a certified legal letter informing me that Nuclear Savage failed to meet PBS’s “minimum broadcast standards,” and that I must now produce and deliver a twenty-six-minute version of the film meeting those unwritten standards, within two months, or be officially in “breach of contract,” with various potentially damaging and expensive implications. This proposed twenty-six-minute show would be a 65 percent cut down from the original eighty-six-minute program.

I spoke by telephone with an experienced PBS documentary pro-
ducer in San Francisco, who offered to “help” me with the situation by intervening with PBS. He was also a well-known distributor of environmental films, and knowing little more than this I initially trusted him. My trust was misplaced.

He spoke with PBS execs and told me that he got them to offer $15,000 to pay for the new proposed reedit of *Nuclear Savage*, under the condition that he act as “executive producer” of the new twenty-six-minute show, and he also said that he would oversee all aspects, including scripting and all actual editing, which he said must be done at his private postproduction facility near San Francisco.

This self-proclaimed “executive producer” also told me that he would “hire outside writers,” under his supervision, to rewrite the narration and edit the script of the new show, and that I, who was the producer, writer, and director of the original eighty-six-minute show, would have essentially no oversight, participation, or payment whatsoever in this new, severely truncated version.

He told me that my show, and indeed PBS’s own fifty-six-minute version, needed to be “sanitized,” to remove any traces of “liberal bias,” and he said repeatedly, “It is in your best interest to cooperate fully” with whatever he and PBS wanted. He warned me: “It’s not wise to bite the hand that feeds you.” There were other vague, and veiled, threats (or “recommendations,” depending on your interpretation). I wondered if I was not actually dealing with a Joe Pesci gangster character from a Martin Scorsese movie. He proposed that I be paid a total of $250 as an “honorarium,” for my symbolic role in the new recut and sanitization, and that he would keep, or spend, the rest of the $15,000 budget as he saw fit. He also proposed that his own company would receive the worldwide distribution rights to the new twenty-six-minute show.

In a telephone conference call between this “executive producer,” a PBS executive, and me, I asked them both point-blank if the proposed, truncated twenty-six-minute show would be allowed to keep its basic premise: that the US had deliberately exposed people to radiation in order to study them, and had lied and covered this up. The “executive producer” replied, “Well, that’s the 600-pound gorilla in the room.”

No, that’s the point and original premise of the film, which PBS funded twice, for production, and postproduction, based on this
original premise, until executives changed their minds, even suppressing their own completed fifty-six-minute internally produced recut. The current PBS demand to sanitize and truncate the film yet again, under officially sanctioned threat of “breach of contract,” reeks of both thuggery and coercion.

PBS’s handling of Nuclear Savage is now being watched by various private attorneys, including civil rights and First Amendment lawyer and nationally recognized expert John Boyd, who wrote, “Whether you look at these events from the perspective of Horowitz’s contractual rights or his civil rights or, for that matter, from the perspective of the public’s abhorrence of censorship, PBS’s behavior is pretty outrageous.”

My experience with Nuclear Savage and PBS is not unique, and similar stories of censorship at that network have been leveled several times in recent years. The New Yorker’s Jane Mayer did a story in 2010, titled “Public Television’s Attempts to Placate David Koch,” and in 2014 the TV satirist Stephen Colbert did a brilliant send-up of PBS censorship and how the network has become “more and more dependent on viewers nothing like you.” Harper’s did a piece in October 2014 alleging widespread PBS corporate sellout and government censorship in the story “PBS Self-Destructs,” and my own film, Nuclear Savage, was the subject of a detailed censorship expose by the media watchdog group Fairness and Accuracy in Reporting (FAIR) in 2014. That story, by Lane Wollerton, is titled “Nuclear Stalemate: When will PBS air expose on deadly Pacific Bomb Tests?”

The answer, sadly, seems to be never. PBS is not only suppressing the broadcast of Nuclear Savage, but the network is also attempting to restrict and censor my own free speech and public discussion of it. After the FAIR story, the PIC/PBS executive Leanne Ferrer wrote to me asking that I “Stop sicking reporters” [sic] on them.

The San Francisco “executive producer” that PBS demanded I hire in their new written contract told me to observe a “gag order” (his words) in dealing with any members of the press and media regarding this program, and told me to direct any media or reporter inquiries to him for comment. PBS executive Cheryl Hirasa wrote to me that “communication to the press about this particular situation should be simply expressed by letting them know that we are moving forward with continuing to find a home on public television—no more, no
less.” PBS’s handling of both Nuclear Savage and me appears like episodes out of novels by Franz Kafka and George Orwell, or the real-life exploits of the infamous World War II propaganda minister Joseph Goebbels. I did not remotely expect this kind of behavior from officials of the US “public” media establishment.

In March 2015, I was watching an episode of Nova, the premier PBS science program, and the show began with narrated, actual sponsor commercials: “Nova. Brought to you by the David Koch Foundation, Boeing, Lockheed Martin, Sandia Nuclear Laboratories, Northrop Grumman, the US Department of Energy, and viewers like you!” These are the kingpins of the US military–industrial complex. You can’t make this stuff up.

Remember that Boeing and Lockheed make the missiles and interceptor rockets tested at the Ronald Reagan Ballistic Missile Defense Test Site on Kwajalein Atoll, which the US government controls by military lease until at least the year 2086.

And remember, too, that the US Department of Energy is the same agency that built the sixty-seven nuclear bombs detonated in the Marshall Islands, and is the same agency that conceived and carried out the deadly and secret human-radiation experiments depicted in Nuclear Savage.

Is there really any question about why this film is having trouble getting a broadcast on PBS? In July 2015, PBS informed me that they had officially declined the film, meaning that they would neither try to make a twenty-six-minute version, nor ever show any version of the film at any length.

Adam Jonas Horowitz is a conceptual artist, documentary filmmaker, and sculptor, who has focused much of his life work and career on ideas surrounding human rights, free speech, and the environment. His first feature documentary film, released in 1990, told the story of a Pacific Island chieftain who occupied lands at the top secret US Ronald Reagan Ballistic Missile Defense Test Site in the Marshall Islands for six months after the US lease expired. He is also the creator of Fridgehenge, a gigantic, satirical public art project and sculptural monument constructed (and reconstructed) in Santa Fe, New Mexico, between 1997 and 2007. At first approved and then later repeatedly damaged and finally destroyed by city government officials, Fridgehenge became a controversial and infamous conceptual anti-monument to a range of ideas about consumer society, hubris, and ultimately censorship. He received dual degrees in journalism and humanities at the University of California, Berkeley, and currently resides in Santa Fe, New Mexico.
Has the increasingly polarized debate over nuclear energy led private distributors of documentary media in Japan to embrace self-censorship? This is the question I am left asking myself following the recent cancellations of all domestic screenings of my film *A2-B-C* (2013, Japan), which documents the health of children living in contaminated areas of Fukushima following the nuclear meltdown on March 11, 2011.

*A2-B-C* is the second film in my series about children living in Fukushima, following *In the Grey Zone* (2012, Japan), which documented children living within twenty to thirty kilometers (twelve to eighteen miles) of the damaged power plant, just one month after the nuclear meltdown. While *In the Grey Zone* depicts parents’ fears about potential health consequences for their children, *A2-B-C*, filmed just eighteen months later, documents an increase in nosebleeds as well as thyroid cysts and nodules in the children living in these areas.

**Domestic Distribution and Protecting Families Who Speak Out**

Sensing it would be difficult to find a distributor in Japan that would take on a film documenting mothers speaking out against the government’s claims that children living in contaminated areas are not in danger, I decided to try “reverse importing,” gaining attention for something abroad with the aim of eventually bringing it back to the country of origin. My goal was to make *A2-B-C* so recognized abroad that the problems it documented could no longer be ignored in Japan.

After receiving the top prize in the Nippon Vision category at the film’s world premiere in the Nippon Connection Film Festival in Frankfurt, Germany, in 2013, *A2-B-C* went on to screen in more than twenty-five festivals around the world, receiving multiple awards along the way. My idea to “reverse import” worked, and in autumn 2013, the rights to distribute the film in Japan were acquired by a Japanese company on behalf of a newly formed group called the *A2-B-C* Screening Committee.
Working to secure a theatrical release in Japan, the committee met with several cinema programmers in Tokyo but were told that, although as private citizens the programmers felt the film needed to be screened, as business owners they could not handle a film that was perceived as being so controversial. The committee then turned to smaller art house cinemas, and beginning in May 2014, a countrywide theatrical release of the film began in Tokyo, eventually moving on to nine cities in Japan.

At the request of the families who appeared in A2-B-C, I had agreed the film would not be uploaded to the Internet and a DVD would not be released in Japan. This was to protect them as much as possible from becoming the targets of harsh criticism for having spoken out in a country where, as the expression goes, “the nail that sticks up gets hammered down.” Already the recipients of cruel bashing and Internet bullying by often-anonymous attackers, the families would be exposed to even more criticism, potentially leading to a concern for their safety, if the film were to be released online.

**Japan’s Secrecy Law**

As is customary in Japan following the theatrical release of a film, a series of “private screenings,” a process by which citizen groups can rent the film and organize their own screenings, was held. In the six months following the theatrical release, there were over eighty private screenings of the film held across Japan, and importantly, these screenings provided a significant revenue source for the screening committee, which served as an incentive to help keep the film off the Internet, thereby protecting the families to a greater degree.

After nearly a year of screening the film, in March 2015, during the week to mark the March 11 disaster’s fourth anniversary, the company advising the A2-B-C Screening Committee suddenly pulled its support for the distribution of the film and abruptly canceled all domestic screenings of the film, including dozens of confirmed contracts for private screenings and those in consideration. This was followed a week later by the dissolution of the A2-B-C Screening Committee. In a blog post that went on to be widely shared on social media, I suggested that this was an act of self-censorship possibly influenced by the Designated Secrets Bill.
Also known as the Secrecy Law, the Designated Secrets Bill grants the Japanese government the power to arrest, imprison, and/or fine anyone accused of revealing “state secrets.” While ostensibly to protect issues deemed to be of national security, the Japanese government’s intentions were called into question when it used cases of whistleblowing abroad as examples of why such a law was needed.

During the debate before the bill was passed into law, opposition lawmaker Mizuho Fukushima, concerned with the vague definition of what would be considered secret, asked the lawmakers in the ruling party for clarification. “What is considered secret,” she was told, “is secret.”

With my recent filming being almost exclusively about Fukushima, I began to wonder if work like mine—interviewing doctors in Fukushima, collecting data, and recording testimonies—would be considered a “state secret.”

**Screenings of A2-B-C Canceled Due to Accusation of Violent Far-Left Extremism**

Following the cancellations of all the screenings of A2-B-C in Japan, rumors circulated, including the suggestion that the topic of the health of children in Fukushima was “taboo.” While a reason such as this would be understandable although still objectionable, the real reason is simply unbelievable: the company advising the A2-B-C Screening Committee canceled all screenings of the film after hearing a rumor that one of the mothers appearing in the film speaking out about her fears for the health of children in Fukushima is a violent extremist tied to a communist political group. The medical clinic where the thyroid examinations of children are carried out in the film was also said to be tied to this group, whose tactics in the past have included confrontations with the authorities.

It should be noted that in Japan the two main accusations that are hurled at someone to discredit them are that they are either ethnically Korean or communist. Accusing someone speaking out of being a communist is a rhetoric often employed in Japan when no other logical explanation can be found.

The mere rumors of a connection to communism proved to be
more powerful than money and resulted in the cancellation of the dis-
tribution of the film when the A2-B-C Screening Committee willfully
chose to turn down guaranteed-profit private screenings rather than
make any attempt to clarify or confirm the accusations.

Whether a member of a communist political group appears in
A2-B-C should be discussed, as well as why this group may have estab-
lished in Fukushima a medical clinic offering independent testing of
children for radiation-related health issues. This is something that
should be debated, not hidden. But it seems that the fate of my film
is in the hands of people who can look at a scene of a child receiving a
thyroid examination following a nuclear meltdown and still attempt to
turn the focus onto the rumored political views of that child’s mother.

Self-Censorship and Fukushima

During my work on the follow-up to A2-B-C, I have been finding
it extremely difficult to meet people who are willing to be filmed
speaking out. One woman I met told me that she would formerly
share and “like” her friends’ Facebook posts about radiation issues,
but that since the Secrecy Law has come into effect she has been
afraid of being identified as antinuclear, and thus no longer shares or
“likes” posts about Fukushima.

At a press conference before the Secrecy Law was passed, inde-
pendent lawmaker Taro Yamamoto expressed his disbelief at the lack
of media coverage that the proposed bill was receiving. “By not pro-
viding coverage of this bill,” Yamamoto said, “the media is putting
a noose around its own neck.” Sadly, his prediction appears to be
coming true.

It is not clear to me how much of the decision to cancel the screen-
ings of A2-B-C was the result of actual censorship and how much was
simply self-censorship. My feeling is that it is self-censorship based
on the fear of a potential censorship problem at some point in the
future. If this is the case, then it is an example of the terrifying and
wide-reaching effect of the Secrecy Law. This law does not even need
to be enforced for its effect to be felt: its mere existence causes people
to engage in self-censorship, imposing on themselves the very crack-
down that the drafters of the legislation surely envisioned.
It seems it is no longer possible to have honest, open discussions and debates about what is happening in Fukushima, and the cancellation of all domestic screenings of A2-B-C is merely the symptom of a disease that has infected free speech in Japan.

**An Unresolved Ending**

The mothers in A2-B-C are not violent extremists, and the clinic is not a terrorist staging ground. But if they are allowed to be convicted in a court of public opinion based solely on rumor and innuendo, and my film is discredited by association, then the single most important issue that we should be focusing on will have been overlooked: the health and the future of children living in areas contaminated by radiation.

If our actions contribute to a climate of fear and the suppression of free speech, it will not be the extremists, whether they are left or right, that we defeat, but rather it will be ourselves.
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**FROM A WOMAN’S POINT OF VIEW—WMNF**

Mary Glenney and Arlene Engelhardt

We host a weekly radio show, *From a Woman’s Point of View*, on WMNF, in Tampa, Florida. We have hosted the show for nearly
twenty years. WMNF is a community radio station that allows programmers tremendous freedom as long as they adhere to the station’s mission—giving voice to the voiceless and supporting social justice and equality. We could say that the show is of and about women, but that is pretty trite and meaningless. Hillary Clinton stated the obvious twenty years ago in Beijing when she said, “Human rights are women’s rights—and women’s rights are human rights.” If one has to state the obvious, it gives an idea of the focus of our show.

We feel that in the media women’s voices are not heard and their expertise not valued. Why? If you listened to our show you would be aware of the competency and brilliance of our guests—all women. We cover the gamut of issues of concern to us all: the environment, climate change, toxins, militarism, the economy, equality, and violence against women—and we never have problems getting qualified guests. Unfortunately, we rarely see or hear them on major media.

One example is Sandra Steingraber. She has been a major fighter for environmental issues for years. We hope you are familiar with her and her work. She has been a guest on our show many times. We remember our first interview with Sandra—we were talking about long-standing toxins and heavy metals in children. Sandra mentioned lead, and she told us that she was a lover of old books and would thumb through them in used bookstores. She happened to see a copy of the tenth edition of *Holt’s Diseases of Infancy and Childhood*, published in 1936. She picked it up and opened it to the page describing the symptoms of lead poisoning in children. There, she said, she clearly saw the list of the symptoms—the doctors were well aware of them then. Sandra told us that the levels of lead in children’s bodies did not change markedly until the federal government passed laws in 1973 regulating the exposure of children to lead in paints, etc. Sandra concluded by saying, “I cannot be a HEPA filter for my children.” And I think that is one of the reasons that women are not heard as commonly as men. Women such as Sandra are not only the scientists, but they are also not afraid to talk about that science in the context of the real world of their children.

Helen Caldicott also comes to mind. She was a young emergency room pediatrician when president Ronald Reagan asked all the emergency rooms in the country to prepare contingency plans for the US
in the event of a nuclear attack. While the other doctors got busy on the plans, Helen said it was impossible—we cannot have contingency plans for a nuclear attack, we have to prevent it. Helen is still fighting nuclear power and weapons. Helen told us that when her grandbabies ask why the world didn’t do something about this, Helen said she could look them in the eyes and say, “I tried, I tried.” In the 1970s, she gave new life to Physicians for Social Responsibility.

Women have been at the foreground in these battles and we have been fortunate to have interviewed them as guests on our show. Jodi Williams has fought land mines; Medea Benjamin, drones; and on and on. Women speak truth to power because, among many reasons, they know the future depends on it. They do not avoid the searching eyes of their children.

Let’s explore militarism a little more. Most of us are aware of the excessive use of militarism and power. We know that you can’t bring peace with the barrel of a gun and yet how many of us speak out? How many of us give peace a chance? Many, many women historically have had the courage to stand up against war, endangering their lives to build bridges to peace. There are almost too many to count, yet how many do you know? They spoke out not only because they were tender hearted. They saw the carnage for what it was and had the courage to define it.

We are all aware of the Nobel Peace Prize, which, incidentally, very few women have received. But do you know anything about its history? Alfred Nobel was a chemist, engineer, inventor, and armaments manufacturer. He developed dynamite, which was used in war. To use part of his fortune to fund prizes in chemistry, physics, and medicine was obvious, but why the Peace Prize? Guilt that his inventions were immediately used for war? What most of us do not know is that he had a close friendship with Bertha von Suttner, a peace activist who argued that his inventions would make peace impossible. Nobel believed that nations that felt secure would not need to make war, but Bertha felt the opposite. Nobel and von Suttner corresponded for years and there is little doubt that she had great influence on his creation of the Peace Prize. Do you think that if there had been more emphasis on her views, we might have a world that is less in need of awards, one with a more deeply ingrained sense of justice? Baroness von Suttner was the first woman to receive the Nobel Peace Prize.
Let’s look at another area, the economy. We have all played Monopoly. Did you learn anything about monopolies and trusts and trying to keep out of jail while playing this game? And did you know that Monopoly was actually invented by Elizabeth Magie and not Charles Darrow, who sold it to the Parker Brothers? Magie was born in 1866 and was a stenographer with a passion for politics and inventing. She lived in the Gilded Age in which the excesses of the privileged were as obvious as they are today. Elizabeth hoped that from the game people could learn something about slumlords, monopolies, trusts, and the whole sense of capital, with spaces on the board for rental properties, electricity, water, etc. Players earned wages, paid taxes, and the players who did well were the ones who could foil the attempts of the wealthy to send them to the poorhouse or to jail. Wouldn’t it have been interesting to have known more about Elizabeth Magie’s ideas?

So with the show From a Woman’s Point of View we make the effort—not to bring Elizabeth Magie, but to broadcast women of today. We feel they are brilliant, passionate, funny, and truly necessary visionaries. We do not feel that women are any more brilliant or visionary than men—we do not see women as morally superior or more altruistic. We do not believe in genetic or biological superiority or inferiority. But none of us lives in a vacuum. We are all shaped in the social, psychological, and cultural milieu of our times, and those conditions have made women, in large measures, outsiders. This has disadvantaged women in positions of power, but we believe it has also given them unique perspectives as outsiders. Not a detached outsider, but the passionate, caring, intelligent observer of the familiar. Particularly at this time in our history, we need the genius and brilliance of many of those “outsiders.”

MARY GLENNEY is cohost and principal interviewer on From a Woman’s Point of View on WMNF, a well-known community radio station in Tampa, Florida. She began doing a segment called “Life Choices” on the show more than twenty years ago and within two years became the cohost. She spent much of her life doing research and writing about genetics. Mary has an MD degree from the University of Illinois. She has been an activist most of her life, focusing on the environment, politics, social justice, and equality for women and minorities.
ARLENE ENGELHARDT is also cohost of From a Woman’s Point of View on WMNF. She was president of the board of directors at WMNF during the station’s capital campaign and construction of their new facility. Previously, Arlene was the executive director of the Pacifica Radio network, directly supervising the national office, five stations, the archives, and the affiliates. Prior to that she was vice president of a multimedia publishing company. She has a Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Illinois. She, too, has been an activist most of her life, focusing on the environment, politics, social justice, and equality for women and minorities.

THE MALE GAZE AND ITS IMPACT ON GENDER PORTRAYALS IN MEDIA

Crystal Bedford, Lisa Davis, Darian Edelman, Lauren Freeman, and Ellie Kim

Celebrations filled the halls of Congress and cities across America in 1868 as the Fourteenth Amendment to the US Constitution was ratified. The centuries-long struggle of African-Americans and the decades-long struggle of abolitionists had led to this moment. The amendment provided citizenship status to black men in the US. Many of the abolitionists who made this day possible had been women. Many of those same women assumed that they would enjoy the sweet taste of equality with their African-American brothers and sisters. However, female activists were shocked that the Fourteenth Amendment only guaranteed citizenship rights for males. In fact, it was the first time the word male appeared in the Constitution. Women had been integral to the success of the abolitionist movement. The lack of rights granted to women created a bitter divide between abolitionists and advocates for women’s rights that worsened when the Fifteenth Amendment only guaranteed voting rights for males. In response, longtime abolitionists and women’s rights activists such as Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton turned to anti-abolitionists to fund their movement for gender equality.3

In 2015, debate over gender equality in the US continues. At the 2015 Oscars, Patricia Arquette echoed history by explaining that it was time for “all the gay people and people of color that we’ve all fought for to fight for us [women] now.” This immediately created friction, as supporters of LGBT and racial equality argued that Arquette was incorrectly assuming that they owe white women anything.4 The lack
of context for Arquette’s comments, such as women’s central role in most social movements in US history, contributes to the coverage women receive. However, by disingenuously representing women and their rights, the corporate press also plays an influential role.

In our study, which this article previews, we argue that the corporate press is operated by and for the interests of men. Despite males making up only half the population, 97 percent of media outlets are male owned and 64 percent of journalists are men. Scholars have argued that this inevitably produces a patriarchal dominant view of media, known as the male gaze theory.

The Male Gaze Theory in Media

The central concept in our study is male gaze theory, which posits that, because men control the creation of media, media messages are dominated by a male point of view. The CEOs of the six companies that own 90 percent of media are all white males. Those same corporations are also heavily invested in the entertainment industry. Thus, male gaze theory argues that, with men controlling the media and entertainment industries, women are the passive objects of the gaze. Although originally applied to narrative cinema, this article postulates that the male gaze is present in all forms of contemporary media, including the music and news industries, in which women are objectified and sexualized.

Even when women are given positions of power within male-dominated media organizations, they face pressure to maintain narratives constructed on the basis of the male gaze. Men outpace women in every news media position, making up two-thirds of newsrooms, and consistently hiring and sourcing men more often than women. The saturation of the male gaze in corporate media ensures that women who attain power are met with multifaceted resistance. For example, in an attempt to break the male-dominated landscape, NBC News chair Patricia Fili-Krushel hired Deborah Turness as president of NBC News. Yet as the first woman to hold the position, Turness wielded less power than previous presidents and experienced conflicts with anchors Matt Lauer and Brian Williams, including Lauer dictating network decisions to Turness. The incident suggested that...
men dominate media even when women are seemingly given power to direct it.

**Studying the Impacts**

This study examines the impact of the male gaze on media representations of women and women’s issues. The study argues that the male-dominated media environment contributes to misleading depictions of feminism and women in coverage of sexual violence, race, and politics, as well as in the entertainment industries, including music and film. These distorted representations leave the public uninformed, or misinformed, about crucial topics such as sexual assault as well as the roles of female artists, professionals, and politicians. Thus, the public is unaware of, insensitive to, and unresponsive to the many issues that impact women’s lives.

These findings are important because the corporate media not only inform the public about current events, but also help shape the values and realities shared by the public. Since the corporate for-profit model and white male influence dominate news and entertainment, it is these interests and messages that are packaged for public consumption. In turn the skewed frames constructed by corporate media limit what women can and cannot do in American society, due in part to the perception of women that results from such framing. However, history shows that women of all types have been integral in the major social advancements of human beings, around the world and in the US. Thus, a strong movement comprised of diverse women needs to undermine and eliminate the dominant influence of the white male gaze. What is in the best interest of people in general, and women specifically, is for the public to be informed about the issues that concern women, without a male filter on that information. Women number slightly more than half of US society. If their concerns are not heard, how can the US call itself a free and equal nation?

The full version of this report is available online at http://www.projectcensored.org/male-gaze-and-its-impact-on-gender-portrayals-in-media.
The authors would like to acknowledge the editorial assistance of professors Laura Wing, Nolan Higdon, and Mickey Huff.
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RACE FORWARD: THE CENTER FOR RACIAL JUSTICE INNOVATION

Jyarland Daniels and Rebekah Spicuglia

We Are: The Center for Racial Justice Innovation

Race has played and still plays a significant role in our country’s political conversation. Although our country has made progress, there is still so much work to be done. Now more than ever, we need to be explicit about race, have productive conversations, and come up with systemic solutions to create positive and lasting change. Too often our national conversations about race focus on individual actions and identifying who is a racist, or who is not. Race Forward is unique in that we offer a systemic perspective to move the conversation on race forward, in a multiracial, multi-issue, intergenerational way.

Since 1981, Race Forward has brought a systemic analysis and an
innovative approach to complex race issues to help people take effective action toward racial equity. We envision a vibrant world in which people of all races create, share, and enjoy resources and relationships equitably, unleashing individual potential, embracing collective responsibility, and generating global prosperity. We define racial justice as the systemic fair treatment of people of all races, resulting in equitable opportunities and outcomes for all.

We work to advance racial justice in several ways—media, research, and practice. Colorlines is an award-winning daily news site, published by Race Forward (see colorlines.com). Our research is cutting-edge, original, and broadly accessible on pressing racial justice issues. We present Facing Race, the country’s largest multiracial conference on racial justice, and offer training on racial justice within our Racial Justice Leadership Institute.

**We Are: Committed to the Racial Justice Movement**

There are many ideas about what makes a movement. We believe that a movement doesn’t necessarily begin with us, but it is about using the resources we have to bring people together to advance a common cause.

One example of our movement work was the Drop the I-Word Campaign, launched in September 2010, which sought to eliminate the widespread usage of the inhumane and derogatory word *illegal* in reference to immigrants, because of the link between racially charged language and racially unjust policies. By Spring 2013, the Associated Press, USA Today, the Los Angeles Times, San Francisco Chronicle, and many other news outlets dropped the I-Word, affecting millions of readers daily nationwide. Drop the I-Word continues to advocate for change at the New York Times, the Washington Post, and media outlets everywhere. This movement has been successful because it engaged and enlisted others, to whom we provided tools and resources for them to use within their communities. Due to the collective efforts of so many individuals, Race Forward was able to influence how the media, one of our most powerful institutions, talk about individuals who are undocumented, and how to do so in a way that centers on their humanity and leadership.
Another example of our movement work is Life Cycles of Inequity: A Colorlines Series on Black Men. Using the power of storytelling, investigative reporting, and the voices of those impacted by structures and systems, Race Forward and Colorlines helped change the narrative on black men. Throughout seven installments of articles, videos, and photo essays, the series explored the ways in which inequity impacts the lives of black men. Each installment focused on different life stages or events, from school discipline to fatherhood and employment. Our strength in investigative reporting and storytelling provided us with the tools to support the movement for racial justice in changing the narrative about black men during a time when honest and humane discussion around people of color is more necessary than ever. The series was especially timely due to events such as those in Ferguson and Baltimore, which, sadly, continue to happen every day.

We also contribute to the movement by bringing those who are committed to this work together to learn, grow, share their experiences, and strengthen their skills. Our largest ongoing contribution to the racial justice movement is Facing Race. Facing Race is the largest multiracial and intergenerational national conference on race, where nearly 2,000 people from multiple countries and continents, convene. This biennial conference is a unique collaborative space for racial justice movement making, featuring talks, panels, workshops, films, and performances by established and rising leaders in the racial justice arena. It brings together advocates, students, academics, journalists, community organizers, and artists.

At Race Forward, we support advocacy and action on complex racial justice issues in several ways. Our work includes mobilization, skill-building, leadership development, organization- and alliance-building, issue framing, messaging, and advancing solutions. Through the Race Forward Racial Justice Leadership Action Network, we provide targeted online and in-person training and consulting services in these areas. We also provide a team of seasoned speakers who can address public audiences on a range of racial justice issues.
We Are: Leaders with a Systemic Approach

A key component to a systemic approach is reframing the conversation on race. In 2014, Race Forward conducted a comprehensive analysis of media coverage in over 1,200 articles and transcripts in a variety of topic areas seeking to identify the extent to which media coverage was “systemically aware,” meaning the coverage highlighted policies and practices that lead to racial disparities. The findings were released in “Moving the Race Conversation Forward,” a multipart report that describes some of the major impediments to racial discourse in the United States, and profiles initiatives that can make racial discourse more productive.

Continuing to serve as a resource to media, we released “The Race Forward Media Reference Guide” to serve as an accessible and concise tool for journalists and thought leaders in the United States who talk and write about race, racism, and racial justice. Our Media Reference Guide aims to provide critical support for the use of responsible language and story framing that reflects our most basic values and affirms the dignity and human rights of people of all races.

Racial justice work is necessary to continue the efforts to make our democracy live up to its promise. However, this work cannot only be done by people of color, it cannot only be done by racial justice organizations, it cannot only be done by those in positions of power or authority. The work of racial justice is important for all of us; therefore all of us must engage in it.

To learn more about Race Forward’s mission to advance racial justice through research, media, and practice, see raceforward.org.

JYARLAND DANIELS is director of marketing and communications at Race Forward, where she is responsible for all branding and communication initiatives. Prior to her work at Race Forward she held senior positions in marketing and public relations at several major corporations. She holds a Master of Business Administration degree from the University of Michigan and a law degree from Wayne State University in Detroit.

REBEKAH SPICUGLIA is Race Forward’s senior communications manager. She has worked previously as media and programs director at the Women’s Media Center,
and as a Media Field Strategy Fellow at GLAAD. Spicuglia has a background in film, a Bachelor of Arts degree in mass communications from University of California, Berkeley, and has dedicated herself to solutions-focused media advocacy that lifts up underrepresented voices and challenges systemic inequities.
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