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DR. BERRY: This meeting of the Pacifica Governing Board will now proceed.

The first item that we are going to consider on the agenda is elections. The executive committee discussed the need to have an orderly transition in the foundation in its leadership.

And my term as chair of this Board expires this year. And in most organizations, leadership is identified early in the process so that there can be an orderly and effective transition. The way it is done in most organizations is it’s done a year ahead. We don’t have that luxury, because too much time has passed. But the executive committee recommended that we elect at this meeting the new chair of the Board and vice-chair who will take office upon the end of my tenure.

Some of you may know that last year we elected the treasurer of the organization and made a treasurer elect while June Makela was still serving as treasurer with the idea that we would have overlap and an orderly transition. So we have decided to do the same thing in
terms of the chair and the vice-chair of the foundation.

So the executive committee has two nominees.

And I'd like Frank Millspaugh to place the names in nomination.

MR. MILLSPAUGH: It's my privilege to place the names of nomination.

David Acosta as chair and Ken Ford as vice-chair. David, as you probably all know, has extensive experience, first of all, on the LAB of the Texas station, the Houston station. He entered the LAB there in, I think, 1994, and served until the change of bylaws in 1999. He was an alternate delegate to the National Board. During part of that period he became a national board member in 1996, has been an executive committee member since '97, the vice-chair since '98 and during much of this time has served as chair of the governance committee.

Ken Ford has also served us well and energetically for the last couple of years as a member of the Board and is chair of the renascent technical committee.

And I think that we have been well served by both of these people and will continue to be well served by them in these new positions. And I do so move.
DR. BERRY: Could I get a second?
MR. PALMER: Second.
DR. BERRY: Ken, of course, came from the LAB in Washington, recommended by the lab in Washington, originally from WPFW.
Is there any further discussion?
MR. MORAN: I have a question.
Being new on the Board, I guess I don't understand the process of election for officers and chair and stuff, how does that work?
DR. BERRY: The bylaws make no provision beyond a majority of the Board must vote for the chair and vice-chair. We have a policy of our own in procedure whereby nominations for the Board have to go to the board governance committee. But these people are already on the Board. And all they're doing is having nominations come forward to elect them. And there's no provision beyond the fact that they have to be elected by a majority of the Board. And so the executive committee is making this recommendation.
MR. MORAN: And those recommendations come from the executive committee; that's where the nomination for the chair and the vice-chair come from?
DR. BERRY: If anyone wants to make another
nomination, they can.

MR. MORAN: I didn't know that there was an
election happening today.

DR. BERRY: It says elections on the agenda

MR. MORAN: I thought it was elections of new
Members of the new board.

DR. BERRY: Does anybody else have any comments?

All in favor of the election of David Acosta and
Ken Ford indicate by saying aye.

(Aye.)

Opposed?

MR. ROBINSON: Nay.

MR. MORAN: And I'm abstaining.

DR. BERRY: Mr. Moran abstains.

Someone said no.

MR. ROBINSON: I did.

AUDIENCE: We say no.

DR. BERRY: Could we have order in the room,
please?

Are there any other abstentions or nays?

It is so ordered.

I want to congratulate both of you, I guess.

And to say that during the period of transition, I will do
as June did with Michael last time, which is to gradually
share the duties of the office and consult with David.

But I will be spending most of my time over the
next few months working on efforts to try to heal, as it
were, the conflict that has surrounded Pacifica. I'll be
working on that. And also working on it with a number of
people who have expressed an interest in doing so.

Many of those people who have called me over the
last few days or sent me E-mails joined together to put
out an appeal to all progressives to stop the Pacifica
bashing, which is on Common Dreams' web site, among other
places. And it was signed by people like Saul Landau and
Ed Asner and Barbara Ehrenreich and Mike Farrell and Jerry
Brown and Frances Fox Piven. And people who -- Ronnie
Dugger, Dave Corn, Bob Borosage, Jon Wiener, Stan
Sheinbaum and Dorothy Healey. There are a whole array of
names. Marc Raskin, Peter Weiss, Martha Honey and James
Abourezk -- are good progressives all with impeccable

progressive credentials who have asked that people stop
spending their time on grievances against Pacifica and try
to use progressive energy in more positive ways.

I will be spending much of my time
endeavoring to try to make that happen over the next
month.
MR. MORAN: I would encourage you -- I know that there's been other notable progressives that have been very concerned about this crisis through the last year and critics of the way that we've carried our business out. And I would encourage you to reach out to the progressive community that has signed other documents that have been critical in order to really have a meaningful healing process.

DR. BERRY: I find this document to be critical. It's just that I find that the notion that we should stop bashing Pacifica and try to work together to do something positive to be appealing. And I, of course, am willing to reach out to anyone who shares my view.

The other point I would wish to make is that I have been given two resolutions by Mr. Moran that he would like to have added to the agenda. Neither one of these has been reviewed by a committee. One of them is on an issue on which Pacifica already has a policy. So I think that it is -- that is, we have a policy that is consistent with the resolution.

The other one concerns a policy that Pacifica has reviewed many times. And that is to ask us to rescind the dirty laundry rule, which we have discussed many times.
before, and which we have only recently affirmed.

The resolution that he has that involves dropping charges against a person who is involved in the protest, is consistent with an earlier letter that we sent already asking the Berkley police to drop all charges against everybody who was involved in the protest.

So I see no reason without further debate not to send such a letter concerning this individual since it's the same subject matter that we had before. And, therefore, the committee would not necessarily -- no committee would need to spend time on it.

So what I would like the Board to do is to indulge me by saying -- and Mr. Moran -- by considering this resolution quickly and then moving on.

The resolution states that the Governing Board reaffirms the letter I sent earlier urging the Alameda County district attorney at Berkeley not to proceed with charges. And this time to specify that the charges in question growing out of the protest are against Kahlil Jacobs-Fantuzzi. And that we would send a letter asking specifically that the charges against him would be dropped.

Could I get someone to move that -- I can't move things -- and have a second?
MR. LUCY: Madam Chairman, I so move.

MS. CISCO: I so move.

DR. BERRY: All those in favor indicate by saying aye.

(Aye.)

Okay. We will do that.

The issue of the dirty laundry rule, since it has only been recently reaffirmed, I don't think that the Board would be well-served by discussing it all over again. Although if anyone wants to move and second that we should do so, I am willing to refer it to a committee to discuss again to see whether there's some reason why we should change the policy.

MR. MORAN: I move --

Do you want me to read it?

I move that, whereas, the Pacifica Foundation promotes free speech and open debate in its mission; and, whereas, the trust between the Pacifica Foundation and its listener and support community has been eroded by recent events; and, whereas, an end to the current crisis in Pacifica can be hastened by open and honest discussion of the issues; and, whereas, the so-called gag rule, which has been used to discourage vital debate on the underlying
issues of this crisis, we resolve that the so-called gag rule forbidding the discussion of internal matters on the air is hereby rescinded.

DR. BERRY: I will refer that to the committee to be discussed again to see if there is a desire to bring it back to the Board.

The next item --

MR. MORAN: There was no second on that, Madam Chair?

DR. BERRY: No, I did not hear one.

The next item that we have to consider is the seating of new members of the Board.

In order that we might proceed with that --

And we will get the recommendation of the board governance committee, which is responsible for that. And we will have the rest of the board governance committee report later. It's just that we want to get these members seated.

I have to tell you that June Makela has resigned from this Board because it frees up a space for another board member. And she has asked that I -- and I am going to -- read her letter of resignation into the record.

She says: I am writing to resign from the governing board of Pacifica. Although my term of office
as a director technically runs until June, my unavoidable absence from this Board meeting makes me realize that I am unable to be as involved as a director needs to be right now. I think it is a good moment to pass the treasurer's baton to Michael Palmer. And I leave knowing that I have helped in some small way to stabilize the financial situation at many of the Pacifica stations.

However, I leave the Board very concerned about Pacifica. I'm sure it will survive the latest battles, but at what price? Pacifica has to be able to change with the times and the needs of the progressive movement of which it claims to be a part.

I continue to be amazed at the intransigence of people within Pacifica to any change that might affect their personal fiefdom or that of their friends.

When we get right down to it, the KPFA battle really began years earlier when the Board and other voices began to say out loud what everyone knew for years.

Because we are a network of progressive community radio stations who claim we have something important to say Pacifica needs to reach more people. But building audience means change and change is very threatening in Pacifica.
I hope that the Board and staff and volunteers, both local and national, can find a way to make this change and move forward together. One way or the other Pacifica does need to move forward. I hope it can be a little less painful in the future.

I am particularly concerned about the number of Governing Board members who seem confused about their roles and pressured by their fear of criticism from the great Northern California E-mail machine.

People who have a need to be popular or worried about their reputation probably don't belong on the Pacifica board. And anyone who feels he/she needs to act against the interest of the Foundation and jeopardize the Foundation's integrity and legal status or other damage really doesn't belong on the Board.

I hope that anyone who is acting in such an inappropriate manner, for whatever good reason he/she might rationalize such behavior, will act in a principled way and resign as a trustee.

There are other ways to be a critical friend of Pacifica by simply a critic, but it is essential when they agree to join the Board, the board members understand that they are representing the whole organization -- the network of five stations, plus national units and all of
its various staff and volunteers and resources.

And, lastly, for the public record, I agreed to stay on the Board for an extra year in the midst of the ugliest period of KPFA crisis because I did not want any group to claim they ran me off the Board. I was appalled by the tactics of the supposed save KPFA, save Pacifica, etc. elements who behaved in many respects like the worst elements of the far right we all deplore -- using violence, racist and sexist epithets, graffiti like lynch Lynn, harassment at peoples' work places and their homes, terrorizing national staff in Berkeley, smacks of right-wing hate groups, not progressives, disagreeing about personnel decisions.

I continue to be disgusted that none of this behavior was criticized sufficiently by those staff and volunteers who claim to be KPFA's community leaders. I quickly lost respect for their efforts and could not hear their voices when their tactics became so clearly unprogressive.

In the end, I stayed on the Board all these many months in support of you, Mary and Lynn. You both bore the brunt of the most vile attacks way beyond the call of duty. I apologize on behalf of all of those who should
have acted better in expressing their views, however passionately felt. And I appreciate enormously the personal toll these last nine months was taking on both of you.

I hope that Pacifica carries on, that new voices are allowed to be heard, that the radio stations become

authentic voices for progressive discourse instead of the private clubs they now are. I will continue to listen and support my local station.

With my best wishes for your continued efforts,
yours sincerely, June Makela.

Okay. Now, June has resigned. And so now we will move to -- and I very much appreciate her service. She served for years on this Board, did a great job, as treasurer gave her time and energy. And I know for a fact that threats were made to her family and her home and at her job, even to her elderly relatives who were frightened to death during this KPFA crisis, and no one ever apologized for any of that. And it took a toll on her. And I'm very glad she served and was willing to stay with us and will miss her.

But now, if you want to put some people in nomination, please do that.

MR. MILLSPAUGH: First, may I ask for an
expression of our appreciation for June's many years of
service to the organization?

Madam chairman, may I request that the Board
minutes reflect the Board’s appreciation for June's many
years of dedicated and very energetic service to the
foundation?

DR. BERRY: All right. Are there objections?
So ordered.
And we will write a letter to her thanking her
for her service in that regard.

MR. ACOSTA: The governance committee recommends
and places into nomination the following for the term
starting February 2000: Leslie Kagan from New York,
Bertram Lee from Washington, D.C. and John Murdock from
Washington, D.C; and for terms to start June 2000, Beth
Lyons from New York and Valerie Chambers from Houston.

DR. BERRY: Do I hear a second?
MS. CISCO: Second.

DR. BERRY: This is the recommendation of the
board governance committee. Does anyone wish to speak?

MR. MORAN: Madam chair, I'll repeat my concern
that I expressed to the governance committee yesterday
that the process to announce to everybody the fact that
there are openings on the Board, the method for which
nominations are received far and wide from a variety of
sources and the process for all board members to be

notified in advance and to receive CVs and other material
in advance and a report in advance from those who have
maybe personally interviewed the candidates is essential
in electing people to the Board. And I'm not going to be
able to support any of the nominations today just on
procedural grounds.

DR. BERRY: Any other comments from anyone?
All those in --
did you say something?
MR. LUCY: No. It was a thought.
DR. BERRY: Okay.
All those in favor of the nominations, indicate
by saying aye.
(Aye.)
Opposed?
MR. MORAN. No.
MR. ROBINSON: No.
DR. BERRY: Two nos. Both Moran and Robinson.
Any abstentions?
MR. KRIEGEL: I abstain.
DR. BERRY: And Aaron abstains.
Two nos and one abstention. So ordered. The new members are elected. You may come forward and be seated at the table if you are here.

Miss Kagan we know is not here. I don't know if Mr. Lee is. Mr. Murdock is here.

Now, if Miss Mary Alice Williams is here we will go to the LAB chair report.

Is she here?

The other thing I want to point out is we are not approving the minutes and we are deferring their approval to next time if there's no objection, simply because they were typed before by the stenographer. They used a computer. And they only informed us after much pressuring them to get copies of the transcript, so we could put it on the web site and use it for the minutes as we need to, that a virus had somehow destroyed it, according to them. And then they began to try to transcribe it and only recently finished it. So it's on the web site.

MS. CHADWICK: A draft is on the web site.

DR. BERRY: A draft is on the web site, but it's not in any shape for anybody to approve, so we're going to have to defer it for technical reasons.
Also, after this meeting at a later time, we will confirm the date and the place for the meeting in June after polling the members, including the new ones. If the LAB chair from D.C. is not here, then we will go on to the committee reports. And the first committee report is of the executive committee. The first thing, the executive committee and the Board during this training session heard a lot of information, and we discussed it at the executive committee, about various matters that I think I should call to your attention. One of these is the data on the audience, the stations here. I had said before that we would make public the data on the audiences of the stations that we get from Arbitron. And we are doing that. We will be releasing that to the public today. And will continue as a matter of policy, unless the Board changes it, to release the data to the public so that the public will have an official source of the data on audience.
The data, essentially, shows that while the total audiences pass 800,000, that WPFW and KPFT have the highest shares in the network and have the strongest growth. And that the audience for the five stations are WBAI in New York, 176,800; KPFK, 177,000; KPFA, 156,000; WPFW, 180,000 and KPFT, 127,000.

And there are charts that show the growth in the audience. Essentially, what we have in terms of total audience loyalty, is that KPFA continues to have a very loyal, but small audience, which raises money, but the audience doesn't seem to be growing, and it is not. And at WPFW and at KPFT, which started out very small and had the smallest transmitters, if I am correct, they have growing audiences. All of these numbers will be put out so that people can see them.

But I did want to read to you, also, a memo that was shared with us from the guy who does the audience research analysis. Because I think it's important and I think that it's important that people in Pacifica not be in denial about the facts concerning what goes on here, even though it is painful to face reality.
The memo that he gave to the Governing Board, David Giovannoni, says, "Pacifica's audience has never been larger, nearly 40,000 listening at any moment, but roughly 40 million people live under a Pacifica signal. So there are 40 million who live under the signal and about 40,000 are listening. And that for most Americans Pacifica simply does not exist."

We're going to put this letter on the web site, so I'm just going to go through it.

"In fact, to most of Pacifica's listeners, it is not a lifeline of ideas and information. It is merely an hour or two per week in addition to their NPR and commercial radio listening."

"The audience gains in the last five years are huge by Pacifica standards, but they are too little too late. And David says, I'm not saying that the 40,000 people listening are insignificant. I'm saying that in context, they are an insignificant number. And that number is important because significant radio programming without a significant listening audience is not a significant public service."

"Pacifica has lost its influence. It is a faded reflection of its proud history. This organization that
invented public radio journalism that brought provocative new voices and ideas to the microphone that advanced the art of radio is today an anachronism on the FM band, arrested in development by a small group of people who are similarly stuck in time.

"In contrast, the noncommercial radio that Pacifica helped invent enjoys unprecedented programming, management strength, public support and a highly focused public mission. It is on the verge of realizing its full potential in the mature radio medium, but not Pacifica.

"At one time we would say that Pacifica was simply underperforming. The time for polite euphemism is over. By any objective measure of public service, Pacifica has crossed the line from underperformance to irrelevance.

"During the last 25 years, other idealists have fulfilled their missions by responding to the way that people use radio. Many at Pacifica rebelled against this knowledge and still reject it to this day. They have confused content with form, free speech with effective use of the media and personal liberty with professional responsibility. And in doing so, they have kept Pacifica's ideals from spreading as far as five powerful
FM stations could have carried them.

"In the last few years, several enlightened ears within Pacifica have attempted to rejuvenate its grand mission by applying proven broadcasting practices. They have been only sporadically successful. Their efforts to revive Pacifica's public service have been frustrated by people who in the name of principle have attacked these leaders personally.

"For the rest of us in public radio, it has been painful to witness. I believe in Pacifica and I believe in what it is trying to do. But my knowledge of radio tells me that Pacifica can serve its political factions or it can serve its audience. It cannot do both.

"Programming for the programmers, rather than the audience, is dysfunctional and counterproductive. Our objective measures can demonstrate this down to the last listener. The diversity of Pacifica's voices demand multiple channels of communication.

"The searchable addressable internet not only offers these channels, it welcomes and nurtures voices in the minority. Internet technology frees the listener and the speaker from having to meet at the same place at the same point in time. The internet is the right medium for
Pacifica in the 21st Century. Don't get me wrong, FM radio will remain the dominant form of realtime audio delivery for at least another decade, but FM stations need coherence to survive and coherence does not seem possible given Pacifica's current structure.

"Pacifica's challenge, then, is to redefine and reorganize itself in the service of its mission in the 21st Century. Do not limit your thinking. Pacifica is not in the FM business. It is in the business of ideas and ideals."

David says, "This is my professional opinion. My personal opinion is that this is a very sad time. The voice of Pacifica spoke to me many years ago and it played an important role in my professional development and personal thinking. In the intervening years, I've watched it squander its capital on familiar revisions that virtually run you out of the radio business.

"I am saddened when I think of the lost opportunities, yet I am energized by the thought of hearing Pacifica on other outlets not bound in time or space instantly retrievable any time from anywhere in the world.

"And so if you are to advance Pacifica's ideals you must reinvent Pacifica. Move your best thinking and
your core values following into this new media. Lose the
rest.

"I wish you all the best of the luck in the
capturing of the ears and minds of the American public. I
realize that it's painful, but it's an important point of
view about what Pacifica is doing."

The executive committee discussed this report
and people had some ideas.

The other thing the executive committee did was
to accept Lynn Chadwick's resignation as executive
director. Lynn will remain with Pacifica as a consultant
after March 1 through the end of September.
Unless she decides to go do something else, she will be
tracking litigation matters for us and regulatory matters

and a variety of other activities for Pacifica during that
period.

And we, in the executive committee, thank her
very much for her willingness to persist in Pacifica
during these very stressful times. And we also thank her
for her willingness to remain with us as a consultant to
be helpful and wish her well.

That's the first thing that happened.

The second thing that happened at the Board
meeting is, in order to succeed Lynn as executive
director, the executive committee is recommending that a
general manager be appointed to be executive director for
a year beginning on March 1 when Lynn moves from that
position. That this person would be appointed with the
idea that within 90 days of the appointment, the executive
committee would review, and the person would review, the
arrangement to make a decision about whether to persist in
it. But that the initial appointment would be no more
than one year.

The person that we have decided to select, and
who has agreed that she would do it, is Bessie Wash, who
is the general manager of one of our most successful
stations, WPFW, here in Washington.

So this is the recommendation of the executive
committee.

I would like to have a motion from someone that
the Board approve this recommendation.

MR. LUCY: So moved.

DR. BERRY: Can I get a second?

MR. FARRELL: Second.

DR. BERRY: Any discussion?

MR. MORAN: I think that a period of one year
for an interim person is excessive. I also think that
there has to be an open process for selection of an executive director. And I would like to know what the plans for that process are going to be?

DR. BERRY: When you are appointing someone from inside, you don't have to have a process, number one.

Number two, it is for a year and subject to review within 90 days, as I said, to see if the parties mutually agree that it should persist or if there should be an immediate search for someone else. We're just grateful that somebody is willing to do this and that we can get her to do it at this point. So that's my answer to the question.

Does anybody else have any comments?

All in favor indicate by saying aye.

(Aye.)

Opposed?

MR. MORAN: No.

MR. ROBINSON: No.

DR. BERRY: Mr. Robinson, no. Mr. Moran, no.

Who is abstaining?

Wendall is abstaining and Ken is abstaining.

So the motion passes with those abstentions and those nays recorded.
The other thing that the executive committee discussed is the fact that we have some union contracts that will be expiring soon at some of our stations. A couple of them, I guess. One at KPFA and a second one at the national programming unit. And that work is beginning on that. Of course, you know that the national office has moved. And one of the things that has to be worked out is what space -- temporary space -- will be there.

The other matters -- I don't think we discussed anything else that needs any action. So there were no other action items for the executive committee.

MR. MORAN: I have a comment on the report. First, I'd like to encourage the Board to consider for the next meeting the matters that are in the so-called training session. Some of them, I think, would benefit from being part of the committee process so that there can be public present. I think a lot of the materials presented in the morning session regarding technology of radio and the materials presented by the Audiographics report and the presentation in the late afternoon of the programming task force are matters that should be discussed in committee or presented in public session appropriately. The public would benefit from that.
That means that I am concerned, extremely concerned, that we are getting programming opinions and policy decisions from a person that's looking at Arbitron data, essentially. And I consider the Arbitron data valuable data to look at numbers of people that are here, but is not an exclusive metric to measure how we are staying with the progressive mission of this station.

Other metrics would include developing ways of measuring how a program is doing in terms of achieving the mission of getting voice to the voiceless and being unique in the material that we present. Additionally, there's community involvement, which is very high in the signal area that I come from, and which negates, in my opinion, any numbers that the Arbitron rating gives.

There's an involvement from every active community and every active progressive organization in Northern California with KPFA. That's been strengthened in the last year.

Finally, KPFA is, in fact, being listened to on the net. We are web casting already. And we routinely get phone calls into our morning show and into our other call-in shows from everywhere -- from Texas, from Arizona, from Oregon, across the country. And those data are not
reflected in the Arbitron ratings. And it is ironic that part of the recommendations to web cast would not be reflected even in the numbers. So maybe we have too many listeners out there that we are not aware of that are picking us out here and there on the web. So I find that a bit contradictory. And I would urge the executive committee, and I would urge us all, to look at other metrics other than Arbitron.

DR. BERRY: First of all, let me say, because I've gotten E-mails, every time Arbitron is mentioned that say that Mary Frances Berry, who is the author of all evil, started Pacifica looking at Arbitron data, that is a lie. Pacifica has been getting these audience research analyses -- the whole industry gets them. All of public radio, all of the community forever. It has nothing to do with me. And it's just that Pacifica has never made the data public. It's a dirty little secret that no one ever talks about in public and that no one wants to contend with.

Also, data is data. You can argue with it if you want to. You can use it. If you don't want to use it, you don't have to use it. But data is data and it exists. And you cannot make it disappear.

Also, most of the Pacifica stations are on the
web. That's nothing new. Sometimes they
even -- you know, WPFW, for example, gives us information
about who's listening to them on the web. That was
Mr. Giovannoni's opinion that somehow we weren't on the
web and somehow we should be on the web.

But my only point is that I didn't invent
Arbitron or the use of Arbitron data by these stations.
And data is data. And we have to not be in denial, no
matter how many metrics we use.

MS. VAN PUTTEN: This is not in reference to the
last statement that was made. This is before you move
onto the next committee report.

I would like the minutes to reflect and make a
motion that we issue in writing a statement of
appreciation for Lynn's extraordinary efforts on behalf of
the Foundation, which have resulted in a significant
personal and professional impact.

DR. BERRY: I meant to mention that. Without
objection, we will do exactly what Karolyn Van Putten
said, express our appreciation for Lynn's work in writing
because we very much do appreciate that. Thank you.

MR. PALMER: I want to go back to what Tomas was
saying. And I acknowledge that the only data that we have
to look at right now is that that is typically provided by Arbitron and our listener support numbers, the total number of listeners, subscribers and people who pledge. And as Tomas and I have talked about at one time, there is a need that people want to be able to measure the other items that are related to Pacifica's mission and vision. Right now there are none. Tomas has said that he will try to come up with some. But in meeting after meeting, nobody has come and said, you can measure it this way and here is some data per department or anything. It doesn't exist right now. And we would like to see that. Because then it gives a little bit more data for us to review all the things with.

Right now there isn't an organization that can measure the minor things that we need to in terms of the different segments of the audience. There's only one or two sources. And they were generated primarily, as you know, for commercial radio. There is no other alternative.

So the thing that we can do is we either get no data and operate, not in the dark, but with a crack in the door, or use this and augment it with things that you are suggesting and that we would all like to see.
fact is that it's the only factual data out there in the marketplace that gives us an idea, not the bottom line, the end all number, but the idea of who we're reaching. And the fact of the matter is that we're 2 percent of the --

DR. BERRY: Less than 2 percent.

MR. PALMER: Well, we're 2 percent of 2 percent. Community radio is 2 percent of the overall listening audience and we're 2 percent of that. Which can lead, I guess, a professional that's in that business to analyze audience data to say, in all due respect, you're bordering on irrelevance.

And I'm not going to go to that point, but simply state that when you look at the numbers, discount them as you want to, they're there and you have to consider them. And I think to roast the numbers is to ignore what it is the obvious at times.

And I hope that Tomas, yourself and the folks that are in high concern about all those things, look at them somewhat objectively, but generate with our help -- I would like to work with you on that -- some other metrics
That's all I'm going to ask for.

MR. MILLSPAUGH: I recollect that seven years back the Markle Foundation invested substantial amounts of money in an attempt to arrive at a form of qualitative measurement of program quality. And I don't think it ever came to a whole lot. But there may have been findings or measurement systems that they developed if either of you want to contact the Markle Foundation and see if they have anything that might assist you in this.

MR. MORAN: Just to reply to both of those comments.

I will look at that foundation packet if you send me the information.

MR. MILLSPAUGH: That's all the information I have. It's name is the Markle Foundation.

MR. MORAN: If you can spell it for me, I'll take it down.

MR. MILLSPAUGH: Sure.

MR. MORAN: Part of my business is to do metrics for the quality of medical care. And it is very standard to develop special metrics for things that other organizations do not at first glance understand how to
So this is not a new business for me. And I'm quite familiar with the technology. I will pursue it and will be glad to bring it to the next board meeting.

Secondly, I would like to say that historically we really don't have figures of what the listenership of Pacifica was in a so-called golden age. It really affected the birth of public radio when this era reached out to all of the progressive voices that were put on the air. So calling Pacifica irrelevant today without understanding how it influences, not only directly, but also indirectly, the political discourse in this country is a mistake.

And, thirdly, yes, we have to look at audience data. It's very important to look at that. But if that's our only metric that we're giving our managers to program by, it is very easy to see how one would turn the program dial and turn the program content to respond to something that increases the audience. And that cannot be the only metric for a progressive radio station.

DR. BERRY: It also cannot be the case that one pays no attention to increasing the audience.
MR. FORD: In that context, if we are to embark upon creating a model by which we will ascertain audience listenership; 1) it becomes an increasingly expensive proposition; 2) no one at this table is qualified to do it; 3) who will quantify it and substantiate it as being valid?

Until we can get that technical expertise, I suggest that we listen to what has already been established and what is accepted. And you can generate whatever numbers you want to create whatever model you want, but it will be criticized as being biased and noneffective.

MR. MORAN: I object, Ken, to your false objection, that no one around this table has the qualifications to do that. That's your opinion about developing metrics. You can read my professional --

MR. FORD: Well --

DR. BERRY: Please, board members. If Mr. Moran feels he is an expert on Audiographics, please let him continue to believe that and not challenge him.

MR. MORAN: I'm an expert on developing metrics for quality.
DR. BERRY: No one is challenging your expertise on anything, sir.

I can see that some of us are still in a state of denial. The numbers are the numbers. They will continue to be numbers. And when I look at Pacifica five years from now, people will still be arguing about whether they should pay any attention to the audience or not. And if they do, can they increase audience without becoming, as some person told me, and I considered it quite racist, that they would have to become a top hits station because they said that to me in my face,

that that was all black people understood.

So I think that it's possible to pay attention to the audience. I think it's possible to pay attention to audience research analysis, as well as other things. And that Pacifica, if it does not want to die, needs to pay attention.

No matter how significant the programming is, no matter how important it is, anyone who walks around with a badge of honor saying, I'm glad that my audience is small, I think it's great, because only a small audience is smart enough to understand what I'm saying, is crazy, in my
view. Because we ought to be in the business of trying to extend the reach of a progressive voice and not trying to limit it to some elite group of which we think we are a part.

The program policy committee is next. Frank, do you have a report?

MR. MILLSPOUGH: Yes. I have no action items, but I thought it would be useful to make a report on the proceedings. It overlaps a little bit with the training session, which we had the day before.

Our meeting began with Garland graciously making a presentation, brief presentation, on the top lines, which we had heard some detail of the day before. So I won't repeat that since you went into it. Except to mention one item. And this is not going into denial, but simply giving due credit.

That in the past five years, there has been a 50 percent increase in our weekly aggregate cume. Not a terribly significant number, perhaps, but still one that shows, you know, by unfailing effort we are making incremental progress. And I don't think that should be entirely discounted.

The bulk of the meeting, however, as some part of the meeting on the previous day, the training session,
had to do with the introduction of the task force on
programming initiatives in which on Thursday, as you will
recall, or whatever day it was, Friday, we had a
presentation by Nan Rubin with the assistance of Juan
Gonzalez and others, on just opening the program issues to
the Board’s contemplation. And it continued then for most
of the three-hour program committee meeting yesterday
developing this line.

The institution of this program task force is in
terms of reconfirming Pacifica’s central mission in
programming. That this is, after all, the business of
Pacifica to do programs. And that we need to focus our
attentions as much as possible on what our programming is
and what we aspire to in it.

The initial phase of the presentation to the
Board and to the station managers started to discuss and
identify the focus for the task force, including such
issues as are related to programming, especially national
programming. Issues related to the necessary upgrade of
technical facilities on the station level and the network

level since it is repeatedly observed that the content of
the program can be great. But if no one can hear it
because of the technical quality, then it falls upon
vital air, if not dead ears. There are also questions of expanding our
distribution capabilities through the new media that have
been touched upon earlier in these discussions. We talked
about supporting the skills building for producers as a
necessary element in order to improve local air sound.

Better promotion of programming is an important
issue. And, of course, all of these things, have
an impact on financial needs. So one of the tasks of
the program task force will be to ascertain potential
sources of funding for implementation of its subsequent
recommendations.

We discussed some of the process of the task
force, which includes a commitment to include all the
signal areas in this exercise. That there be an important
role for listener feedback through the local advisory
boards. That there be representation from such differing
parties, such as academics, supporters, et cetera. That
there be regular feedback to apprise all the participating

Nan Rubin made these presentations or led in the
making of these presentations and has asked me to ask you
for suggestions regarding the structure of the task force.
We would certainly want one of the managers to be part of
its regular body. And we ask that the administrative
counsel select one of the managers to help us anchor that.

We will have both members on the task force, as
well as a larger body of advisory people, who can be
called upon from time to time as matters touch upon their
areas of expertise. And we will soon be tasking the LABs
in regard to this activity, as well as programming people
in the station -- the technical people, managers and
staff.

And, as I say, there is no action required at
present.

Oh. Andrea has consented to act as sort of
principal board liaison for this task force as it develops
and will help keep us apprised of its progress.

And I believe that from the expressions -- there
was no requirement to take a vote or anything -- but a
number of the board members attending the committee
meeting yesterday expressed their enthusiasm that we
undertake this act. We've undertaken this activity and
looked to it to help refocus our attentions on the
positive aspects of the Foundation and upon what our true
business is.

DR. BERRY: Thank you for that. Since we were
talking about programs, I think you were right to point to
the 50 percent increase in the cume. I think particularly
congratulations are in order for the folks at KPFT and W
where they continue to focus on these objectives in terms
of the audience.

But I also wanted to say that one of the bright
spots in Pacifica is the work of Amy Goodman and Democracy
Now, which is an example of how you cannot only have a
good show and have audience, but you can also have
influence on other people who deliver the news and on what
the news is and where the focus is throughout the
industry.

I know Democracy Now is getting better and
better, but Pacifica has to find a way to make it the best
that it can ever be while working on some other signature
programs. But I think that all of us ought to see
Democracy Now as one of the sort of bright stars in the
constellation as we worry about the future of this
organization.

I just wanted to say that. And I'm sure the
Board members would agree with that assessment. I just want to congratulate you Amy, because I see you over there. I think I see Amy over there. Is Amy over there? Amy is embarrassed. I want to congratulate you for that. And acknowledge for the record Pacifica News, of course, is our other national program now. We need more national programs. The staff there works very hard to get the news on every day and present a high quality project.

So from my perspective, one of the wonderful things about this year is — in the last three years is that despite being barriers and despite the conflicts there are people in the organization who are working very hard to focus on the mission, to move forward on the goals and are achieving some success, and it shows.

MR. MORAN: I'd like to echo the praise for Democracy Now. I think it is an excellent show. And I think that in that vein I'd like to maybe recommend that the program committee consider and undertake in addition the consideration of the policies within our station that reaffirms the right of those professional news broadcasters in our organization to act independently of anything within the organization.

It is their best judgment and their
professionalism that has made and will continue to make
this organization strong. And as a signature voice that
puts out free speech and that promotes itself as a free
speech network, we need to reaffirm that. We've been
criticized. There's a boycott by a number of
people against Pacifica at this point questioning, I
think, the question out there of our reputation,
Pacifica's reputation in terms of whether we maintain
independence of the rights of the professionals who are
driving the content of the program has to be made clear
and reaffirmed, because that is a place that we don't want
Pacifica to fall from in the public view.

DR. BERRY: Mr. Moran, I will simply respond to

you only by reading from an appeal to all progressives,
Stop the Pacifica Bashing, signed by Saul Landau, Ed
Asner, Barbara --

AUDIENCE: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

DR. BERRY: And I will simply read the part that
says, The war suffered its most recent escalation when a
group of part time freelance correspondents for PNN news
called for a three-month strike and boycott against
Pacifica national news. Others have joined in this
movement by calling for the withholding of some or all
financial support for Pacifica and its five stations. We
call for an immediate end to such tactics. There is, indeed, no sanctioned strike or authorized labor dispute under way at Pacifica national news. Some of those urging the boycott have differences with Pacifica news management. That is their right. But they do not have the right to cloak their grievances in the language of a bona fide labor dispute. Boycotts, defunding campaigns, negative public relation strategies are powerful tools that have been used against recalcitrant and abusive corporate employees. To turn them against Pacifica is unconscionable.

I was only referring to the part about the boycott.

MR. MORAN: I appreciate that. I think that the matter of censorship, if it's a perception in the public that Pacifica is censoring its news programming, we need to address that as a Board because that is central to the mission and to the success of our organization.

DR. BERRY: Pacifica already has a policy that managers implement the rules about what's on the air.

Is there anybody who wants to speak further to this or to second a motion?

Hearing none, then I will move on and ask, can I
have a motion to accept a report of the program committee?

MR. PALMER: I move that we accept a report of the program committee.

DR. BERRY: Can I get a second?

MR. KRIEGEL: Second.

DR. BERRY: All those in favor indicate by saying aye.

(Aye.)

Opposed?

So ordered.

Now we will have the report of the finance committee.

MR. PALMER: Thank you, Dr. Berry.

And I'd like to start simply by saying that --

Maybe I should have said this just before you finished. But I hear what Tomas is saying. And as the representative for the bay Area, I know that it's important that you speak to those things. And, as such, you're doing a good job, and I appreciate you bringing these things.

I heard, though I haven't seen, but I've requested a copy of it, that somebody at PNN had studied the particular people that are undertaking the boycott in terms of what they had actually done for PNN.
And I think that we'd like to share that with everybody at some point just so that we can know that these folks that are doing it are doing their heartfelt best at what they think they should be.

Their contributions aren't as dramatic as they were originally represented. And I understand that some of them that were on the list didn't actually sign it. And I just want to be clear about that so that the record becomes a little clearer with the factual data.

So with that I'd like to --

DR. BERRY: Yes. Please move on to your report.

MR. PALMER -- start the finance committee report from yesterday.

First of all, acknowledging the good work that's been completed at so many of the units, a couple of facts that were provided through the financial data. Listener support for the foundation through five months is ahead by 32 percent. That means that the listeners are donating their money, which is their representation of value that they're getting, like I said, by 32 percent.

The breakdown per station is at KPFA it's up 36 percent or about $300,000. At KPFK it's 18 percent ahead of plan, $134,000. At WBAI, 4 percent, or just under
At WPFW, 31 percent ahead of plan or about $50,000. At KPFT, 44 percent ahead of plan, roughly $157,000. And at KPFT, 44 percent ahead of plan, roughly $138,000.

And I think that the managers at each unit and the staff are to be commended. Things are going well. The auditor who provided his report earlier said that things are as well as they have been at Pacifica in a number of years. So, therefore, there aren't just as many crises to point to.

I think with the increasing listener support, manager, and staff, and communities expectations grow, the January-February drive, the total pledge goal that the stations had, that fell short of a very small amount of money. But I just want to be sure that we are cognizant of the fact that we're in an upswing due to a number of reasons -- the economy, the interest in the network -- and we just need to be cautious in getting too far ahead of ourselves.

We had the controller provide a brief explanation of our budget process and the procedures through which budgets are adjusted for deficits or surpluses. We provided this to new board members because they weren't necessarily aware of it. They hadn't been around or asked enough questions as to how this is done.
In order to give them background we had our controller, Sandra Rosas, provide background on this. The procedures for handling budgets, surpluses, deficits, all things financially related to the foundation have been in place for years. It's an organic process, just like any budget process is.

And it involves the constant interaction of the managers with Sandra and going back and forth with the finance committee when needed, and the executive director at all times. And that is the procedure that it takes. And it will continue to be that way. And all items brought to the finance committee or related to these matters should go through these normal procedures.

The managers then spoke about their individual operations. And just a few of the points that were made beyond how well they're performing financially. WPFW, their audience continues to grow in their financial support. Bessie mentioned that in the near term, within the next year or two, that their tower and antenna requirements and needs have to be addressed. And those items have to begin to be budgeted. And the exact dollar amounts, while not large in any other context, are not insignificant for Pacifica. They're in the range of
$150-200,000 to complete these essential items -- a tower and antenna, which are critical.

And, also, they are on such a good upswing, while they would like to undertake a capital campaign to locate a new home, they do have existing options on their current facility, which we will be reviewing in the coming months.

At KPFT, things are going well. And the only thing to report there was that the fire that had occurred in the garage behind the studio, the suspect, a local suspect, had been apprehended and had gone through trial and sentenced. So that episode is complete at this point.

With KPFK, there are a couple of personnel positions that are critical that they want to fill. Mark wants to begin a process of redesigning the renewal process to make it more effective. And I know at KPFT we've done that with Molly and it's helped quite a bit, because it helps to not rely so much on fund drives.

The tower project that KPFK is undertaking is being redesigned. There is an obligatory redesign because the Forest Service has updated their design criteria. It could take another couple of months.

Also, involved in that is there may be a refund from the Forest Service because of the mechanism on which
they charge for use of the area where the tower is located.

WBAI has been going through a difficult year. And because of the deficit situation right now they're making a tremendous effort. But it's been a difficult year for that unit so far.

KPFA, they also have some personnel positions that they would like to fill. The transmitter upgrade is needed. That unit also -- again, we're getting into infrastructure here that has to be done. There's no question about can you do this or not? You have to do these types of things. So we'll begin to budget for that in the coming months as well.

Jim Bennett would also like to have the backup generator replaced because it's a 40 year old piece of machinery. And I applaud our ability to get the full useful life out of all equipment, but I think that's stretching it a little bit. So we need to undertake that.

So all in all, the managers didn't have any severe difficulties, at least on the financial front. And reported that things are going well, but with some infrastructure items that need to be addressed.

Following that, three initiatives were brought
committee or to the Board as a whole. I want to state that I'm aware now that I may have given the appearance of circumventing processes by which this material is supposed to go through the controller or the executive director and won't make that error in the future.

I further have to state that these requests were made to provide the material in advance, which is the tradition and the procedure for Pacifica as a whole, as well as the finance committee, and that this wasn't accomplished. And I'm hoping that next time this material can be circulated for review. Because we're trying to make the effort where everything can be circulated ahead of time in Pacifica. And this shouldn't be an exclusion. If I'm working on a situation where I feel like I have to keep it until the Board, I'll just have to accept that it may not actually get on the agenda for discussion at that time.

I also think that the items that were presented, because they weren't involving directly Jim Bennett, the interim general manager at KPFA, it's going around people that are normally there. And the board members have to -- I have to remember in these situations that there are
people that are in charge of running the station and the
day-to-day operations and we're here to assist and
oversee.

So these things have to come through channels
just out of courtesy. And I hope that we can do that in
the future. And as the chair of the finance committee, if
they're not, then I don't know that we'll be able to allow
them to come to the floor.

I would also like to restate for financial
reasons for the Foundation that through a letter from our
attorney regarding one of the suits that we're involved
in, that he requested that all communication related to it
go through him. And I say this as the treasurer mainly
for financial reasons. That the Board and the managers
and the staff have to do all they can to keep us out of
hot water when we can.

And I hope that the letter that has been
circulated will be read by everybody and adhered to out of
simple awareness of what we're supposed to be doing or not
doing.

And I think too that it needs to be said, just
so those people can understand, that the people that are
named in this suit that are bringing the suit, our
attorney has requested that we not speak to them without
going through him, because that's the way that the law
requires the communications to go. And I know that for
me, personally, even though I don't know these people by
face, it concerns me when there are so many of them that I
have to watch who I would be saying what to. And I just
encourage all of us to keep that in mind.

And, finally, I just want to say that I
personally will do as the treasurer everything I can to be
sure that the Foundation and the operations go forward.
It's a difficult time for a lot of reasons, some of which
I was directly responsible for, which I own. However,
when you look at what our capabilities are and what we're
achieving, we need to challenge ourselves to do better.
The issues before us will work out in time, but we have to
be able to go forward. And I hope we can all put our best
energies in that area.

DR. BERRY: Could I get a motion to accept the
report?

MR. ROBINSON: I so move.

DR. BERRY: Second?
MR. MILLSPAUGH: Second.

DR. BERRY: Comment?

MR. MORAN: I just wanted to comment on the motions that I brought to the finance committee. I think two of them were acknowledged, the first two. I am moving that we consider -- and I am bringing to the finance committee -- I think that's how it was referred to yesterday, that they consider motions that basically clarify or modify financial policies, which is really the purview of the Board to understand what the policies are for the funds that are in surplus, for example, and how they are allocated back to the departments or not allocated back to the departments, or what have you.

And that type of issue is certainly a policy matter that the Board should be thinking about and clarifying for our own understanding. And also for the listeners. So that when we pitch to the listeners and we ask them to send money in, we're doing so in a clear contract with what it is that we are intending to do with that money.

And I will be working with the manager to bring the specific budget amendment for KPFA by the middle of
March.

DR. BERRY: Mr. Moran, you are a board member of the Governing Board, right?

MR. MORAN: I am.

DR. BERRY: You do not represent a signal area. And you do not work with the manager of a station to bring forward something to the Board. That is not the function of a Governing board member. A Governing board member will have a conflict of interest if a Governing board member is the initiator of a recommendation from a station to come to the Board and then the Board has to act on it.

I don't wish to debate it further, but it just seems on its face that everyone would understand that that is not appropriate Board behavior and that it creates a conflict of interest.

MR. MORAN: Are you talking about the first two motions that I referred to?

DR. BERRY: I'm not even referring to motions. I'm referring to the comment you just made about you working with the station manager to bring forward an amendment to this organization. You are a Governing board member. You act on recommendations that come forward.

You do not initiate --

MR. MORAN: Madam chair --
DR. BERRY: I did not ask you to go to the manager and help him to prepare a budget amendment. I have never asked you to do that. No board member is supposed to be in the internal management of a station -- whatever station it is. I don't care what it is -- or a program helping people perfect budget amendments and bringing them forward. I don't even care what the amendment is or the issue or anything else. I'm not trying to debate the issue.

I'm just reminding you, sir -- and you can do whatever you like, obviously. You're a free human being -- that a board member, a Governing board member -- and this is why we have Board training, so we can discuss what Governing Board members are supposed to be doing -- is to act on recommendations that come forward, not to be the person who sits down to prepare the thing that's coming forward to us to act on. Because then you have to recuse yourself as a board member when it came forward because you were the guy who put it together.

I'm only just reminding you of that. Please be cautious, be careful.

MR. MORAN: I understand that.

AUDIENCE: What are the bylaws of this? This is
out of order for any rules.

DR. BERRY: Would the audience please be in

order.

MR. MORAN: The recommendations that are brought

forth to this Board, I told you I wanted to make a

presentation on a reconciliation of motions that I was

bringing to the Board, and I wanted to present them as a

reconciliation packet to the entire Board. They are

definitely not recommendations on budget line items.

DR. BERRY: Please, Mr. Moran, please, indulge

us.

In the interest of time, we do have your

motions. They have been submitted. We didn't get them

beforehand, as Mr. Palmer explained. I was not referring

to any of that. I was just saying, please don't help them

to prepare the budget amendment that you're going to bring

for us to act on, please.

Now, Mr. Robinson, did you have a comment you'd

like to make?


MR. ROBINSON: No.

DR. BERRY: Did anyone else?

Could I get a motion to approve the report of

the finance committee? Did I get it?

MR. MILLSPOUGH: Yes.
DR. BERRY: Okay. All in favor indicate by saying aye.  
(Aye.)  
Opposed?  
So ordered.  
Could I get the report quickly now, because we're behind time, of the board governance report, the rest of your report?  
MR. ACOSTA: Thank you, Madam Chair.  
We considered the nominations that were acted upon earlier this morning. This is the first time since we allocated four new positions in 1997 that all the positions would be filled. We committed to formalizing the nominations process to include formal notification to LABs and board members and nominees as to the status of the nominations before, during and after the process. It will also include a formal interview procedure and orientation for elected members.  
We also considered proposed amendments to elevate the Board's October 1999 resolution pledging not to sell any station to the status of a bylaw. We deferred the matter to our attorneys for formulation of appropriate language and should have a proposed amendment to be
noticed and voted on by the June 2000 meeting.

We established a procedure for submitting allegations of inappropriate behavior by LAB members, staff and board members, which includes formal notice to the chair of the governance committee, investigation by the chair and/or his or her delegate, report to the committee for consideration of action and appropriate notification of such action.

Additionally, the chair delegated board members, Robert Farrell and Aaron Kriegel to investigate the situation between the KPFK and LAB and report back to the committee for any action, if necessary.

For the record, I'd like to state that although board members come from a certain area, they're on this Board to take into consideration and act upon the needs of the entire organization. I don't want there to be a perception that members are here to present only concerns in areas from which they reside.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

DR. BERRY: Could I get a motion to accept the report of the board of governance?

MR. MILLSPAUGH: So moved.

DR. BERRY: Could I get a second?

MR. CISCO: Second.
DR. BERRY: Any discussion?

MR. ROBINSON: Would the chairman, Mr. Acosta, consider making a statement to the effect that while the attorney is drafting a statement, whether it's a resolution or amendment to the bylaws, that no sale will take place without certain procedures? That until such resolution or amendment takes place, the Board will not act in such a fashion?

MR. ACOSTA: We already have a resolution to that effect, Rob, and it was brought forth in October. And we don't have to go any further than that.

MR. ROBINSON: Okay. So you're just reemphasizing it. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

DR. BERRY: Nobody is selling any station, license or whatever.

MR. ROBINSON: I understand that.

DR. BERRY: All in favor indicate by saying aye. (Aye.)

Opposed?

So ordered. Do you have a report, Mr. Ford?

MR. FORD: Yes, I do. And in the interest of time, I will not restate the current problems, as far as the hardware is concerned, at the various stations.
Michael Palmer reiterated those during his report as to the needs of repair and upgrade of the facility.

What I would like to focus on is that as part of what was stated by Nan Rubin in her report about the task force, we talked a great deal about the content. But one thing we didn't discuss in detail was the delivery system. And that's what the technical committee is going to focus on.

Regardless of what the stats are as to what the listenership is, whether they are high or low, valid or invalid. The point is we have to increase audience. That's fundamental. And I think that's something everybody can agree upon.

What we're currently going to do is to look at the new mechanism by which we can convey our message out to the marketplace. And that is going to be primarily through the internet.

The internet offers a great deal of opportunity. One, even on current operations, a lot of the stations often miss a feed and I'll have to call back to the station. By using an unlimited server we can be able to put the material out there and they can download it at any time. We can also look to market the service in order to get more affiliates signing on board with us because it
will have the ability on a limited budget to be able to
use our resources in that vein.

Currently, just about every station has some
mechanism for putting their signal out on the internet.
All of them have very limited capability. No more than 80
subscribers at a given time.

If we were to come up with a concrete plan to
devise a mechanism whereby we can start streaming all five
stations through an unlimited server, people will be able
to do time shifting and download the signal from Amy
Goodman's show to Gary Null's show to any show that we
have out there at any given time of the day or night.

This will, in fact, increase our audience. This
is one mechanism that we have not looked at in earnest.
What we're going to do in the technical committee, we
formed a working group consisting of three board members
and two of the general managers to put together a concept
plan by which we can move Pacifica within a very short
time frame and at minimum cost to allow us to get, say,
one year behind technology, whereas we're in the Stone Age
today basically.

So what we're going to do is try to make a
comprehensive shift on a technical aspect identifying what
the problems are, what the needs are from the various stations and to try to accomplish this over the next 18 months.

Now, at the next Board meeting, we're going to come back with this concept plan. Here again, the plan is going to be developed by us. We're going to ask other people to look at it. We're going to come back with a concept plan to the Board for its action whether or not to proceed with it or not to proceed with it to take a look and get critique, earnest critique, as to where we feel we should go.

Nan Rubin has offered to be involved in that to help us to make sure it's compatible and in sync with what their doing from the programming side. So that's what we're going to look to do.

Secondly, we're also going to look at the aspects of creating an E-Commerce link on Pacifica's web site to provide, I guess, a Pacifica store whereby a lot of the materials from the archives will be sold. Authors of the progressive movement who have books and who have other tapes they want to dispense and don't have the wherewithal, we will provide that service. It can be very effective. It can be another revenue stream for us.
Currently there are a lot of fulfillment companies out there that charge them with 6 percent on a given sale to fulfill those orders. This can be a very good revenue stream for us to increase our revenues in order to pay for the new development of programming, as well as the application of going forth in the future with new technology changes.

And, lastly, we've got a problem with the archives. It currently is down. We're going to work with the ED to try and pull that together to get that back up in use such that the people who are looking to purchase materials from the archives, we will be able to do that in the very near future.

And that's it, Madam Chair.

DR. BERRY: Can I get a motion to accept the report?

MR. JOHNS: So moved.

DR. BERRY: Second?

MS. VAN PUTTEN: Second.

DR. BERRY: Any discussion?

All in favor indicate by saying aye.

(Aye.)

Opposed?
So ordered.

That comes to the end of the reports of the committee. And we are just a little bit off, so we're going to begin the public comment period.

We have a sign-up sheet. Each person will have two minutes to come to the microphone to make a statement.

Mr. Robinson?

MR. ROBINSON: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I just wanted to -- this is not committee business, but I wanted to welcome the new members of the Board.

I also wanted to go on record as stating that I have the gravest concerns about this Board's ability to exercise its fiduciary responsibilities were it to be accountable if we can't even provide minutes of our past meeting, committee reports, written committee reports or a report from the executive director. Thank you very much.

DR. BERRY: Mr. Lucy?

MR. LUCY: I don't have my copy of the agenda, but I would like at some point during the course of the meeting --

DR. BERRY: I think you should do it now.

MR. LUCY: If I may. I hate to prolong the public section of the meeting.

I would just really like to do two things.
One, express my appreciation to the members of the Board for the opportunity to have worked with the Board over the period of time that I've been a member of the Board. But also to express to the chair and through the chair, I'd like to tender my resignation from the Pacifica Board.

And I do so with a feeling of lack of fulfillment. When I was asked to be a part of the Board, I really had the notion that I could bring something positive to the Board and its operation. I had some misguided notion that I had some sort of a voice as a limited progressive in the area of organized labor and thought we could share some things, both on the trade union side and on the Board side.

Over the last year or so I've come to understand the folly of that notion. And I sort of reached my own level of uselessness and really have come to a conclusion that I think my resignation is in order. We've gone through a period of difficulty. And we're still in a period of difficulty.

And I think that if the Board needs someone from labor who can spend the time, who has the energy and has the commitment to try to find a way through these mine
fields. Just to make a point, I'm not convinced that I have the time to do that. Nor in light of some of the personal conflicts that we get engaged in, do I have the desire to do it.

I think it might be useful for the Board to understand -- and this is certainly not to bring dismay to the new members -- personal confrontations in separate and distinct areas of activity on the issues involved here has just become distasteful. I heard the letter read from June and I think that is fairly symptomatic of some of the things that some of us have gone through over the last year or so.

And while it may still continue and we'll deal with it in the same way, I think whatever contribution I can make of this Board can still be made and would try to make without being a member of it.

This is not to suggest that I will even deal with conflict. I just think that given the amount of time and energy I've got to work on some things, I ain't got the time in hand-to-hand combat and trench warfare. I appreciate the fact that I'm allowed to work with the Board this long, but I will send to the chair or through the chair a letter indicating that it's so ordered.

DR. BERRY: Bill, I will expect to receive such
a letter. And I just want to say to you that just as Jack
O'Dell seduced me into being chair, I seduced you into

being a member of the Board. And so I apologize to you --
Jack has not yet apologized to me -- and say that you have
been my brother in many struggles. You and I have slept
on the floor together. We've done all kinds of things
together and would take a bullet for each other, probably.
I'd take one for you. I don't know about you.
MR. LUCY: I take the same position.

DR. BERRY: And I realize that it's been very
costly to you in terms of stress and everybody else. And
there comes a time when you just think you can't make any
contribution so why go through all the stress.
So I just want to tell you that I appreciate
your willingness to stand with me during this time. And
I'm reluctant to say that you can go, but this year I go
too. So thank you again, my brother, and we very much
appreciate your service here.

MR. LUCY: I would just add this. That sometime
ago when this was discussed, you said I could go when I
found another trade unionist to replace me. I'm having to
leave without having found another to replace me.
DR. BERRY: I understand perfectly, my brother.
Let us go now to the public comment part of the meeting. You will have two minutes to speak. Could somebody --

Anton, could you take the time?

The names Alice Chon, Robin Urovitch, Lee Houder and Sam Hoseiney. Those are the first five names. So if you could be ready to come forward and identify yourself.

MS. CHAN: My name is Alice Chan. I want to talk about something that the progressive left doesn't usually mention -- the powers of good and evil.

Standing before you I sense a lack of interest in my views, possibly disdain and even dislike for me, even though you don't know me. At the Board meeting last fall when I gave Ken Ford an envelope from the KPFA steering committee and he tore the envelope up right in my face, I sensed the contempt pouring from him them. And I sense it now from some of you.

And I also sense the power of evil. You have locked out the power of good from your hearts and your spirits. None of your official actions this weekend were decided with love or peace in your hearts. And since I can't believe that you are evil people, I can only think that it must be the power of evil that is acting through
you creating a new obscenity. Pacifica once was a voice
speaking truth to power.

        Now you seek to twist those words by turning
Pacifica into a power to silence truth. I know there is
nothing I can say to reason with you, to change your
minds, to persuade you to turn away from evil and seek
peace and truth. I do not have the power to make you see
these things.

        And so I now call upon a higher power. I call
upon the great spirit of my Cherokee ancestors to enter
your spirits and touch your hearts. I call upon the God
of my fathers and my mothers to enter your spirits and
touch your hearts. I call upon the volcano Goddess Paley
to enter your spirits and touch your hearts.

        I call upon the higher power to whom we must all
answer to enter your spirits and touch your hearts so that
you can see and be outraged by the evil that you do here.

Touch your hearts so that you can see that you have become
the henchmen and the handmaking of the evil power that has
taken over corporate America.

        Listen to this new voice in your hearts and be
outraged by your evil acts. Listen and hear this new
voice in your hearts. And if you cannot join with the
true spirit of Pacifica, resign now. You do not belong
here. Ignore this voice at your peril. God have mercy on
your souls.

DR. BERRY: Thank you for your remarks.

Robin Urovitch?

MS. UROVITCH: My name is Robin Urovitch. I'm a
reporter for Pacifica network news. And I'm one of 42
reporters around the country and on four continents that
are on strike against this network.

And what strike means is that we won't file
stories for Pacifica for three months until our issues are
dealt with. The basic issue is censorship. Now, the
reason why we and anyone with any integrity works for
Pacifica is because we're interested in reporting news
from a grass roots perspective and news that's unfiltered
and uncensored. And it would be an extreme hypocrisy for
us to stand by and pretend that we're working for an
organization that defends free expression when we're
clearly not.

We've given all of you a list of incidents of
censorship that I'm sure many of you have read. But I'm
just going to tell you one experience that I had. I worked in the KPFK news room. And what we saw there in terms of censorship is like a bad characterization of a totalitarian regime in a Hollywood movie. We, as the reporters there, were told that we wouldn't be allowed to report on a situation at KPFA because we were too involved in the story in some sort of way. And that when it began to appear on the associated press wires on a daily basis, we were told that we would be able to read those associated press wire stories only. That's one example.

This is a fight about our ability to do our work with some kind of integrity. And you have a list of our demands. But we're demanding editorial independence for all of the news departments and we want Dan Cofflin who was removed because of an attempt to silence him. We want him to be reinstated. And we want you to take a position on censorship. And we want you to discuss those issues with us.

And, Dr. Berry, I think it's a very good idea that you said that you want to heal the conflicts at Pacifica. And the way to do that is to deal directly with us, because we're the ones that have a conflict with you,
among others. And we've sacrificed part of our income and
part of our ability to be on the air in order to try to
bring this problem to a head.

We sent each of you a letter on the 24th of
January, and we haven't received any response to date.
And that's an outrage, because we're people who work for
you.

DR. BERRY: Your time is up. I didn't hear you,
but which payroll are you on?

MS. UROVITCH: I'm on a payroll. I'm a
freelance reporter and we're workers.

DR. BERRY: All right. I just didn't understand
you.

Lee Houder?

MR. HOUDER: Dr. Berry, we've been on opposite
sides before. I was head of the Vietnam Veterans against
war in Colorado when you were at the University of
Colorado. And that you fought us with black student
alliance and Latino students when we were fighting the war
back in the late '60s, early '70s. And now on this I feel
that we're on opposite sides too.

As I look at this fight, and as I've watched

this Board meeting, I've been a union rep and I've been
leaders in active unions in a lot of public interest
groups over the years. And you're not following any procedures that the Board does not dialogue with board members. That you don't put up board members as slates. That you have an open debate on it. And this isn't a democratic procedure. But this is in keeping with how Pacifica has been running all along.

Take, for instance, the gag rule where Democracy Now is cut off the air on our local station here in D.C. And I'm a native Washingtonian. And other programs are censored here because we do not talk about dirty laundry on the air.

But at the same time, people that support the network get to talk about dirty laundry -- Dorothy Healey and Ambrose Lane had long programs that aren't pulled off. So we have a double standard here, just as the Board is exhibiting a double standard on how it's running it.

In other words, we don't have a rules based organization. We're having an organization based on personality.

DR. BERRY: Your time is up.

MR. HOUDER: And another one is putting Bessie up in charge of the station who has recently told high donors that she doesn't support Democracy Now and that she
doesn't support the progressive news on the station.

And one other fact is the reason why WPFW is going up in the ratings is because we've lost our other jazz station in town. And just because we're reaching out to the white people out in the suburbs who like jazz, doesn't mean we're not. We should be reaching out to the progressive community -- the black, Hispanic and progressive environmental community in the city, and we're not.

DR. BERRY: The next speaker is Sam Hoseiney.

And a point of personal privilege, I was not at the University of Colorado during the Vietnam War. And that is just false, totally inaccurate. It has nothing to do with anything I've ever done. Not that it matters. Go ahead, Mr. Hoseiney.

MR. HOSEINEY: Thank you. Lee said it was just after, as he stated.

DR. BERRY: It wasn't just after either, so go ahead.

MR. HOSEINEY: I'd like to reiterate the point, because the Chair has brought up that the numbers for WPFW has gone up. The other jazz station, UDC, the UDC station, was sold two years ago and became C-Span radio. So perhaps I'd just suggest that that might have something
to do with increased ratings. And it isn't due to any particular brilliance on the management of WPFW.

On the Saul Landau letter, I talked to Jim Averesk who founded the American Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee, which I was communications director of. I told him, Jim, you're telling one side to unilaterally disarm here. You're telling to silence the critics just as they're putting on a board member who is in a position who buys and sells stations.

Jim Averesk didn't know the first thing about the situation. Jim Averesk, a great man, who is in South Dakota, he doesn't know what Democracy Now is and he signed that letter because Saul is an old buddy from way back. And I think that is a very dangerous thing to just do something because somebody is an old buddy from way back.

Verna spoke at our teaching last night, Verna Avery Brown, and she talked about how unprogressive some of the people who are running the Pacifica network news are right now. That they rolled their eyes when she suggested doing a story about affirmative action or when somebody suggested doing a story about gay rights.

AUDIENCE: That's not true.
MR. HOSEINEY: Were you at the teaching last night?

AUDIENCE: That's not true. We were at the meeting with Verna there.

MR. HOSEINEY: Verna said last night that that's the atmosphere of the people who were there last night. Let me just give the board members Verna Avery Brown's phone number, since the Chair is not returning Verna Avery Brown's phone calls -- (301)681-4327.

DR. BERRY: Your time is up, sir.

MR. HOSEINEY: I think our time has just come. Thank you.

DR. BERRY: Thank you very much.

Amy Rosenberg. And then after that, Mike Mage and Adrienne Lauby.

MS. ROSENBERG: I'm the elected unpaid staff representative to a local board in New York City and I've been a long term programmer. And I remember interviewing you, Bill Lucy, when you arrested control from the old guard to create a new voice in the AFL-CIO. It was a very rancorous time. But you listened and there was an atmosphere where people can listen.

And the atmosphere that's been created here is immediately polarizing. And, indeed, I've heard more
bashing here based on the statements that have been read than I've heard in a long time about Pacifica. Certainly more than I've heard from the right.

A critical issue that's been presented -- and I've been here three days now and I've been at Pacifica for many years -- is, indeed, audience development. It's very important. And a critical question then becomes how do you develop the audience?

Do you kind of opportunistically grab at easy arbitrons and cursory statistics in the form of David Giovannoni who has already had some serious problems, even within the MPR realm, and certainly is not the only statistician available and turns out cynical and bashing reports, and certainly doesn't compute within that context any -- it's not a substitute for serious analysis and the hard work that needs to be done to understand what it takes to take a difficult message and bring it to the forefront of people's consciousness? And messages about working people and the oppressed are difficult messages within the realm of the status quo.

So that's one way of looking at it just grabbing at the statistics. Now, I've watched very carefully the work of the Board. Now, there is another way to go, and
that is to understand --

DR. BERRY: Your time is up, lady.

MS. ROSENBERG: Lady?

DR. BERRY: Your time is up, ma'am.

MS. ROSENBERG: Mary, you really have to learn
to treat people with a lot more dignity and respect.

DR. BERRY: We have a lot of speakers who want
to speak.

MS. ROSENBERG: I understand that. And the only
thing I would say is that if our message is not that of
the mainstream, but to serve those who are unempowered by
the mainstream and those who are hurt and oppressed like
the brother, Amadou Diallo, which we broadcast
continuously, yes, like brother Mumbia Bushimal, then for
God sake, let's figure out how to enhance it, how to
strengthen it, how to technologize better, but not to
 crush it, not to be swayed by superficial statistical
data. I don't want to ignore it.

But I will say one thing. The Board has to do a
little soul searching just as we do. I'm very critical.
I don't want 16,000 people to be subscribers in New York.
It doesn't even make for a good demonstration. I want to
enhance our programming. But there is a way of doing it
which shares information and does some hard work. The
Board in three days came without agendas, several committees didn't meet, there was no democratization, Mr. Palmer's role, who is now treasurer, we were told was not going to happen, Mr. Acosta, who is now acting as Chair, that was not discussed in the committee.

DR. BERRY: Ms. Rosenberg, your time is up.

MS. ROSENBERG: I'd just ask you in conclusion to democratize and create a climate that's a little warmer for people to engage in discourse.

DR. BERRY: You are taking time away from other people.

Mike Mage?

MS. MAGE: My name is Mike Mage. There are lots of things that I would like to say to you. But I thought perhaps the best use of my time would be to redo my reply to Saul Landau when he asked me to sign his letter. I said, and I'm summarizing, I have been following the Pacifica controversy for the past year and have become fairly familiar with its details. My overall observation is that most of the people who disagree with the Pacifica board, particularly those at the radio stations, have tried repeatedly to do exactly what you ask. And, Dave, that is engage in honest, open and
civilized discussion, end of quote.

But starting way before the crisis last June they have been repeatedly rebuffed, disrespected, ignored and mocked. Read the appeals from Chomski, Herman and Zinn and read Mary Frances Berry's response. Read the appeals from the local advisory board of KPFA from the station workers and volunteers in February 1999 and subsequently.

I agree with you, Saul, that we need debate and cooperation, unquote. But people who have discussed or even just gave news about Pacifica issues on the air have been repeatedly censored and/or fired or forced to resign. The latest being long time news anchor Vernon Avery Brown.

I predict that your most difficult problem by far will be getting people like Mary Frances Berry, Lynn Chadwick and your own Mark Cooper to start engaging in, quote, honest, open and civilized discussion, end of quote.

As a board member of the American Civil Liberties National Capitol area affiliate, I have been impressed with how the ACOU manages to be both democratic, decentralized and unified nationally.

I wrote to the Pacifica Board suggesting that they could do well to study ACOU structure and sent them a
side by side comparison of the two organization structures. One board member, Rob Robinson, expressed some interest. But I have seen no further attempts at governance reform. I wish you luck, Saul, in your attempts to resolve the crisis and will be happy to work with you on it. But your letter as it now stands is much too one-sided for me to sign.

Thank you.
station KPFA was crucial to my survival. I've lived with a chronic illness for 15 years. I rarely left my home. And I understand very much what Pacifica brings. For me, it brought a sense of community, intellectual stimulation, hope and some very concrete resources.

Because I have been poor all my life, because I've been an out lesbian for two decades I know a lot of people for whom this is true. And I would be willing to bet the contents of my wallet against the contents against any of yours that it is not crucial to your survival the way it is to mine. And that's why I will be back, and I assume other people will also be here. And I thank you for your time.

DR. BERRY: Thank you very much.

Kyle Crofton and then Jeff Chan and Wynona Hower.

MR. CROFTON: Hello. My name is Kyle. I'm from the Northern California area. I'm 17 and a KPFA listener. KPFA and Pacifica are the voices of the progressive radio movement. I admit my age group doesn't really listen to Pacifica, but it is your duty to preserve the voice or the voices for my generation.

Since July of last summer, I've learned much about the conflict between KPFA, Pacifica and the
listeners. I've heard but one side. It is up to you to prove them wrong, to restore my faith in the future of thought and free ideas.

There's a poster in my history teacher's room that says, KPFA, free speech radio. What is a gag rule?

It is a direct attack on the free speech of your foundation that it was built upon.

If you dilute free speech we lose the freedom and expression. I fought for free speech at my high school and won that battle at the school board level. But you must leave my generation with an alternative flow of thought.

Oh, another thing. I just want to take you through these simple steps. Pacifica creates Democracy Now. Pacifica, therefore, supports this idea. If one supports and voices an idea, wouldn't it be reasonable for that Board to practice what it preaches?

I know it's a little simplified, but I've only got two minutes. So the programs are not an indicator to the demographics, but need to retain their dignity. I am the voice of my generation here and I am the future and I need assurances that because free thought didn't get high enough ratings it's gone.
Thank you.

DR. BERRY: Jeff Chan?

MR. CHAN: Each meeting of this Board that I attend convinces me more of the unfitness of the Board to
govern the institution that I think of as the Pacifica
Foundation. I was going to start my comments by saying
that allowing public comments after all decisions have
been made is not allowing no statement at all. But your
having a comment session after the program policy
committee, kind of negated that statement.

However, even when you allow public comment, you
ignore it leading me to believe that this is a bone that
you are throwing to us and we are your pet dogs.

I will continue to speak, though, because the
real audience from my comments is behind me. I cannot
believe that I'm the only person who sees conflict of
interest when the Foundation who I count on to expose
government and corporate misconduct has on its Governing
Board high government officials, corporate executives and
people who have clients who have corporate executives
guilty of some of the worse environmental misconduct.

Then there are the actions of the Board at
yesterday's committee meetings. It was my impression that
Mr. Millspaugh was to bring a resolution to this meeting
regarding no say to the bylaws. I believe that's my memory.

MR. MILLSPAUGH: Your memory is faulty, I'm afraid.

MR. CHAN: Mr. Moran did bring a proposal, but his proposal was thrown out because it didn't meet process. Now, it is my understanding that he was a member of the governance committee. However, I was told that was wrong. My notes say that he was. I have other notes that say he was. I wonder about this. Was there a change in some meeting that he wasn't told about and that we weren't told about?

DR. BERRY: Your time is up, sir.

MR. CHAN: The revolution is going to reside or you'll be forced out.

DR. BERRY: The next speaker is Wynona Hower.

MS. HOWER: I'm Wynona Hower. I'm with the local group, the Alliance for Progressive Radio. This has been characterized as a family fight. But this is part of the attack on our democracy. Our elections are being bought and sold, our social policy for the future is putting people in jail. And 50 percent of the wealth in this country is owned by 1 percent of the
people. We aren't hearing about any of the important

issues that matter to working people in this country.

Our only hope for having any democracy and voice
on the airwaves is Pacifica. But rather than being a
galvanizing force for the progressive community that talks
about issues that has more shows like Democracy Now,
Dr. Berry, you are presiding over the corporatization of
Pacifica, stocking the Board with corporate
representatives and not making Pacifica a voice for
everyone.

Our local station WPFW is a good example. Yes,
it's gaining listeners because of the sad, sad demise of
WDCU, another jazz station. But local public affairs
programming at WPFW are at an all time low. There are no
shows talking about all the people in prison in
Washington, D.C. This is a huge diverse community with
Latinos, a large gay community, one of the largest Asian
communities in the entire country. There's no programming
at WPFW to serve those communities.

We want a local advisory board that is active
and responsive to the community. We want public affairs
programming that covers Congress and the demise of our
democracy. And we want a management at WPFW that doesn't
hang up when listeners call in and have concerns, that
refuses to answer phone calls, that makes fun of its
listeners.

DR. BERRY: Your time is up.

MS. HOWER: We want a real progressive radio
station in our community. And we are going to fight for
it. We are not done fighting.

DR. BERRY: Elaine Gron.

MR. GRON: Hello. My name is Elaine Gron and
I'm a local listener. And I moved here from Europe. And
I was very tired of the crap I heard on all the radios.

So I began listening to Amy Goodman.

And she was the only
voice I heard which said things that I have never heard in
this country before. I heard things about Cuba, I heard
things about East Timor.

And when I was at lunch a couple of months ago
and I suggested to Bessie Wash that a lot of people cannot
listen to Amy Goodman should have a program in the
evening. So if you want more public affairs, that is the
way to go, I think.

And I also want to congratulate Mr. Moran,
because he is a descending voice and without a descending
voice you don't have democracy.

DR. BERRY: Sherry Gendeleman. And then after
that David Adelson.

MS. GENDLEMAN: Good morning everybody. I'm
Sherry Gendeleman, chair of the KPFW local advisory board.
I only have a few comments.

I want you to know that we too welcome the
letter signed by Saul Landau, Barbara Ehrenreich and other
people, and have been meeting with them over the weekend
and have plans to meet with them to resolve this crisis
and conflict that have been going on for a long time and
threatening what we consider to be the most precious asset
for the progressive movement.

I would like to seed the rest of my time to
Laverne Williams, who is also from the Bay Area.

So, Laverne, could you come up here and finish
this?

MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you. My name is Laverne
Williams. I'm from the Bay Area. And I would just like
to say good morning.

And I would just like to ask all of us to
acknowledge the strength of the Amadou Diallo family. And
also to observe a moment of silence for his brother who
made the transition, and also a moment of silence to
confirm our believe in peace and justice and the freedom
to express this.

And I just want to say that the State of
California, of course, as we know, is one of the most
diverse states in the union and that our representatives
from the Bay Area, Thomas Moran, who is Latino, we have
African-American and Europe, who is not here, Pete
Bramson, and, I'm sorry, the sister here, Karolyn Van
Putten.

And what I'd like to say is that I don't see
that much diversity here on the Board. And I would say
that Tomas Moran, who is a board member, this appears to
be an orchestrated attack on him as a board member. The
people in the Bay Area certainly don't appreciate that.
And this is something we will carefully monitor, as will
our elected representatives.

Thank you very much.

MR. ADELSON: Hi. My name is Dave Adelson. If
you could give me a thirty second warning so I can finish
up in a timely way.
A member of your board, who I like very much, said to me at the end of the last Board meeting, after all, this is a business. And I would like to distinguish between being a business and being fiscally responsible. There are a number of institutions in our society -- educational institutions, churches and other things that need to be fiscally responsible, but whose primary reason for existence is something other than maximizing profit. And we all know churches that want to maximize money and membership and churches that do other things that have a different flavor when you walk into the room.

I would say that I would like very much to see more people from the educational community on the Board. There are relatively few of them, even though Pacifica is an educational institution.

I very much applaud the statements of Mr. Moran and Mr. Palmer relating to how you measure values other than the market values, because that's very important to know what we're talking about when we say we're succeeding in serving the mission.

There are people --

In response to what Mr. Ford said, I've made contact with a professor of public policy whose specialty
is measuring on market values and I'd like to put her in contact with you.

One thing about educational institutions is that there is an administration. But there is also a concept of an economic senate. The academic senate is the group that makes decisions by curriculum and other things like that.

So if we were to look at features of educational institutions that ensure that values other than just money in reach, which is not to denigrate money in reach. Money in reach are important to sustain an environment in which people can come and do good work over long periods of time.

But I would like to see Amy Goodwin, for example, on an academic senate participating in decisions about curriculum and other such people. I think I'll seed the rest of my time too to all the people who have gone over.

Thank you very much.

MR. KERSHER: Thank you. My name is Leon Kersher. I'm from the KFFA signal area.

The vision of Lou Hill, a founder of Pacifica, and, indeed, the mission of Pacifica itself, is to
contribute to a lasting understanding between individuals of all nations, races, creeds and colors. And Pacifica has a 50 year tradition of doing just that, and a tradition that we can all be proud of.

So it pains me to observe a board of directors that itself so pointedly exemplifies the intolerance and antagonism that exists in the world.

If you cannot heal the obvious antagonisms in this room, you cannot dream of healing the larger Pacifica community or the world. You lack the humility required to be a truly great leader.

Under your direction Pacifica has been hemorrhaging. You have lost some of your most creative and professional voices -- Nicole Salia, Dan Cofflin, Vernon Avery Brown and others.

You have squandered over half a million dollars on ill-advised attempts to suppress descent. Your actions have exposed Pacifica to at least three lawsuits. And 42 reporters refused to work with PNN on ethical grounds. Whether you call that a strike, or whatever you call it, that's damning.

This is hardly a record to be proud of. Quite the opposite. Contributing to lasting understanding in the world? I don't think so. Your attempts to suppress
descent within Pacifica have exacerbated the crisis.

Alexander Michael John whose thinking has been a profound influence on the founders of Pacifica said that suppression is always foolish, freedom is always wise. I hope you'll reflect on that. Thank you.

MS. ROSENBERG: My name is Tracy Rosenberg. It's been stated over and over again at this meeting that of 40 million potential listeners, only 800,000 listen. That number is 800,000, not 40,000, which Dr. Berry misstated earlier. 800,000.

You're concerned people aren't listening. And, you're right, they're not. People in a community listen to noncommercial public community radio because they feel invested in a station. They feel invested because they can participate. They feel invested because the station shares the values of that community.

Communities are entirely blocked from participating in Pacifica. Power is increasingly centralized. No one can vote on anything except for you.

You just told the representative for the Bay Area, which happens to be my signature area, it's a conflict of interest for him to bring forward resolutions that reflect our concern to this Board.
When it comes to shared values, which in this case are progressive values, that is the mission of this organization.

Let's review. Censorship and gag rules are not a progressive value. Authoritarianism is not a progressive value. Sicking the police on your fellow progressives in Berkeley, California is not a progressive value. People aren't listening to Pacifica because you're disenfranchising communities, failing in your mission and lacking any future plan whatsoever that doesn't hinge on arbitron ratings.

MR. LISTON: My name is Jeff Liston. I'm a long time listener and subscriber. But this is my first Board meeting. And, frankly, I am shocked and appalled at the cavalier disregard of organized procedures, disrespect between members of the Board. And it's just shocking and disappointing to me. I came here being reluctant to come and start spatting off about the legacy of Lou Hill and Pacifica. But after what I've seen today, I feel I need to.

I am just so incensed that you all are so out of touch with what the original mission and the unique value of Pacifica really is. We live in a time of unprecedented corporatization and consolidation of control over the
media of communication, particularly the broadcast media.
And in that consolidation Pacifica has been and can continue to be a unique voice.

And what I see here and have seen in the struggle over the last year has been a total subversion of that potential role and that value. And I urge you all to think seriously and take a step back. Think about what the original mission and the values and the things that this is really about, what is unique about this.

We don't need another MPR clone station. There are plenty of those. We don't need another top forty station or another country and western station. What we need is a unique voice for the listeners in the role that Pacifica has fulfilled. So I urge you, please.

Arbitron ratings are useful data. I don't dispute that. On the other hand, increasing listenership is also a good thing. But what does it profit a network or a station to gain market share if it forfeited its mission and its reason for being?

MR. WAGNER: I'm Frank Wagner. I'm a local listener to -- well, I listen to Democracy Now now. But I just wanted to say that Lou Hill must be turning over in his grave if he would listen to what you people are
putting down right now with the exception of Thomas Moran. I think this is a sham. I think that democracy in the Pacifica Board has disappeared, and probably hasn't been there for a while. And, particularly, I want to address the censorship in Pacifica, and, particularly, in the Washington area.

They have gone so far in this censorship of censoring Amy's program, the Pacifica network news. And Counter Spin, which is put out by Fair, I'm sure you know, criticized PFW two or three times and so they pulled it off the air, completely eliminated it. Now, if that's democracy and if that's progressive radio, excuse me, but I don't get it.

And this reminds me of the election of 2000 just looking at you people. I think you ought to be ashamed of yourselves. You're a disgrace to progressive radio. You're a disgrace to any form of progression. And I just can't believe that this is going on. This is my first board meeting.

I just want to talk about Lou Hankins for a minute and Bessie Wash.

DR. BERRY: You will not defame or degrade any individual in this meeting.

MR. WAGNER: Okay. Just about the leadership at
PFW. They've gone so far as to censor a PNN news program which was sanctioned by Pacifica in California, actually sanctioned by you. They pulled ten minutes of it off the air. It's outrageous, it's disgusting. And I hope you people will listen to the spirits, as the first woman who spoke said, and examine your consciousness and get a life people.

MR. Potoff. Hello. My name is Rick Potoff. I'm a member of a Houston committee for people's radio. And I suppose I should congratulate Mr. Acosta on becoming a chair. The only thing is I can't because I don't approve of the process in which he was appointed by.

I mean, I'd approve if I had a chance to vote on whether he should be a chair. And I would approve it if the listener sponsors of Pacifica and of KPFT had a chance to vote on who sits on their local Board and who sits on the National Board. I mean, who's Valerie Chambers? That's all I have to say. Thank you.

MR. SCHAEFER: My name is Paul Schaefer. I'm bothered by the material I heard about the heroic advances of WPFW and KPFT. I think the obvious retort to make is what proportion of their programming would be out of place at a run of the mill MPR station.
I'm not sure that they're advancing Pacifica's goals even as their numbers get better. I'm bothered by the fascination of audiographics and the references to Pacifica's grant, but I'm willing to play that game. In corporate speak on marketing, one of the things that you worry about is the distinctiveness of the grant.

Now, in all those reams of audiographics reports, how much is there on the question of maintaining and improving the distinctness of the grant? I think the answer is none at all. And I think, basically, the audiographics program is to homogenize Pacifica into MPR style broadcasting.

I think one of the problems here -- I'm reminded of a Groucho Marx film -- the one where he doesn't want to belong to any club that will have him. I think a lot of what's going on here is that anyone who consciously favors Lou Hill's ideas, the principles of listener sponsored progressive radio, is by definition outside the target audience. I think that's a bizarre way to function, but I think that's the way in which we're moving.

Lastly, I was really struck --

I actually went through that bound book of
reports to the Board and was struck on page 23 with
Pacifica network news saying first, gee, our resources are
strained, and then saying, gee, great idea, how about we
spend some money to get AP audio feeds?

Now, if on a particular story PNN is aware that
it has nothing to bring to the table beyond what the wire
services have, why is it throwing money out or suggesting
throwing money out to get a wire service feed that has the
same material that everybody in the country has?

I think the function of Pacifica network news
should be to bring fresh stuff to the table. And on
stories where it doesn't have fresh stuff, it should do a
relatively brief coverage and polish it off.

MS. CHEZNAY: My name is Heidi Cheznay and I am
from the KPFA signal Fort Worth bay area.

And I am too incensed with the deliberations of
this Board this weekend. So I am going to allow my time
to Lee Garrett who will speak on the behalf of many of us.

Thank you.

MS. GARRETT: I'm pretty incensed too so I'm
going to speak to the real owners of this Foundation.

In Berkeley, a couple of years ago when the
bylaws heist was enacted, Dr. Berry made a comment that
Pacifica's purpose was to put out a progressive message. And she did not understand why people asked her what that meant. She said, a progressive message, I mean, that should be clear.

Well, I would submit that if the Board's idea is to put out a progressive message and we observed their activities for five years that include hiring union busting consultants, having journalists hauled off the air in handcuffs, having gag rules -- I'm sorry. I'm so angry I can hardly talk. And now a board member that thinks that it would be -- a new board member, Bertram Lee -- that it would be appropriate to throw Lou Hill's vision down the toilet and take corporate sponsorship. Because, oh, no, this isn't going to affect the content of the news and the coverage. Do you believe that?

AUDIENCE: No.

MS. GARRETT: Okay. So with people like this in a so-called leadership claiming to be progressive and Saul Landau's ridiculous letter, it is no wonder that people are confused when Dr. Berry has said, what do you mean by progressive?

Because I'll tell you, this is not what I meant. What do you mean by progressive? If this is not your vision of what it means to be progressive or what it means
to be radical, let's please say radical. This was a radical radio station formulated with a radical intent. And a radical vision has never been more needed in America than now. So let's make this a radical radio station. And I believe that if we speak truth to power to the American people, if we get them the facts and the information and do it with rigor and integrity and not like hippocrates, we will increase the audience. And the working class are not represented on this Board.

DR. BERRY: Miss Garrett, your time is up. But if you want to take your next two minutes -- you signed up again -- would you like to take that now?

MS. GARRETT: Well, I'd like to know -- --

DR. BERRY: Do you want to take that now?

MS. GARRETT: I'd like to know if you share in that.

Yes, I'll take that. Thank you.

Is there anyone who would like to share in that?

Okay. The corporation for public broadcasting. This is another good thing to bring up. Now, the move of the Pacifica offices to the city in the dead of night were justified by the fact that it brings the Pacifica administration closer to the people that it considers
important -- the FCC the CPB and the government apparatus.

Once again, I want to respond again to the purpose that as a pacifist network Lou Hill and the founders understood the role of the state and the role of capital in creating war. They understood that the state was a police force for capital to expand their resources and control of people here and people abroad through war.

It is, therefore, utterly inappropriate that the Board of Lou Hill's foundation should consider becoming closer to --

AUDIENCE: How dare you leave!

MR. ACOSTA: Could we have order, please?

MS. GARRETT: They've left and they don't listen anyway. That's why my back is turned. Because I've gone through this ridiculous charade for years. So I'm talking to you because the decision to do something about it rests with you.

I thank you very much for listening to this incoherent rant.

MR. ROLAND: My name is Paul Roland. Until I left Portland a couple of years ago, I was a programmer at cable community radio with my own weekly program for around ten years, a public affairs program. As I'm sure some people know, KBOO is one of the 69 Pacifica
affiliates and one of 16 which participated in a recent one-day boycott of the Pacifica network news out of concern for recent actions of the Pacifica Board. It was called, I understand, A Day Without Pacifica -- obviously I wasn't there anymore -- to show what it would be like to lose the independent voice or voices that Pacifica represents.

Now, in my long time in Portland and with KBOO I learned what a community station really is. I also learned a lot of the inevitable internal conflicts that that brings up. In some ways its' sort of a microcosm of what's going on in Pacifica. Although because it's much more locally based, it doesn't have the bigger difficulties that Pacifica faces.

But I know that KBOO, which is, I believe, the third oldest community station in the country, was built on the work of volunteers and the money of the listeners. It was built on that. That's a resource, an investment, a community resource that was built up over a long period of time by volunteers and a court paid staff, obviously underpaid staff like everywhere, and the $20, $40, $60 contributions of the listeners.

That's an investment built up over time. And
that's an investment that I understand wants to be sold
off by certain elements that are now either on or close to
this Board. And that scares me a lot.

So that's really the only thing I want to say,
is that if people have any concern at all for what's left
of the possibility of creating a community-based democracy
participatory system, then this represents one of the
places where it can happen. And I want to see that
continue.

DR. BERRY: Let the record show that when the
yelling went on about don't leave or whatever, I went to
the lavatory, if you don't mind, thank you. I know at
Pacifica you're not supposed to do that. But, anyway, go
ahead and talk.

THE WITNESS: Less Rathke. I'm from the KPFA
signal area.

I wanted to talk about the soul of a soulless
country and the heart of a heartless country, which is
what I hope that the Pacifica network once again will
become. What I mean by that is when you have a governor
who actually laughs at the execution of a death row
prisoner and you have a president who says there doesn't
need to be any stopping and halting of executions of poor
people across the country, we have a problem. There needs
to be a roar about how important the Mumia demonstrations are. We have to have on all of our networks a growing, not a declining, but a growing audience in protest of all these executions that are going on.

If there's going to be, for example, an investigation of the Los Angeles station, it should be a program which states that the Mumia demonstrations are detracting from the death penalty movement. A program like that is an abomination for a station which calls itself part of Pacifica.

When we have a situation where bombing of innocent people goes on, there should be 24 hour programming on all the networks to increase the audience so that people know they can turn to this station and give the soul to a soulless country.

Dr. Berry, you are active in the struggle for democracy in South Africa. One of the things this Board has to do is to be involved in the struggle for democracy in this country, and it starts at home. In the KPFA signal area we are democratizing, spent a lot of time on it and we're going to democratize our Board. I will hope that if this Board has anything left of decency at all,
that the first thing you will do is carry out the same
struggle you did with South Africa, carry it out on this
Board and democratize this Board and democratize this
process.

Finally, I'm a teacher, and as a teacher for
decades, and as somebody who has also worked with the KPFA
signal area for decades, I just want to read these two
paragraphs from the San Jose Federation of Teachers.

Be it resolved that the San Jose Federation of
Teachers go on record in support of KPFA and the continued
existence of listener supported radio stations free from
corporate sponsorship and influence.

And be it further resolved, that the San Jose
Federation of Teachers supports the campaign for
establishing a governing structure for the Pacifica
Foundation, which will provide for democratic elections
and input by staff, volunteers and listener sponsors.

Thank you.

MS. HEFLEY: Hi. I'm Patty Hefley. I'm a
plaintiff in the lawsuit against the Pacifica Board to
remove the Pacifica Board. I'm a member of the Coalition
for Democratic Pacifica New York and I'm a listener
I've been attending these Board meetings since 1995. And it has become more disappointing and disrespectful as it goes on to the listener shareholder who makes it possible for you to come hang out in a hotel for the weekend.

I applaud Thomas Moran for his dedication to Pacifica's mission and I thank you.

I liken the Board's approach to listener sponsors to that of pro life and also death penalty advocates -- kill the listeners you have to preserve the listeners that you don't have. It's hard to take serious a leadership that would secretly move a multi-million dollar, actually priceless, public asset into the house of somebody's mother. Unfortunately, you are in charge.

This is a corporate takeover and you, Dr. Berry, are well aware of what you are doing. What I want to know is whose payroll are you on?

MR. FABREY: Good morning. I'm not capable of expressing things so concisely in two minutes. I just have two questions. The first of which came out of a recent meeting of the KPFK advisory board. That is, what
is the programming policy at Pacifica, at Pacifica radio?

No one there seemed to know.

This came out in a discussion about the community needs assessment, so I'll ask you now, what is Pacifica's programming policy? Does Pacifica have a written programming policy?

Okay. On the heels of that, I then raise the question, does Pacifica have a policy, a written policy, regarding the acceptance of corporate underwriting of programming? This is not an abstract concept for us. There was actually a program on KPFK that did accept corporate underwriting. So I'm asking again, perhaps rhetorically, is there a written Pacifica policy regarding the acceptance of corporate underwriting for the programming?

DR. BERRY: When you're finished with your statement and all the statements are finished, we'll answer anything that's asked that we feel needs to be answered that we have an answer to at the end of all the speakers.

MR. FABREY: Okay. I just have those two questions.

One more tiny, tiny thing regarding the Saul
Landau letter and the phrase, Pacifica bashing. No one in this room is here to bash Pacifica. We're here to support the Pacifica mission.

MR. WOLF: My name is Lewis Wolf. I came here in 1977. We founded Covert Action Quarterly. And I really feel like you -- I'm not going to turn my back to you, but I feel you have turned your back on us. That's everyone maybe, excluding Mr. Moran.

We build 100 new prison cells every day. And it seems to me that I'm witnessing prison construction under construction inside our Board. You hired IPSA International, which is a known corporate and intelligence gathering front, corporate front, as security. I don't know who they represent -- two gentlemen outside for security. Are we some threat to you? I doubt it.

There's a gag rule. And it's -- I heard you say, Dr. Berry -- a point of order. It's an echo of Joe McCarthy when I hear that here today.

Lou Hankins, I heard -- who's the station manager in Washington -- on Veterans Day shut down two listeners who called in talking about the military industrial complex. And he accused them of disrespecting veterans who he said died for our freedoms. And he
slammed the phone down and cut them off. If that's
democracy in action, I have to question it.

Samori Marksman, a great man, wasn't even in his
grave -- the manager of WBAI in New York -- wasn't even in
his grave three weeks before Mel Wolf, Melvin Wolf was --
no relation -- fired as the pro bono attorney in New York.

I would also ask -- I have two further
questions.

When are you going to reinstate Verna Avery
Brown, Larry Bensky and Dan Coughlin and Nicole Sawaya?

And, secondly, I would like to -- and I'm not
going to sit down until I get an answer. When are we
going to know when you're considering selling any entity
of Pacifica? I want an answer today.

DR. BERRY: We've already answered that. But we
will answer any questions that we have answers to after
every speaker has spoken. Thank you very much.

MR. WOLF: Well, will you answer that question?

DR. BERRY: I said we will answer after all the
speakers have spoken.

Your time is up, sir.

Cliff Smith is the next speaker. And then after
that Lucy Oppenheim is a speaker.

MR. SMITH: My name is Cliff Smith. I'm a long
time listener and financial supporter of WPFW.

What is Pacifica to me? It's certainly not about Arbitron ratings, nor audience share, nor how much the signals and properties are worth. Pacifica with its 50 year history is about democracy. It's about America. Its core purpose has been to speak truth to power and the problems of America in the world and to guide us toward democratic and humane solutions to these problems.

Do you think our founding fathers would have gotten high arbitration ratings with the abolitionists and slavery leaders have gotten high arbitration ratings? How about the sufferage movement, the struggle for labor rights? Even during the 50 years of Pacifica's existence we may not have had high ratings or audience share, but look at what Pacifica and millions of Americans have accomplished during this time.

Did the civil rights movement get high shares, the struggle against the war in Vietnam, the women's movement, the women for dignity by Latinos, lesbians and gays, handicapped students, children, Asians and native Americans? I don't think so.

But Pacifica and millions of patriot democracy loving Americans moved this country toward significant
democratic gains during these past 50 years. In fact, I would argue that it is the greatest increase in true democracy in our history. Pacifica didn't get the ratings, but it helped get the results. Pacifica accomplished what it was set up to do.

But is everything now hunky-dory and okay in this country in the world? I don't think so. Pacifica is needed as much now as it ever was. The corporate military industrial intelligence complex hates democracy today as much as it ever has, and we have to remain ever vigilant.

Pacifica has been attacked for 50 years from the outside. Despite all these attacks, Pacifica still exists. So those who hate Pacifica have decided that the only way to destroy it is from within. And it appears that this is happening within the Board of Directors. We can see this through their actions during the past decade.

This destruction may manifest itself by supposedly innocuous issues, such as personnel matters or whether something is newsworthy or not, it's a myriad of other issues. But the overall goal is to destroy this great outpost of humanity and democracy.

I hope the end of Pacifica doesn't happen. I really want Pacifica to continue. But it happens that there is deep pride in Pacifica, and especially within the
Board of Directors. I think some listeners have good reason to be deeply suspicious of what's going on. The solution is transparency of finances, of open meetings, of everything with regard to Pacifica.

MS. OPPENHEIM: Hi. I'm Lucy Oppenheim. The Civil Rights movement began before I was born. I became an activist as a teen-ager and opposing militarism and opposing nuclear weapons and nuclear power.

One of the attitudes that I learned growing up in a white liberal community was that racism was a terrible evil that had been demolished by the great Civil Rights movement that took place continuing through the period when I was a child. That attitude came to change when I discovered WPFW. In 1990, I started to listen avidly to the public affairs programming that was on the station at that time. Over the next couple of years that great public affairs programming continued and continued to change my attitudes to the point where I began to focus my activism on studying and fighting racism. And that continues to be the effort I focus on today.

This is a success for WPFW and for Pacifica. That's what success means in achieving that mission of fueling and enriching the movement for social change.
Today there's been talk about how to measure our success. There's been talk about the data Arbitron provides. And Dr. Berry is right, data are data, and you decide what to do with them. If what we decide to do with data about listeners is focused entirely on the number of listeners, what we're doing is looking at the ability to sell our air time to the highest bidder. That's what everyone in the radio business does.

But Pacifica's job is not to succeed in the radio business. Radio is Pacifica's tool for enriching and fueling the movement for social change. That's a different purpose.

One board member today said that the listeners' money is their estimation of the value they're getting.

But that's not a successful measure, because a $10 donation from someone living on $13,000 a year simply has a different meaning from a $10 donation from someone living on $130,000 a year. So that's not how to measure the value listeners are getting.

What we need to do is learn to measure the success of WPFW and the other Pacifica stations and of the network as a whole in terms of the real difference they're making in fueling and enriching the movements for social change.
DR. BERRY: Karen Kroman?

MS. KROMAN: I wanted to say that what we are trying to do is very difficult. We speak about Arbitron ratings. If you look at the radio market, it's cut into segments. There are Black radio stations, there are Latino radio stations, there are radio stations for adult oriented contemporary music. It's a split spectrum. That's what the market has done. That's why Lou Hill said, let's try to figure something else out. It's a great medium, how can we do something?

So what we are trying to do is very, very difficult. We talk about Democracy Now like could Democracy Now work? Do you know why it works? Because Amy Goodman works very, very hard.

These stations work because people work very hard. They're flawed. We're not doing it. It's not working. But let me tell you, if we don't create a dialogue, a jury in Albany couldn't see the fact that a man walking into his own door was not allowed to look behind him to make sure that there was nobody coming up behind him. And guess what? There was somebody coming up behind him, and we paid his salary.

We have to create a dialogue. It's very
difficult. You guys, you have to talk to each other. Our Board meetings, we don't leave a committee meeting. I work on the LAB in New York. We don't leave a committee meeting until we set the next committee meeting. It's work. It's tedious. It's really a drag. I know. It is not how I want to spend my Wednesday nights often when I leave work. But it is a privilege to have a place to create that dialogue. And you have to -- you have to work harder. I'm telling you, you've got to work harder on your committees. I've been involved in kind of being a witness to two committees here. And you're not working hard enough. We're critical of your process. We're critical because you've got to work harder.

My questions are, how does one get to sit on a committee, because there seems to be some question about that? And that disturbed me a little bit. It's a volunteer board. I thought you kind of came on the Board and you sat on a committee based on your skills and interests. I'd like that answered.

And I would like to know how you plan to open the committee process to the larger community? There are a lot of people out here who are very interested in the same things that you are. And we could really have a much better time.
MS. GILDEN: I'm Julie Gilden. I'm from Sausalito. I come here representing the Coalition for a Democratic Pacifica. They sent me. That's the enormous group of listeners in Northern California and spreading across the country who step up to the plate whenever they feel threatened and are working very hard to increase the dialogue between staff and listeners in our signal area.

I wanted to say just a couple of things.

Our board members out there -- Tomas Moran is doing really -- we all support him 1,000 percent. He works so hard. Karolyn, my history is at Western Public Radio, and I have a deep respect for you and what you do. You need to come and talk to us. It's good that you have people from KPFK taking digital audio editing courses at Western Public Radio, and I think that's good. You need to come and dialogue with the listeners and the staff people so that your impressions are more firsthand.

I think that's the way all of the Board people need to work. You need to be spending more time with your constituencies. If you don't represent a signal area specifically, you still need to do that in your area. I've served on boards. I've covered boards as a labor representative, as a member of the press. I know how
boards function. I know that you do not have to be broadcasting experts to be on the board. But it is incumbent on you to understand what your mission is and to understand who you're serving.

The more that media becomes globally corporatized and owned by fewer and fewer people, the harder and more important it becomes for Pacifica to do its founding mission job. We will appear to have fewer and fewer audience, which is our -- you know, the audience rating, Arbitron rating, is radio's -- you know, that's like redwood trees. We're not redwood trees. We're freedom writers for free expression. You're driving the bus, we're paying the gas. We've got a trip to take and you have to stay with it, you have to stay with us.

MR. EDWARDS: My name is Billy Ray Edwards, and I am committed to the mission statement of WPFW. And I was a volunteer at WPFW and one of the highest fundraisers from 1977 to 1990.

In 1988, a one-page document came out that said that you had to sign a programmers agreement. The programmers agreement had never been issued before and it was issued by the National Board of Pacifica. Before 1987, if you were a first or third class radio license holder, you were responsible for everything that went
across the airways.

This issue of censorship would not have been an issue today if it was addressed in 1989 when the Pacifica board decided to issue the programmers agreement. And I asked a question. And that question was, who is responsible for any derogatory thing that goes across the airways? Is it the individual that signed on the log who is the license holder or the Pacifica Foundation, who owns this radio station?

Before 1987, all volunteer on air personnel were community reporters. We had reporters like Ron Martin who broke the story on Grenada. And I broke a story on a woman from Wichita that finally got that man down in Texas.

And I think that a compromise needs to take place between the Pacifica Board and all of these people here now who are feeling the effects of what happened to me being removed off the air in 1990. And that compromise is that for Pacifica to admit, the Board to admit, that when that rule changed in 1987, that took the responsibility away from the community reporters to be responsible to the government of this country for what went across the airways and gave the power to the Board
that controls this organization right now.

I do understand why you had to take control of the Pacifica organization -- because they caught you with your pants down with that rule. And one of the solutions that I would say in a healing process and a compromise is

that you need to let the whole world know that when that rule changed, it took thousands of reporters away. Because if you were on the air and you held that license, you had an opportunity to bring forth issues that were beneficial to the community. Since 1990, I have not heard a person on WPFW radio now lead a struggle against anything. Nothing whatsoever.

And my suggestion is, like I said, notify all the other five stations that the most important issue in censorship in America is that in 1987 under Ronald Reagan's administration they removed a responsibility of content that is broadcast across the airways in America from the license holder and gave it to the corporate entities that owns and controls the radio station outlets and created this act of censorship that's taken place in America today. That's what everybody needs to know. This is the main issue that needs to be addressed.

I have here in my hand -- and for the first time I documented something. The first time in my life I
documented my fights at WPFW in December of 1989. And I
would like to pass it out to everybody so you may
understand where I've been for ten years trying to explain

for people this is the issue. The issue is the third
class-first class radio telephone that don't give you the
right in the morning to be responsible for what you have
done on the airways. Thank you.

DR. BERRY: That will be the last speaker.
Let me just say, unless somebody else had their
name on the list, I've read all the names.

MS. BOBB: I had my name on the list and then I
crossed it off.

DR. BERRY: What's your name?

MS. BOBB: Joanne Bobb.

DR. BERRY: Okay. Go ahead. You're the last
one.

MS. BOBB: Dr. Berry, I have something to say.
My name is Joanne Bobb. I am the chair for the local
advisory board, WBAI. I'm here today to plea with this
body to open up the lines of communication between a local
advisory board and the National Board.

One critical reason why the local advisory board
is the liaison between the community and the National
Board is we've severed the ties between us in communication. That means that my community, the
Africans, Latinos, the progressive whites, in our community would not have the opportunity to speak to this Board because I represent them. And if we cut those lines of communication because, oh, we can't talk because our lawyers tell us we have to talk between lawyers, I don't think that that would be the best way for me to represent my community and for them to get a feeling of what's going on.

Right now we're going through a critical time because of the Amadou Diallo case. Our community really needs us to be on point and have some sort of structure. So what I'm saying is can we somehow call the troops and at least communicate and not let lawsuits stop us from saying things that we need that is important to our community?

DR. BERRY: Thank you very much.

The public comment period has come to an end. I will only say that we thank you for your comments, although we are not, as you know, required to take public comment. And some people ask me who I see around why we take public comment when it only consists of bashing us. But, that's right, we open it up to public comment. And
many of the same people keep coming back making the same
comments.

One of the things that has occurred to me
listening to this is that it's going to be a very
difficult job, insofar as the people in this room are
concerned, to engage in the healing process because we
simply talk past each other. People keep on repeating the
same things. And no matter how many times we say we're
not selling the station, we're not selling the license,
we've got a resolution, somebody comes back and says,
you're selling the station. No matter how many times we
say we don't want a top hit station, somebody comes back
and says, the only way you can change is to have a top hit
station.

So no matter what we say it's as if everybody
has their own script and they're going to continue to
repeat it no matter what. And everybody thinks they know
exactly what Lou Hill would do. It's exactly like we do
every Martin Luther King Day when all of us ask, what
would Martin Luther King do if he were here now? And
people are always answering what he would do even though
the man is dead.
Anyway, I think that, to answer a couple of
questions, Pacifica does not take corporate sponsorship of
programs; that is, a policy that was passed long before I
got here. It's one of the policies. It is in the
policies and procedures of Pacifica.

The other is that -- somebody asked about
programming, something about programming -- programming is
done by the local stations and the program directors and
the people at the stations for the programs that are there
consistent with their vision of what would be consistent
with the overall mission of the organization. And
national programming is done by the national people.

We are going to be soon hiring a national
program director, a position which has been -- at least
the staff will be. I don't do this even though people
keep writing to me as if they think I'm running Pacifica
every day.

Someone asked whether there were any teachers on
the Pacifica Board as if there weren't any. There are
several. As a matter of fact, I'm a teacher. That's what
I do for a living. That's how I make money. That's how I
live and have my entire life.
Someone impugned my integrity by implying that I was in favor of the Vietnam War which was a lie.

AUDIENCE: You worked for an organization that was.

DR. BERRY: I was active in the antiwar movement, have a public record in that regard, which is in the public record for anyone who cares to look up the public record and wrote newspaper articles about it, as a matter of fact, from Vietnam. So for those who don't know that, I wish we at Pacifica would stop spouting things about each other.

I also was told by several people who signed the appeal that various other comments have gone out on the air repeatedly, in addition to reselling the station, which is ridiculous, or selling some station, which is totally ridiculous. That I, in particular, made a public statement that I wanted to sell a station to buy some black radio stations in the south. Since I'm black, I want to buy some black radio stations in the south. That is an absolute lie. I never said any such thing.

As for the programming at WPFW, for people to be criticizing specific stations, there have been discussions
of prisons on WPFW's air because I have been on the air
discussing prisons. And other people have too. So that
is a lie.

So I think we'd do well not to criticize our
individual stations, although we may have our own personal
points of view. I wish we would learn -- I will try to
listen more carefully to you and to other people who are
not in this room in order to try to hear, even if I don't
agree with what people are saying, and to try to be
responsive. And I will do more of that in these my last
months in Pacifica. It is something I will devote myself
to.

And I thank you for your comments. I know that
they were heartfelt.

Does the Board have any other business or
anything else to come become the Board?

MR. MILLSPAUGH: I make a motion to adjourn.

DR. BERRY: Second?

MS. CISCO: Second.

DR. BERRY: We are, therefore, adjourned.

(The above meeting was concluded at
approximately 12:00 o'clock, p.m.)
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