

## COMPLAINT PBRC019

3/8/2020 9:47:55

[email address redacted]

Sherry Gendelman

[email address redacted]

Anonymous: No

"The NES had issued a warning that no one at stations was to conduct a ""debate"" without clearing it with the election inspectors and without having a plan to ensure fairness. [name redacted] (""[name redacted]"" in the e-mail below) ignored that admonition and proceeded with a ""debate"" on her show (Houston Indy Media) on Friday, Mar. 6, 7-8 pm CT on KPFT. [name redacted] spent the entire hour on the proposed new Bylaws. The broadcast was a one-sided, and therefor, biased presentation. [name redacted] has been an outspoken opponent of the new Bylaws, accordingly she is the opposite of the Fair Elections and Court Order requirement for neutral moderators.

The Offending show can be downloaded and/or listen to the show at <https://archive.kpft.org>

The show had one person, [name redacted], speak in favor of the new Bylaws, and another person ([name redacted]) speak against. The primary host of the show, [name redacted], also spoke against the Bylaws several times and only gave one brief quote from our the proponents web site ([rethinkingpacifica.org](http://rethinkingpacifica.org)). [name redacted] was obviously very well prepared, while [name redacted] was not.

This show was an example of why we should not have people representing the Yes side who were not involved in developing the new Bylaws. [name redacted] was not familiar with details of either the current or new Bylaws, or even more importantly, why various parts of the current ones are changed in the new Bylaws - which is critical to know and have discussed in any debate on whether to change the Bylaws.

This is another example of why having a biased moderator and show host can prevent a fair debate by avoiding discussion of the most important reasons for bylaws reform, and giving the NO representative more time, because the proponent, [name redacted], was not informed sufficiently and, therefor, did not know how to respond to many of the questions.

The show also demonstrated why listeners should not be able to call in and give their biased view of Bylaws reform and suggesting something almost unrelated as an alternative to Bylaws reform, then giving the NO representative an opportunity to agree and talk more.

There seemed to be no one timing to see if both sides got equal time, and [name redacted] did get to speak a lot more.

As indicated above, more troubling is that although [name redacted] seemed to be trying to represent the Yes side, he clearly did not understand the reasons for many of the changes in the new Bylaws, was not familiar with the problems of the current Bylaws, and even had to ask what the Pacifica mission was, along with inquiring as to what were the differences between the LSB and CAB.

The show ignored some of the most important reasons the new Bylaws have been proposed, i.e very dysfunctional boards, growing debt, and no plans to pay off the \$3.2 million loan that uses all our buildings and more as collateral. [name redacted] was not aware of those issues and it was clear he had little knowledge of the issues and ended up guessing at why certain things will be done differently with the new Bylaws.

The format [name redacted] used was to give simplified comparisons of what was changed in corresponding sections of the current and new Bylaws, with no questions about why changes were made. But she gave [name redacted] plenty of time to talk about what [name redacted] did not like about the changes, with [name redacted] basically unprepared to respond.

At least twice, [name redacted] also falsely alleged ""hidden agendas"" by those advocating for new Bylaws and no one challenged that assertion.

Finally, at the end of the show, an extremely biased anti-Bylaws reform cart, with carefully chosen background music and a number of false accusations, was played.

Suggested remedies:

1. Allow the proponents to produce their own show, with a neutral moderator, and with PRP members representing the Yes side. or in the alternative broadcast the Davy D show on the by-laws
2. The anti-Bylaws reform cart played at the end of the Indymedia show should be pulled and banned from air play. Station management should be tasked with determining how many times it, or other one-sided carts, have been played.
3. PRP should be able to write and/produce a cart representing the YES side and it should be played at least as many times as NO carts have played.

**Election Inspectors Response: The Inspectors have ordered that the one-hour Davey D-hosted program, which substituted for an episode of "From the Vault", and demonstrated a Yes vote bias, be broadcast at KPFT on a weekday evening in a timely manner. The Pacifica Restructuring Project has been invited to produce thirty-second carts to be aired as a remedy for any No group thirty-second carts which have aired or might air.**