



Andrea Garcia <agarcia@norridge80.net>

Illinois Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Request - 5 ILCS 140 / 1

Michael Ayele <waac13@gmail.com>
To: agarcia@norridge80.net
Cc: "Michael Ayele (W)" <waac13@gmail.com>

Thu, Nov 13, 2025 at 6:06 AM

W (AACL) Date.: November 13th 2025
Michael A. Ayele
P.O.Box 20438
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
E-mail: waac13@gmail.com ; waac1313@gmail.com ; waac142913@gmail.com

Request for Records

Hello,

This is Michael A. Ayele sending this message though I now go by W and I prefer to be referred to as such. I am writing this letter for the purpose of filing a FOIA request with Norridge School District 80.^[i] The bases for this records request are [1] the biography of Jean Seberg (November 13th 1938 – August 30th 1979)^[ii] and [2] Chapter 22.2 of Iowa's Open Records Law.^[iii]

I) Requested Records

What I am requesting for prompt disclosure are records in your possession detailing your discussions about [1] the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) as a federal agency of the United States government which has on (or around) July 13th 2022 concluded the processing of FOIA Request Case No.: 820 – 2022 – 005060 by affirming to Michael A. Ayele (a.k.a) W that (i) they do not recognize the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) as an “independent federal agency created in 1965;” (ii) they have absolutely no knowledge of the awards granted by the NEH for “top-rated proposal examined by panels of independent, external reviewers;” (iii) they have absolutely no knowledge of the NEH defining the term “humanities” as the “study and interpretation of language, linguistics, literature, history, jurisprudence, philosophy, archeology, comparative religion, ethics etc;” [iv] [2] the NEH as a federal agency of the United States government which has on (or around) March 24th 2022 concluded the processing of FOIA Request Case No.: 22 – 26 by affirming to Michael A. Ayele (a.k.a) W that they have never contacted (i) the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) before publishing (on their official

website) a brief biography of Jean Seberg stating that “*Jean Seberg had become a member of the NAACP at the age of 14 (fourteen)*” in 1952; (ii) the Department of Justice (DOJ) Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) before publishing (on their official website) a brief biography of Jean Seberg stating that Jean Seberg was “*defamed and wiretapped*” under the direction and coordination of the FBI with the Los Angeles Times and Newsweek; [3] Michael A. Ayele (a.k.a) W as a Black Bachelor of Arts (B.A) Degree graduate of Westminster College (Fulton, Missouri) who has witnessed his written content being paradoxically subjected to frenzy before it was very inappropriately filtered and distorted on search engines such as AOL, Bing/MSN, Google and Yahoo following his decision to publish (i) his correspondence with the EEOC on matters related to the mission statement of the NEH; (ii) his correspondence with the NEH on the biography of Jean Seberg (after the defamation and wiretap she was subjected to); [4] Chapter 22.2 of Iowa’s Open Records Law decreeing as follows: “*Every person shall have the right to examine and copy a public record and to publish or otherwise disseminate a public record or the information contained in a public record. (...) The right to copy a public record shall include the right to make photographs or photographic copies while the public record is in the possession of the custodian of the public record. All rights under this section are in addition to the right to obtain a certified copy of a public record under section 622.46. A government body shall not prevent the examination or copying of a public record by contracting with a nongovernment body to perform any of its duties or functions;*” [5] the Iowa Public Information Board (IPIB) as a state government agency which has on (or around) November 06th 2025 disagreed with Michael A. Ayele (a.k.a) W interpretation that Chapter 22.2 of Iowa Open Records Law (i) enables every person regardless of race, gender, sexual orientation, national origin, religious affiliation and/or disability state to “*publish or otherwise disseminate a public record or the information contained in a public record*” without fear of harassment and fear of retaliation; (ii) codifies in American state level of government the 1st (First) Amendment of the United States Constitution which decrees as follows: “*Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of people peaceably assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.*” [v]

II) Request for a Fee Waiver and Expedited Processing

In my judgment, the facts presented in my request for a fee waiver and expedited processing will not bolster public confidence in the activities, the engagements and the priorities of internet search engines (ISE) such as AOL, Bing/MSN, Google and Yahoo because they have previously filtered, distorted and suppressed Michael A. Ayele (a.k.a) W correspondence with [1] the EEOC on matters related to the mission statement of the NEH (in violation of Chapter 22.2 of Iowa’s Open Records Law); [2] the NEH on the biography of Jean Seberg (in violation of Chapter 22.2 of Iowa’s Open Records Law).

As previously mentioned, Chapter 22.2 of Iowa’s Open Records Law decrees that “*every person shall have the right to examine and copy a public record and to publish or otherwise disseminate a public record or the information contained in a public record.*” For me, this statute makes absolutely clear that the dissemination of a public record is not a

privilege, but an inherent right of the public (and the press) in a free and democratic society. In other words, once a record has been transmitted from a government body to an individual recipient, that individual recipient is fully entitled to share, reproduce, or otherwise circulate that record without interference or retaliation. The spirit of Iowa Code Chapter 22.2 rests on a simple but vital democratic principle that the individual recipient of a public record – not private corporations – determines how, when, and in what form government information is made accessible. When search engines such as AOL, Bing/MSN, Google and Yahoo filter, distort, and suppress correspondence between the government and those primarily engaged in the dissemination of public records, they are in essence violating the letter and the spirit of Iowa Code Chapter 22.2.

The right to examine, copy and disseminate public records is an expression of the core democratic principle that government transparency sustains informed and thoughtful discussions in society by bolstering public confidence in government activities, engagements and priorities. In furtherance of this principle, Chapter 22.2 of Iowa's Open Records Law explicitly prohibits any government body from contracting with a nongovernment entity—whether for-profit or nonprofit—to perform duties that the government itself is legally obligated to carry out. The statute unambiguously declares that ***“a government body shall not prevent the examination or copying of a public record by contracting with a nongovernment body to perform any of its duties or functions.”*** This provision codifies a foundational rule of administrative responsibility: the duty to maintain and disclose public records cannot be delegated to private intermediaries whose interests may diverge from the public's right of access. This provision also codifies that the act of disclosure is a core governmental function that must remain under direct public authority and accountability. In practical terms, this means that local and state government agencies may not outsource the processing of records requests to private law firms, data-management contractors, or third-party vendors in ways that restrict or delay the public's right of access. Allowing private entities—especially for-profit organizations (such as law firms)—to handle records request submitted to the government (and thereby act as gatekeepers of information) undermines both the spirit and the letter of Chapter 22.2 of Iowa's Open Records Law. On a personal level, **I am concerned by the growing number of contractual agreements concluded between local government agencies (such as school districts) and private for-profit law firms tasked with processing records requests. I am also concerned by the growing number of contractual agreements concluded between state government agencies (such as community colleges) and private for-profit law firms tasked with processing records requests. For me, these written contractual agreements constitute an improper delegation of governmental responsibility and violate the statutory and democratic principles enshrined in Chapter 22.2 of Iowa's Open Records Law.**

The public has a compelling and legitimate interest in this information because:

- 1) Jean Seberg became a member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) at the age of fourteen in 1952.

- 2) Jean Seberg's membership with the NAACP at such a young age has been recognized and publicized by the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH): a federal agency of the United States government.
- 3) Jean Seberg's decision to join the NAACP in 1952 - at the height of Jim Crow segregation - reflects a truly extraordinary level of moral courage, open-mindedness and commitment to racial equality. In the twenty-first (21st) century, Jean Seberg's example (as a white global superstar who embraced anti-racist principles) offers a very powerful inspiration for white girls and women to speak up and to take legal action against racism as well as sexism.
- 4) The issues presented in this records request raise very serious questions about the decision of local government agencies (such as school districts) to contract for-profit organizations (such as law firms) in a manner that violates Iowa's Code Chapter 22.2 which decrees as follows: "*A government body shall not prevent the examination or copying of a public record by contracting with a nongovernment body to perform any of its duties or functions.*"
- 5) The issues presented in this records request raise very serious questions about the decision of state government agencies (such as community colleges) to contract for-profit organizations (such as law firms) in a manner that violates Iowa's Code Chapter 22.2 which decrees as follows: "*A government body shall not prevent the examination or copying of a public record by contracting with a nongovernment body to perform any of its duties or functions.*"
- 6) The issues presented in this records request raise very serious questions about the decision of internet search engines (ISE) such as AOL, Bing/MSN, Google and Yahoo to retaliate against people primarily engaged in the dissemination of public records in violation of Iowa's Code Chapter 22.2 which decrees as follows: "*Every person shall have the right to examine and copy a public record and to publish or otherwise disseminate a public record or the information contained in a public record.*"
- 7) The issues presented in this records request raise very serious questions about the letter and spirit of Iowa's Code Chapter 22.2 in the age of artificial intelligence (AI) particularly given AI's tendency to hallucinate in a manner that exacerbates racism and sexism.

For these reasons, expedited processing is warranted because:

- 1) The requested records bear directly on urgent and ongoing matters of public understanding, including civil rights history, federal surveillance, propaganda media in the service of racist and sexist interests, Iowa's Code Chapter 22.2 and the representation of Jean Seberg in public memory.
- 2) Any delay in disclosure will perpetuate existing gaps and distortions in how Jean Seberg's life is officially portrayed and remembered by the American government - at the federal, state and local levels.
- 3) Jean Seberg's life and death (November 13th 1938 – August 30th 1979) are directly tied to the unlawful surveillance and disinformation activities of COINTELPRO, a covert FBI program that targeted civil rights activists and their allies. Jean Seberg's inclusion in COINTELPRO operations – resulting in the deliberate planting of false

stories about her in national media – represents a documented abuse of government power against a global superstar engaged in anti-racist advocacy.

4) The issues raised in this records request puts into question the government's integrity about the way that people are treated in the United States of America (U.S.A) particularly if they espouse anti-racist and pro-feminist beliefs as Jean Seberg did.

5) The issues raised in this records request puts into question the government's integrity about the way that people are treated in the U.S.A on account of their anti-racist and anti-sexist activities (including but not limited to their financial support for anti-racist and anti-sexist organizations as well as their participation in anti-racist and anti-sexist demonstrations).

6) The issues raised in this records request demonstrate that the 21st Century is not the appropriate time to make excuses for incidents of racism and sexism particularly given Jean Seberg's very brave and passionate anti-racist activism in the years leading up to the civil rights movement of the 1960s.

Under penalty of perjury, I hereby declare all the statements I have made to be true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

Be well. Stay well. Take care. Keep yourselves at arms distance.

Michael A. Ayele (a.k.a) W
Anti-Racist Human Rights Activist
Audio-Visual Media Analyst
Anti-Propaganda Journalist

Work Cited

[i] Please be advised that I have previously disseminated a vast number of documents obtained through records request using the means of various digital publishing platforms. As a representative of the media, I would like to take this opportunity to inform you that the records you disclose to me could be made available to the general public at no financial expense to them. This records request is being filed for non-commercial purposes to inform members of the general public / representatives of the media [who may be interested in the written content of Michael A. Ayele (a.k.a) W – Association for the Advancement of Civil Liberties (AACL)] about the activities, the engagements and the priorities of the U.S government at the local, state and federal level.

[ii] About Jean Seberg's Biography (November 13th 1938 – August 30th 1979) and Michael A. Ayele (a.k.a) W's Correspondence with the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH).

Despite publishing a brief summary of Jean Seberg's life on their website, the NEH denied ever holding internal discussions about [1] Jean Seberg's membership with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP); [2] Jean Seberg's charitable donations to the NAACP and the Black Panther Party; [3] the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) wiretap of Jean Seberg; [4] the mental health impact of wiretap on Jean Seberg; [5] the mental health impact of libelous articles (published by the Los Angeles Times and Newsweek) on Jean Seberg; [6] the circumstances surrounding the suspicious death of Jean Seberg when she was only 40 (forty) years old; [7] Kristen Stewart portrayal of Jean Seberg in the 2019 movie entitled "*Seberg*."

As a Black Bachelor of Arts (B.A) Degree graduate of Westminster College (Fulton, Missouri), Michael A. Ayele (a.k.a) W does find it odd that the NEH would publish a summary of Jean Seberg's biography on their website without [1] internally discussing the matter among themselves; [2] contacting non-profit organizations (such as the NAACP) they say she was close to; [3] contacting the Department of Justice (DOJ) Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) who they say were responsible for her wiretap; [4] the Los Angeles Times and other news outlets that have gone on to (i) smear her good name; (ii) adversely impact her mental health; (iii) take issue with her being an anti-racist woman.

It is the judgment of Michael A. Ayele (a.k.a) W that the NEH processing of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request, which was assigned Case No.: 22 – 26 was very bizarre for various reasons. For instance, even though the NEH say that they are an independent federal agency created in 1965, Michael A. Ayele (a.k.a) W was unable to independently corroborate this with the NEH in his correspondence with them. Additionally, even though the NEH say that they are responsible for the processing of application of grants submitted to them by museums, archives, libraries, colleges, universities, public television, radio stations, individual scholars etc, Michael A. Ayele (a.k.a) W was unable to independently corroborate this with the NEH in his correspondence with them.

Michael A. Ayele (a.k.a) W deeply regrets the NEH processing of the FOIA request that had been assigned Case No.: 22 – 26 as much as he regrets the processing of the FOIA appeal that had been assigned Case No.: 22 – A – 01 because the processing of this FOIA request (and the ensuing processing of the appeal) served to further undermine public confidence in the mission of the NEH.

[iii] Iowa's Code Chapter 22.2. Right to examine public records.

1) **Every person shall have the right to examine and copy a public record and to publish or otherwise disseminate a public record or the information contained in a public record.** Unless otherwise provided for by law, the right to examine a public record shall include the right to examine a public record without charge while the public record is in the physical possession of the custodian of the public record. The right to copy a public record shall include the right to make photographs or photographic copies while the public record is in the possession of the custodian of the public record. All rights under this section are in addition to the right to obtain a certified copy of a public record under section 622.46.

2. **A government body shall not prevent the examination or copying of a public record by contracting with a nongovernment body to perform any of its duties or functions.**

Retrievable here.: : <https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/ico/chapter/22.pdf>

[iv] About the Mission Statement of the NEH and Michael A. Ayele (a.k.a) W's Correspondence with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC).

When disclosing [to Michael A. Ayele (a.k.a) W] limited and redacted records related to the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) Management Directive (MD-715) report, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) confirmed (on or around July 13th 2022) never having discussed with the NEH [1] their function in the U.S government as an *"independent federal agency created in 1965;"* [2] the awards they have granted for *"top-rated proposal examined by panels of independent, external reviewers;"* [3] the grants they award *"typically going to cultural institutions, such as museums, archives, libraries, colleges, universities, public television, radio stations, and to individual scholar;"* [4] their decision to define the term *"humanities"* as *"the study and interpretation of language, linguistics, literature, history, jurisprudence, philosophy, archeology, comparative religion, ethics etc;"* [5] Jean Seberg's membership with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP); [6] Jean Seberg's charitable donations to the NAACP and the Black Panther Party; [7] the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) wiretap of Jean Seberg; [8] the mental health impact of wiretap on Jean Seberg; [9] the mental health impact of libelous articles (published by the Los Angeles Times and Newsweek on Jean Seberg); [10] the circumstances surrounding the suspicious death of Jean Seberg when she was only 40 (forty) years old; [11] Kristen Stewart portrayal of Jean Seberg in the 2019 movie entitled *"Seberg."*

[v] November 04th 2025 Email Sent by Michael A. Ayele (a.k.a) W to Iowa's Public Information Board (IPIB)

Hello,

This is Michael A. Ayele sending this message though I now go by W and I prefer to be referred to as such.

I am writing this letter to the Iowa Public Information Board (IPIB) for the purpose of filing a complaint.

The facts that have led me to file this complaint are straightforward and the facts are not in dispute.

While I was an undergraduate student at Westminster College (Fulton, Missouri) in the early 2010s, I came across the biography of Jean Seberg (November 13th 1938 - August 30th 1979): a woman who was born and raised in the State of Iowa. Incidentally, Jean Seberg has previously attended the University of Iowa, and the public facing web page of that university lists her as an alumna of note who has made good-faith efforts to make the world furthermore anti-racist and anti-sexist.

Approximately 9 (nine) years ago, in the Spring of 2016, the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) (a federal agency of the United States government) published a very brief biography of Jean Seberg noting how [1] she had become a member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) at the age of 14 (fourteen) in 1952; [2] she was wiretapped and defamed by the Department of Justice (DOJ) Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) for being an anti-racist and anti-sexist woman; [3] she was subjected to slanderous articles published by news media organizations such as the Los Angeles Times and Newsweek for being an anti-racist and anti-sexist woman.

On February 04th 2022, I filed a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request with the NEH seeking to ascertain what conversations (if any) they have had with [1] the NAACP prior to publishing their biography of Jean Seberg publicizing how she had become a member at the age of 14; [2] their government partners in the FBI prior to publishing their biography of Jean Seberg publicizing how she was defamed and wiretapped by the FBI (in coordination with news media organizations such as the Los Angeles Times and Newsweek).

In response to my FOIA request (which had been assigned FOIA Request Case No.: 22 - 26), the NEH informed me on (or around) March 24th 2022 that prior to publishing their biography of Jean Seberg, they had not given a heads-up to the DOJ (FBI) to inform them that they would officially recognize the defamation and wiretap of Jean Seberg. Additionally, the NEH informed me that prior to publishing their biography of Jean Seberg, they had not given a heads-up to the NAACP to inform them how Jean Seberg (as a white girl and at the height of Jim Crow segregation) became a member of their non-profit organization. Lastly, the NEH informed me that prior to publishing their biography of Jean Seberg, they had not contacted news media organizations such as the Los Angeles Times and Newsweek who had made efforts to slander her good name for being an anti-racist and anti-sexist woman.

As a political scientist (by training and education), I was a little bit perplexed by many aspects of the NEH processing of the FOIA request they had assigned Case No.: 22 - 26. One of the things that startled me about their processing of my FOIA request was how they denied ever having contacted the DOJ (FBI) before publishing their biography of Jean Seberg. To this day, I continue to be very skeptical by the NEH claim that they have not contacted the

FBI prior to publishing their biography of Jean Seberg wherein they recognized that the FBI had a vendetta against Jean Seberg because she was an anti-racist and anti-sexist woman.

A few months after the conclusion of my correspondence with the NEH about the biography of Jean Seberg, I began disseminating my correspondence with the NEH (sometime in July 2022). At the time I began publishing my correspondence with the NEH on digital publication platforms, I had published it as is by including the NEH response to my FOIA request as well as my original FOIA request. Not long after I published my correspondence with the NEH about the biography of Jean Seberg, I began noticing how there was a non-negligible amount of frenzy about the written exchange I had with the NEH. However, I chose to ignore this frenzy hoping it would go away on its own, but it didn't. Indeed, after the frenzy that my correspondence with the NEH had generated came the filtering and distortion of my correspondence with the NEH on various internet search engines including but not limited to AOL, Bing/MSN, Google and Yahoo.

As you are likely aware, Chapter 22.2 of Iowa's Open Records Law decrees that "every person shall have the right to examine and copy a public record and to publish or otherwise disseminate a public record or the information contained in a public record." For me, this statute makes absolutely clear that the dissemination of a public record is not a privilege, but an inherent right of the public (and the press) in a free and democratic society. In other words, once a record has been transmitted from a government body to an individual recipient, that individual recipient is fully entitled to share, reproduce, or otherwise circulate that record without interference or retaliation. The spirit of Iowa Code Chapter 22.2 rests on a simple but vital democratic principle that the individual recipient of a public record – not private corporations – determines how, when, and in what form government information is made accessible. When search engines such as AOL, Bing/MSN, Google and Yahoo filter, distort, and suppress correspondence between the government and those primarily engaged in the dissemination of public records, they are in essence violating the letter and the spirit of Iowa Code Chapter 22.2.

Unfortunately, I regret to inform you that what has happened to me has happened to others. For instance, on (or around) December 27th 2023, the New York Times (NYT) had filed a complaint against Microsoft and OpenAI for filtering and distorting their correspondence with the United States government. According to that complaint, Microsoft and OpenAI generative artificial intelligence ("GENAI") tools rely on large-language models ("LLMs") that were built *"by copying and using millions of NYT copyrighted news articles, in-depth investigations, opinion pieces, reviews, how-to guides and more. (...) Through Microsoft's Bing Chat (recently rebranded as 'Copilot') and OpenAI's ChatGPT, both Microsoft and OpenAI seek to free-ride on the NYT massive investment in its journalism by using it to build substitutive product without permission or payment. (...) At the same time as Microsoft and OpenAI models are copying, reproducing, and paraphrasing NYT content without consent or compensation, they are also causing the NYT commercial and competitive injury by misattributing content to the NYT that it did not, in fact, publish. In AI parlance, this is called a 'hallucination.' In plain English, it's misinformation. ChatGPT defines a 'hallucination' as the 'phenomenon of a machine, such as a chatbot, generating seemingly realistic sensory experiences that do not correspond to any real-world input.' Instead of saying, 'I don't know,' Microsoft and OpenAI GPT models will confidently provide information that is, at best, not quite accurate, and, at worst, demonstrably (but not recognizably) false. And human reviewers find it very difficult to distinguish 'hallucinations' from truthful output. These 'hallucinations' mislead users as to the source of the information they are obtaining, leading them to incorrectly believe that the information provided has been vetted and published by the NYT. Users who ask a search engine what the NYT has written on a subject should be provided with neither an unauthorized copy nor an inaccurate forgery of a NYT article, but a link to the article itself."*

The NYT have also noted in their December 27th 2023 complaint that “it takes enormous resources to publish, on average, more than 250 original articles every day. Many of these articles take months – and sometimes longer – to report. That output is the work of approximately 5,800 full-time equivalent Times employees (as of December 31st 2022), some 2,600 of whom are directly involved in the Time’s journalism operation. Quite often, the most vital news reporting for society is the most resource-intensive. Some of The Time’s most important journalism requires deploying teams of journalists at great cost to report on the ground around the world, providing best-in-class security and support, filing lawsuits against government entities to bring information to light, and supporting journalists through investigations that can take months or years. (...) Making great journalism is harder than ever. Over the past two decades, the traditional business models that supported quality journalism have collapsed, forcing the shuttering of newspapers all over the country. It has become more difficult for the public to sort fact from fiction in today’s information ecosystem, as misinformation floods the internet, television, and other media. If The Times and other news organizations cannot produce and protect their independent journalism, there will be a vacuum that no computer or artificial intelligence can fill. The protection of the Time’s intellectual property is critical to its continued ability to fund world-class journalism in the public interest. If The Times and its peers cannot control the use of their content, their ability to monetize that content will be harmed. With less revenue, news organizations will have fewer journalists able to dedicate time and resources to important, in-depth stories, which creates a risk that those stories will go untold. Less journalism will be produced and the cost to society will be enormous. The Times depends on its exclusive rights of reproduction, adaptation, publication, performance, and display under copyright law to resist these forces. (...) The Times requires third parties to obtain permission before using Times content and trademarks for commercial purposes, and for decades The Times has licensed its content under negotiated licensing agreements. These agreements help ensure that The Times controls how, where, and for how long its content and brand appears and that it receives fair compensation for third-party use. Third-parties, including large tech platforms, pay The Times significant royalties under these agreements in exchange for the right to use Times content for narrowly defined purposes. The agreements prohibit uses beyond those authorized purposes. (...) In 2019, the Times published a Pulitzer-prize winning, five-part series on predatory lending in New York City’s taxi industry. The 18-month investigation included 600 interviews, with more than 100 records requests, large scale data analysis, and the review of thousands of pages of internal bank records and other documents, and ultimately led to criminal probes and the enactment of new laws to prevent future abuse. OpenAI had no role in the creation of this content, yet with minimal prompting, will recite large portions of it verbatim.”

Therefore, the questions I am asking the Iowa Public Information Board (IPIB) to address are the following ones.

- 1) Given the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) onto internet search engines and the tendency of AI to hallucinate in a manner that exacerbates racism and sexism, how does the IPIB interpret Chapter 22.2 of Iowa’s Open Records Law which decrees as follows: “Every person shall have the right to examine and copy a public record and to publish or otherwise disseminate a public record or the information contained in a public record?”
- 2) Does IPIB view Chapter 22.2 of Iowa’s Open Records Law as a statute that prohibits for-profit organizations such as AOL, Bing/MSN, Google and Yahoo from harassing and retaliating against people who have previously published their correspondence with the United States government about the biography of Jean Seberg (November 13th 1938 – August 30th 1979) or on other issues related to systemic racism and sexism?
- 3) Does IPIB view Chapter 22.2 of Iowa’s Open Records Law as a statute that prohibits for-profit organizations such as AOL, Bing/MSN, Google and Yahoo from filtering, distorting

and making unsolicited and incorrect summaries of people's correspondence with the United States government about the biography of Jean Seberg (November 13th 1938 – August 30th 1979) or on other issues related to systemic racism and systemic sexism?

Be well. Stay well. Take care. Keep yourselves at arms distance.

Michael A. Ayele (a.k.a) W
Anti-Racist Human Rights Activist
Audio-Visual Media Analyst
Anti-Propaganda Journalist

-

-

2 attachments



W (AACL) Records Request About the Biography of Jean Seberg.pdf
4671K



Biography of Jean Seberg After Defamation and Wiretap.pdf
3609K