Final Agenda

0. Introduction of New Speakers
   b. Ashley Gorski, Senior Staff Attorney, *National Security Project, ACLU*
   c. Patrick Toomey, Senior Staff Attorney, *National Security Project, ACLU*
   d. Patrick Eddington, Senior Fellow, Homeland Security and Civil Liberties, *Cato Institute*
   e. Josephine Lau, Executive Director, The *Serica Initiative* (*SupChina*’s sister nonprofit)

At the beginning of the meeting, Jeremy Wu announced that APA Justice has nominated Dr. David Ho to the White House as a candidate to fill the NIH Director position that will become vacant when Dr. Francis Collins, current NIH Director, leaves the role. The position requires White House nomination and Senate confirmation.

On December 9, Health and Human Services (HHS) Secretary Xavier Becerra announced that Larry Tabak, current principal deputy director of NIH, would become NIH acting director beginning on December 20.

1. CAPAC updates
   a. Speaker: Nisha Ramachandran, Executive Director, Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus

Nisha began by noting two outstanding requests for CAPAC meetings, one with OSTP Director Eric S. Lander and one with FBI Director Christopher A. Wray. CAPAC will provide an update when these meeting requests are processed.

CAPAC will also put in a request to meet with Assistant Attorney General Matt Olsen at some point in the future. CAPAC has been in touch with the Attorney General’s Office and the Department of Justice on follow up from CAPAC’s member meeting with the Attorney General about a month ago.
Regarding Dr. David Ho, Nisha mentioned that CAPAC Chairwoman Judy Chu supports Dr. Ho's candidacy for the NIH Director position. Other CAPAC members may weigh in with their support.

Nisha then mentioned a letter relating to Dr. Anming Hu’s case. As Dr. Hu is working through the aftermath of his case, CAPAC members including congressman Ted Lieu’s office and Congressman Jamie Raskin’s office supported this letter.

Regarding OSTP, many people on the call had submitted comments relating to guidance for the federal grant applications. Nisha said that CAPAC had not received any updates about the comments submitted. CAPAC continues to check in on the status of the comments.

CAPAC is also tracking provisions related to research in China that appear in outstanding legislation remaining for this year. CAPAC is maintaining its messaging guidance, released earlier this year, about how to talk about China in a way that recognizes legitimate criticism without using inflammatory rhetoric that puts APA communities in harm’s way.

- **Question from Jeremy:** About three months ago the Department of Commerce announced that it had accepted all the recommendations from its internal review and will disband the ITMS (Investigations and Threat Management Service) unit within 90 days and implement other recommendations within 180 days. We are at the 90 day mark. Have you heard any more from the Department of Commerce, first on the disbanding of ITMS and then the implementation of the other recommendations? **Answer:** Nisha had not heard any additional information regarding these items, but suggested that CAPAC can check in with the Department of Commerce.

### 2. Letter to AG Merrick Garland on Review of "China Initiative"

a. **Speaker:** Jeremy Wu, Co-Organizer, APA Justice
   - 2021/11/24 APA Justice: [Letter to AG Garland on Two Requests on the Review of "China Initiative"]
   - APA Justice: [Watch Out for Unexplained Changes in the DOJ Online Report]
   - APA Justice: [End The "China Initiative"]

On November 19, 2021, the Department of Justice made major unannounced and unexplained changes to the online report on the "China Initiative." On November 24, 2021, APA Justice sent a letter to Attorney General Merrick Garland making two requests on the pending review of the "China Initiative," including an official scope and boundaries of the "China Initiative," a list and a count of "China Initiative" cases, and the
inclusion of the letters and comments from almost 2,000 faculty members, scholars, and administrators nationwide as part of the thorough review being conducted by Assistant Attorney General Matt Olsen.

In September, 177 Stanford faculty members wrote to AG Garland calling for the end of the China Initiative. Since then, through additional letters from UC Berkeley, Temple University, Princeton University, University of Michigan, and Southern Illinois University, and the national campaign started by APA Justice, over 2,400 faculty members from 226 institutions across all 50 states (plus District of Columbia and Puerto Rico) have joined the call to end the China Initiative.

3. **Breaking:** 2021/12/02 MIT Technology Review: [The US crackdown on Chinese economic espionage is a mess. We have the data to show it.](https://www.technologyreview.com/2021/12/02/1160631/the-us-crackdown-on-chinese-economic-espionage-is-a-mess-we-have-the-data-to-show-it/)

2021/12/02 MIT Technology Review: [We built a database to understand the China Initiative. Then the government changed its records.](https://www.technologyreview.com/2021/12/02/1160629/we-built-a-database-to-understand-the-china-initiative-then-the-government-changed-its-records/)


Public understanding of the China Initiative has been limited due to the lack of transparency from the DOJ and FBI. As facts and evidence accumulate, two recent reports by Eileen and her colleagues at the MIT Technology Review have filled some of the gaps in information.

Eileen began by stating that MIT Technology Review (MTR) has been working for the past couple of months to put together a database of all of the known cases of the China initiative. MTR believed that the best way to understand, scrutinize, and hold the Department of Justice accountable for the China Initiative was to review what the DOJ was saying about the initiative and examine the priorities outlined at the initiative’s launch on November 1, 2018, and compare that to the cases that they are highlighting as supposed “success cases.”

MTR’s database currently contains 77 known cases that have been charged under the China Initiative. It does not contain all China Initiative cases. It is difficult to know what is considered a China Initiative case and what is not. MTR staff spoke with DOJ spokesperson Wyn Hornbuckle, Andrew Lelling (who was on the steering committee that first set up the initiative), and some DOJ officials that did not speak on the record but provided background information. These individuals indicated that there was no “definition” of the China Initiative; there were priorities and aims associated with the initiative, but no definition of what makes a case a China Initiative case.

The 77 cases in MTR’s database include 162 defendants, 148 of whom are individuals and the rest of which are companies, research institutes, and universities. MTR’s
process began with reviewing press releases and went on to include a review of court records from PACER on those press releases. MTR included many cases in the database that were not on the Department of Justice website but were referenced in court records or by Department of Justice officials. There were also cases that were on the DOJ website that the DOJ later claimed were not China Initiative cases.

MTR published two big stories based on their review of China Initiative data. Their main findings were as follows:

- There is no officially defined “China Initiative case.” As a side note there is also no definition of “nexus to China,” which is not a legal term but is one of the criteria to determine whether or not something is a China Initiative case.
- Trends in the database show that beginning in 2019, the initiative has moved away from economic espionage and hacking cases to focus on research integrity. A significant number of these research integrity cases have been dropped or dismissed–far more than what is normal in federal statutes for criminal cases. Only about a quarter of people in institutions charged under the China Initiative have been convicted. Interestingly, many of the cases associated with the greatest harm–hacking cases for example–are the cases least likely to be prosecuted, often because the defendants are in China or in other countries from which they cannot be extradited. It is worth highlighting and scrutinizing the disconnect between the cases that do the most harm–in terms of economic impact or in terms of hacking–and the cases that are being prosecuted.
- Many of the cases have little or no obvious connection to national security or after trade secrets. This is especially evident in the research integrity cases.
- There has been a lot of conversation about whether or not racial profiling or implicit bias have played a role in in how the DOJ and the FBI are charging cases. MTR found that nearly 90% of the defendants (130 out of 148) charged under the China Initiative are of Chinese heritage. Of those, 40 are American citizens. Of all 148 defendants, 89 are PRC nationals, 40 are American citizens, one holds multiple citizenships, and MTR is still trying to confirm the nationality of six defendants.
- It is worth noting that the China Initiative has not stopped under President Biden. There have been six new cases that have been announced under the Biden administration. Three of these are research integrity cases. There are still many ongoing cases. For example, Charles Lieber is going to trial in a week and a half.
- The Department of Justice does not list all of the cases on their website and they have changed what they consider to be China Initiative cases or not. DOJ changed their website on November 19, two days after MTR sent them a very long list of questions about the China Initiative, including confirmation of about 12 additional cases that MTR had found. One of these cases was Qing Wang, who had been removed from the site but was added back onto the site on November 19.
Eileen invited attendees to read MTR’s article and take a look at the air table database they created. The data is downloadable.

Eileen highlighted the ad hoc nature of the China Initiative, which MTR spoke to in its article titled “We built a database to understand the China Initiative. Then the government changed its records.” Eileen gave two examples of cases that were not clearly labeled. One was the case of a man who had organized a turtle smuggling ring between New York and Hong Kong—this case appeared on the DOJ website. Another was that of Gang Chen, an MIT professor whose case did not appear on the DOJ website.

In a phone interview with MTR, a former senior DOJ official (who did not want his name to appear on the record) looked through the turtle smuggling case and was trying to understand why this case made it on onto the DOJ website. The former official told MTR that there was no definition of “nexus to China,” but that the turtle smuggling case had likely been mistakenly added to the website by a junior staff person at the DOJ looking for “nexuses to China.”

The China Initiative has broad impacts that we are only beginning to understand. In some cases, people are being charged arguably because of errors that they are making on grant disclosure forms. Yet on the other side the DOJ is making its own errors that have broader impacts and they do not appear to be held accountable. Gang Chen’s was a case that was not added to the DOJ website, even though Andrew Lelling called his a China Initiative case and there were multiple press releases about the case. Because the indictment came about a week after the January 6 insurrection, Department of Justice officials were too busy to add it to the site.

These two cases speak to the lack of clear guidance surrounding the China Initiative within the Department of Justice.

Eileen also highlighted the data MTR collected on talent programs. In MTR’s database one can view how many defendants participated in the Thousand Talents program, how many participated in Wuhan programs, and how many participated in other programs. Overall MTR found that defendants in 19 of the 77 cases were alleged to participate in talent programs. Of those, 15 were research integrity cases (mostly involving academics), and four were trade secret cases. When examining court documents, MTR found that in many cases, it was participation in the Thousand Talents program or other talent programs that caused the FBI and the DOJ to be suspicious and begin investigating individuals. And yet, participation in the Thousand Talents program and other talent recruitment programs is not illegal.
Eileen credited Jeremy Wu for pointing out that the China Initiative poses an issue with rule of law. There are major differences between what the DOJ claims to be doing, what the law says, and what they are actually prosecuting individuals for.

“The US crackdown on economic espionage…” is the first of many stories MTR is working on. They plan to build more detailed databases, especially of the research integrity cases. One follow up story that Eileen is working on will focus on the number of labs shut down as a result of China Initiative cases. MTR has identified two labs that collectively have resulted in 11 jobs being lost and 11 people returning or being forced to return to China. In most cases these individuals were never charged or investigated; they simply worked in the laboratory of someone that was ultimately charged or pleaded guilty. Interestingly, in the case of Emory University Professor Li Xiaozhang, his lab was shut down and his graduate students were sent back during the investigation stage, months before there was ever a formal indictment. MTR is also interested in understanding the impacts associated with the many cases and investigations that do not get charged.

Eileen invited anyone with additional information about these sorts of cases to join a conversation with MTR. She believed there would be an ongoing effort to bring transparency to the China Initiative and expressed that MTR would be interested in collaborating with anyone who would like to contribute information.

Her email is Eileen.guo@technologyreview.com

4. Secret Mass Surveillance and What It Means for Asian Americans; Sherry Chen Civil Lawsuit
   a. Speaker: Ashley Gorski, Senior Staff Attorney, National Security Project, ACLU
   b. Speaker: Patrick Toomey, Senior Staff Attorney, National Security Project, ACLU
      - 2021/11/09 Axios: Exclusive: ACLU joins Chinese American scientist's lawsuit against U.S.
      - 2021/10/26 The Hill: 20 years later, it's time to move on from mass surveillance
      - Sherry Chen Legal Defense Fund: The Sherry Chen Story
      - APA Justice: Sherry Chen
      - APA FISA Watch: http://apafisawatch.org/

Ashley began by talking about the article she and Patrick had written and published in The Hill on the 20th anniversary of the Patriot Act in late October.

Background on the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA)
   In 1975, the US Senate formed a special committee in the wake of Watergate to investigate wrongful executive branch surveillance. This committee uncovered warrantless surveillance of civil rights activists, Vietnam War protesters, and
international communications involving Americans that spanned decades. To address this issue, Congress enacted the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA). Under FISA, when the executive branch was conducting surveillance inside the US, it had to go to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, a secret court established by FISA, to get specific approval to conduct the surveillance. The executive branch had to show that the target of the surveillance was a foreign power or agent of a foreign power. This system was in place for over 20 years.

In the weeks after 9/11, Congress rushed to pass the Patriot Act with little debate. It quickly became a global symbol of excessive executive power. The law gave the government authority to spy on Americans’ communications, track their associations, and monitor their financial transactions.

Congress and the courts had opportunities to impose meaningful restraints on excessive government surveillance (which disproportionately harms communities of color including Asian American communities), but they frequently gave in to executive branch demands for greater spying powers.

After 9/11, the Bush administration conducted warrantless surveillance with no judicial approval, in violation of FISA and the Constitution. There was public reporting on this surveillance and some executive branch officials pushed back on the surveillance. As part of an effort to place the Bush administration’s surveillance efforts on firmer legal ground, Congress enacted Section 702 of FISA in 2008.

Section 702 of FISA, which is still in place today, radically changed the previous system that had been in place under FISA by authorizing the warrantless surveillance of Americans’ international communications — phone calls, emails, chats and web browsing. The executive branch no longer needs to go to the secret Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court for approval to conduct surveillance of individual targets. While the court now conducts an annual review of executive branch surveillance, it no longer reviews the particular targets of such surveillance. Additionally, targets do not need to be connected to criminal activity or terrorism and can include journalists, lawyers, human rights workers, and any non-US citizen abroad who is likely to communicate about US foreign affairs.

Today there are over 200,000 government targets under Section 702. Targets can be individuals or groups, so the exact number of individuals affected is not known. Warrantless executive branch surveillance captures the communications of any American who communicates with a government target. As US foreign intelligence priorities turn toward China, surveillance conducted under Section 702 is growing and likely includes more individuals who are communicating with people in China.
After describing the framework of FISA and Congress’ expansion of government surveillance by passing Section 702, Ashley turned the floor to Patrick, who spoke about Executive Order 12333, another surveillance authority that has been in place alongside FISA since the 1980s. Whereas FISA addresses surveillance conducted inside the US with overseas targets, EO 12333 primarily addresses surveillance conducted outside of the US, including surveillance conducted by the NSA, CIA, FBI, and other agencies. Surveillance under EO 12333 is less regulated than surveillance under FISA and does not need to undergo court review.

In 2013, Edward Snowden’s revelations about the breadth of U.S. government surveillance under EO 12333 and Section 702 shocked the world. The public learned about the National Security Agency’s “PRISM” and “Upstream” programs, which involve the NSA working closely with Google, Facebook, AT&T and Verizon to conduct warrantless surveillance of Americans’ international communications. They have profound implications for Asian Americans and yet many are not aware because of the government’s lack of transparency and excessive secrecy. In 2017, APA Justice created a website for organizations and individuals concerned about the misuse and abuse of FISA and its amendments on innocent people, particularly Asian Americans who have been victimized under the guise of national security.

Patrick went on to describe a specific set of revelations about EO 12333 surveillance that came through the Snowden revelations. There were disclosures about bulk surveillance and wide ranging surveillance directed at some of the leading technical and scientific research universities in China. Those universities also housed some of the major internet backbones within China, and therefore were appealing targets for surveillance of communications within China or of people overseas who were communicating with others in China. The South China Morning Post reported on these instances of surveillance, as did a number of other news outlets.

While the focus of EO 12333 and Section 702 surveillance is typically overseas, it is easy for people in the US who are communicating with friends, family, research colleagues and business associates overseas to be swept up in the course of EO 12333 and Section 702 surveillance. If someone in the US is communicating with someone in China, the person in the US may be protected by the Constitution and US laws. However, analysts at the NSA, CIA, or FBI are able to enter the vast databases of communications collected by the government and extract communications even from someone in the US. Overseas targets may be the starting point for surveillance, but analysts can search for the name of someone in the US within the databases and access communications that would otherwise be off limits behind a warrant under the Fourth Amendment. These types of database queries are often called backdoor searches, and enable the government to sidestep bedrock protections of privacy in the US.
Patrick emphasized that the people who are often most impacted by this surveillance are vulnerable communities. Black and Brown communities and people of Asian descent are disproportionately scrutinized by government surveillance. This surveillance, while sometimes thought of as “invisible,” can have devastating real world effects for people who then become subject to even more intrusive investigations. This can entail being stopped at airports entering and leaving the country or having FBI agents show up at their door to question them.

In the case of Professor Xi and his family, whom the ACLU helps represent, there is a set of claims about how these types of surveillance fed into the government's flawed investigation of Xi, contributing to the intrusion on their privacy and their lives.

Patrick then handed the floor back to Ashley to discuss Sherry Chen's case. Ms. Chen is a Chinese American hydrologist who had a very successful career with the National Weather Service, and who was wrongly prosecuted for using a shared office password to access a government website, and was painted as a spy for China. Although the Justice Department ultimately dropped those charges, her life was completely upended, and she is continuing to pursue justice and accountability for the fact that she was wrongly prosecuted and subject to wrongful surveillance. Prior to the prosecution Ms. Chen was the subject of an investigation by the Commerce Department's Investigations and Threat Management Service (the National Weather Service is housed within the Commerce Department). Ms. Chen’s case is a high profile example of how ITMS' rogue activity fed into criminal prosecutions.

In July 2021 the Senate Commerce Committee released its report addressing ITMS' abuses over several years. That report specifically highlighted Ms. Chen's case as an example of an overzealous investigation and described other baseless and discriminatory investigations of government employees of Asian and Middle Eastern descent. On November 9, 2021, the ACLU joined the legal team representing Ms. Chen in her federal lawsuit in the Southern District of Ohio seeking accountability for what happened to her. We are joined by the Cooley Law Firm and we are also working with the two solo practitioners who have been representing Ms. Chen, Michelle Young and Peter Toren.

Last month Ms. Chen’s legal team filed an administrative complaint with the Commerce Department and the Department of Justice stemming from the new revelations in the Senate Commerce Committee’s report and the Commerce Department's own internal report about the abuses of ITMS. The government has six months to address the issues raised in the complaint. If it does not address these issues to Ms. Chen’s satisfaction, the team will incorporate these claims into the pending federal lawsuit in the Southern District of Ohio.

5. Cato Institute Policy Forum on The “China Initiative”
Patrick began by introducing the following event: On December 16 from 1-3pm, the Cato Institute will host a policy forum on the “China Initiative” featuring Derek Scissors of AEI; Jamil Jaffer of the Antonin Scalia Law School at George Mason University; Gisela Kusakawa of AAJC; Jeremy Wu of APA Justice; and moderated by Cato Senior Fellow Patrick Eddington. The forum will examine the U.S. government’s approach to alleged or actual PRC espionage and IP theft activities and their impact on the rights of U.S. researchers.

Patrick went on to comment on the remarks of ACLU attorneys Ashley Gorski and Patrick Toomey on the issue of surveillance. He referenced a piece he had authored in July about the FBI’s use of “assessments,” a tool brought online in the closing days of the Bush 43 administration by then Attorney General Michael Mukasey. Up to that point in time, most FBI investigations fell into one of two categories: a preliminary investigation to determine whether or not a prosecutable offense existed, or a full field investigation targeting particular individuals for alleged or actual criminal activity. The new category of “assessments” does not require a criminal predicate to open an investigation.

Patrick’s article discusses the case of Concerned Women for America (CWA), a conservative, pro-life group. In response to a Cato Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request, the FBI provided a redacted but still very illuminating—and alarming—FBI Washington Field Office (WFO) “Charity Assessment” on CWA conducted in July 2016. The Assessment was opened “to determine the possibility of fraudulent activity,” in the absence of any criminal predicate. In that assessment, the FBI agent ran against the number of the databases Patrick Toomey referenced earlier.

Opening similar assessments is one way the FBI may be conducting de facto investigations of Chinese Americans, particularly Chinese American researchers, Chinese American companies or companies with a Chinese American connection. Most people may never hear about assessments unless the Freedom of Information Act is used to uncover them.

6. SupChina and Serica Initiative

a. Speaker: Josephine Lau, Executive Director, The Serica Initiative (SupChina’s sister non-profit)
   - The China Initiative: The Ethnic Targeting of Chinese Scientists and the Subsequent Brain Drain (video 7:30)
   - Scientists in the crosshairs: How to avoid getting snared in the U.S. crackdown on ‘China Ties’. (video 21:04)
The Serica Initiative is partnering with PBS to create an AAPI film series for the PBS/ WNET "Exploring Hate" program. Serica has also produced two top-quality short films to provide a jumpstart of the "China Initiative" and how to avoid getting snared in the U.S. crackdown. Josephine Lau spoke on the Serica Initiative and SupChina.

Serica convenes a community of global changemakers in order to make a positive social impact between the US and China. They do this through storytelling, dialogue, and effective philanthropy between the two countries.

Serica is a sister nonprofit of SupChina. SupChina is based in New York City and is an independent multimedia platform. SupChina provides around-the-clock English language news on China, including nine podcasts and seven newsletters.

Josephine provided an overview of Serica’s AAPI work. Four broad areas of focus make Serica’s AAPI initiatives unique:

1. **Focus on Sinophobia**
   The anchor for Serica’s AAPI initiatives is looking at the relationship between Sinophobia, the increasing anti-China sentiment in the United States, and how that is translating into anti-AAPI hate domestically.

   Serica’s AAPI work began with a Sinophobia tracker started in 2018. The ongoing tracker has recorded from the earliest cases of the China Initiative to the latest updates on Professor Hu Anming’s case. Serica welcomes potential collaboration on the Sinophobia tracker.

   Serica has also produced two short films on the DOJ China Initiative as one of the first grantees of The Asian American Foundation, in its earlier incarnation. The first film is a 20-minute video intended for ethnically Chinese scientists. The video includes interviews, and addresses potential legal and other means of recourse for scientists facing discrimination. Serica interviewed Professor Xi Xiaoxing of Temple University, Dr. David Ho of Columbia University, and other individuals in the fields of academia, policy, and law including Catherine Pan, head of the US China practice at the law firm Dorsey & Whitney.

   The second film Serica produced is a seven-minute short film with the goal of giving the general public an overview of the China Initiative, and what it means for the Chinese scientist community in the US. The film also celebrates the many achievements of ethnically Chinese scientists and the many contributions they have made to major US academic and research institutions.
Serica’s two films have reached over 600 government agencies, industry associations, and major universities. Serica has shared the films with the help of 100+ partner organizations on YouTube and other social media platforms.

2. **Focus on the new Chinese diaspora**
   Josephine began discussing Serica’s focus on the new Chinese diaspora by mentioning Frank Wu, president of Queens College and a board member of Serica.

   Frank wrote [an article](#) which is featured on APA Justice’s website and talks about three different waves of Chinese immigration. Serica and SupChina focus on the newest cohort of the Chinese diaspora in terms of their audience and content. Many in this cohort are professionals and students from mainland China. They tend to be more educated and privileged than earlier waves of immigrants, and they have a very different relationship to China and to their own cultural identity. They have their own set of overlapping, but also different concerns from other AAPI communities.

   Josephine went on to describe some of Serica’s work focusing on the new Chinese diaspora. Serica held two panels with Peng Zhao, board member of The Asian American Foundation and CEO of Citadel Securities. On one panel, Josephine sat down with Peng to talk about the growing role of Chinese philanthropists in the US and the role of the Chinese diaspora in the AAPI community.

3. **Focus on the next generation**
   A significant portion of Serica’s and SupChina’s audience are millennials and Gen Z. The two organizations have found that different AAPI generations define and take action on issues of social justice and fairness in different ways. Josephine described two examples of Serica’s work with the Next Gen AAPI community.

   Serica held a film screening and panel discussion on the film *Finding Yingying*, which Peng Zhao executive produced and helped to fund. Zhang Yingying was a Chinese student who moved to Illinois for a PhD program and disappeared within weeks of arriving on campus at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. She was never found alive again. Jenny Shi is a young Chinese documentary filmmaker who made a documentary about Zhang Yingying’s story. The documentary was eventually nominated for an Emmy.

   *Finding Yingying* focused on Yingying’s story specifically, but more broadly also looked at the story of the increasing numbers of Chinese students now studying in America and the discrimination that they face. The film brings to light
generational differences in the AAPI community. For instance, Peng Zhao of The Asian American Foundation came to the US to study half a generation ago. His generation kept their heads down and is now becoming more active in social justice. Jenny Shi, the documentary filmmaker behind *Finding Yingying*, is of a generation with the resources and the means to directly pursue the arts and social justice from the very beginning of their careers.

Josephine highlighted that allyship and solidarity with other communities of color are important to the next generation of Asian Americans. With this in mind, Serica hosted a film screening about Afro-Chinese relations. Serica continues to pursue this subject area with partners across the country.

4. **Focus on storytelling**
Both Serica and SupChina heavily utilize the tools of visuals, film, and social media to tell the stories of the Asian American community and the issues they face. In partnership with PBS/WNET, Serica is producing a digital film series on AAPI issues and communities. This is part of the PBS program called *Exploring Hate*. The film series will be released at the end of May 2022.

Serica’s film series will be released in conjunction with a documentary by filmmaker Gina Kim. Gina’s documentaries have been screened at the MoMA and the Smithsonian. Her latest documentary will focus on the one-year anniversary of the Atlanta shootings earlier this year and what has changed in the year since the shootings. How has the community in Atlanta been impacted? What kind of advocacy has taken place? What policy changes have occurred since the Atlanta shootings?

Serica’s film series will visit regions across the US and profile personal stories within the Asian American community. Serica is currently finalizing its partner organizations and interview subjects for the PBS film series. If an organization is interested in participating in the film series, they may reach out to Josephine at josephine@supchina.com.

Serica has an ongoing partnership with PBS’ education and community engagement teams. They will continue to collaborate on events and educational initiatives. PBS’ educational programming is mainly focused on K-12, and reaches more than 700 million people online each year.

7. **Anti-Racial Profiling Project and Related Activities - Asian Americans Advancing Justice | AAJC**
   a. Speaker: Gisela Kusakawa, Staff Attorney, Advancing Justice | AAJC
      - Advancing Justice | AAJC: [Anti-Racial Profiling Project](#)
- Legal Referral Service: Contact 202-935-6014 using the Signal app for attorney referrals. AAJC staff can assist you in Mandarin Chinese and English.

Gisela provided an update on Advancing Justice | AAJC recent activities, including Professor Xi’s case. AAJC is currently focusing on upcoming meetings with federal agencies as well as closing the loop for their commitments with impacted persons who have needed assistance.

Gisela highlighted an opportunity to help AAJC by signing onto an amicus brief for Professor Xiaoxing Xi. AAJC will send out an unofficial sign on form next week. The draft will not be in circulation yet, but because of the upcoming holidays AAJC would like to circulate a sign on for anyone interested in being notified when the draft for the amicus brief is finished. Those interested in supporting the amicus brief are encouraged to fill out the form and to circulate it widely with their networks. AAJC will circulate a final brief between January 8 and January 11, 2022, during which time organizations will be able to officially sign in support of the amicus brief.

8. Q&A and Discussions

9. Next Meeting

Happy New Year!
- Next Meeting: Monday, January 3, 2022