This is Danielle Citron. I'm a law professor at the University of Virginia School of Law and the Vice President of the
Cyber Civil Rights Initiative. And on the anniversary of the Cyber Civil Rights Initiative's 10 year anniversary, I'm
sitting down in a conversation with Dr. Mary Anne Franks, the President of the Cyber Civil Rights Initiative, and
Dr. Hany Farid, a board member of the Cyber Civil Rights Initiative.

We're going to talk about CCRI, where it began, how it began, the history of the work that we've been doing, and
doing together. And before I dive in, I just wanted to make sure that we all understood a little bit more about Dr.
Franks and Dr. Farid. So Maryanne Frank's is a law professor at the University of Miami, and in, I think, two
months will be a law professor-- is joining the faculty of GW Law School, with a distinguished, very fancy title--
role, that I'm not going to get--

MARY ANNE FRANKS: Incredibly long.

DANIELLE CITRON: Right. And was from the beginning. CCRI's Tech Policy and Legal Legislative Director and founding-- one of the
founding members of the Cyber Civil Rights Initiative, and has a doctorate in philosophy. And so draws on that
work in doing your own legal scholarship. And next, so Dr. Hany Farid, is, as I always say-- and you cringe, I think,
but it's, I think, fair to say is the--

HANY FARID: I'm cringing on the inside.

DANIELLE CITRON: I know, forgive me-- is the father of photo DNA, which seismically changed the phenomenon of child sexual
exploitation material and its visibility, and preventing the re-upping or re-visibility of child sexual abuse material.
You're also a professor of computer science at Berkeley, University of California at Berkeley. And you have a very
fancy title too. And joined our board of CCRI-- began working with us in 2018, and joined our board in 2019.

So it's such a gift. You also are authors-- Fake Images, and The Cult of the Constitution, and soon, Fearless
Speech. So thank you so much for joining us to sit down and talk about CCRI's history. It's the 10 year
anniversary.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: It is.

DANIELLE CITRON: It's a lot to take in, if you think about it.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: Yes.

DANIELLE CITRON: Where we started and where we have come, but also, of course, all the work we still have to do.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: Yeah.
DANIELLE CITRON: So I guess the first question is to describe the beginnings of the organization. Where it began, what the initial goals were, and then maybe take us through a little bit, Dr. Franks, like where we went in those early days, in that early work.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: Yeah, it's interesting to reflect, 10 years on, that we've actually seen a decade of this work in this space. And to think back how all this started was really with an email. It starts with an email from a woman named Dr. Holly Jacobs, who is the founder of Cyber Civil Rights Initiative. But when she contacted me, back in 2012, she was experiencing what, at the time, was being referred to as revenge porn.

And what had happened was that there were intimate images of her that she never expected anybody other than her partner to see, had been splashed around on websites. They were being sent to all kinds of places and to people, her employer, her friends, her intimate partner. And she was looking for help. And she, in 2012, was going to lawyers. And she was going to the police. And she was going to anyone she could think of to say, this can't be right what's happening to me.

And pretty much the response she got from everyone in 2012 was, this isn't a crime. What were you doing giving those pictures out. You should have never taken those pictures. And so she has this struggle, these months and months of struggle where she's trying to plead with these websites that have her images, pleading with them to take them down, saying these aren't authorized. And just stonewalled at every turn.

And so, as I like to say sometimes, Holly is so desperate that she starts to read law review articles. And she comes across a law review article that I had written about online abuse. Now revenge porn was just a small part of it that I had mentioned in this piece, but it was about the way that the internet can be used to harass women in particular, and how this can impact their education and their employment. And she discovers that we're in the same city.

So we're in Miami. And she thinks, well, I should just go and see-- see this person. So we have this conversation. And the conversation in short was, if this is right-- she wanted to ask, first of all, is it true that this happening to me, these intimate photos that I never meant for anyone to ever see beyond this relationship, are now out there in the public. Is it true that the law says there's no problem with that? And I said, unfortunately, in most places that is true.

And she says, well, if that is true, then the law should be changed, and I want you to help me change it. And that's how it all started. And there was this moment where we delved into her vision for what she wanted this non-profit to be. And it was really I don't want anyone else to experience what I'm experiencing. I want them to have support. I want them to have resources. And I want them to live in a world where the law has changed, and technology companies have changed, and platforms take this seriously.

And after, I think, the first conversation I had with her, I immediately put her in touch with you. Because I thought the person you need to speak to, in addition, is Danielle Citron. And we'll start thinking about how we can come up with some ideas here. Because I had never done this kind of work. And when I say that, I mean, I'm an academic. And so I write articles that no one reads.

HANY FARID: [LAUGHS]

DANIELLE CITRON: Except for really crucially--
MARY ANNE FRANKS: Except one time.

DANIELLE CITRON: --Holly Jacobs. I mean, they do read all of your work, but this made such an impact.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: But that's an--

DANIELLE CITRON: You think about it, though.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: --unusual thing to be asked, to say--

DANIELLE CITRON: Of course.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: --OK, so I read an article, and now I want--

DANIELLE CITRON: Change the law.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: --to operationalize it. I want there to be an actual statute. I want there to be lobbying. And I thought, I've never done any of those things. But what I had done was, I had several years of teaching as a law professor under my belt. And so I thought, well, why not try to come up with a model statute? People come up with model legislation all the time. And I could take a shot. And so having conversations with you about this, because Hany comes into a little bit later. But in those early years, we were promoting model legislation that says--

DANIELLE CITRON: You want to tell us a little bit about how when you wrote the model state law, you were blogging, which seems like ancient history now.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: It does, and blogging seems like ancient history.

DANIELLE CITRON: But you were blogging and comparing opinions.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: Yes, which no longer exists.

DANIELLE CITRON: Which no longer exists, but was such a great blog that we both participated in. And you put the idea out there.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: I did.
That's here's this model statute, and we can craft this.

Yeah.

And we can craft it in a way that's narrow, that's clear, that's precise, that's consistent with the First Amendment.

And what happens next? Oh, golly.

I was so popular.

You were. You were radically popular.

So this is a blog that you were a part of, and that you had-- I think were one of the people who had invited me to guest there. And I thought this is a perfect opportunity to speak to a small legal community.

And this is 2013. So we--

Yeah, 2013, it's a long time ago. But it, at the time, was a very well-respected blog. A lot of legal thinkers were either writing for it, reading for it. And so I thought, well, I'm going to put that out there and see what people think. And what they thought was, you hate free speech. You hate the internet. You are proposing something that is going to destroy free speech as we know it. And it's all because you want to protect women who've made bad choices.

I mean, it was really like every trope you can think of right now. That it's basically the victim's fault, that the law can't do anything. That even if we thought this was sympathetic, the First Amendment would keep us from being able to do anything here. Criminal laws are bad, all of these kinds of objections. And at the time, I think it never feels great to have people just pile on about an idea you have, but looking back on it, I'm really glad that this is the way that it happened. Because it meant that we were very battle tested early on.

Totally.

So I took those criticisms, refined some of the things that I put in the model statute. Stuck to my guns, though, about the idea that, look, I teach First Amendment law, and I teach criminal law. I know that it's not true to say that the First Amendment necessarily protects this, and that we have privacy laws that exist, and we can build on those things. And so, yes, it was deeply unpopular at the time. It continues to be deeply unpopular with some people, but--

And we wrote an article in 2014--

We did.
Danielle Citron: or that came out in 2014.

Mary Anne Franks: That's right, that's right.

Danielle Citron: So we were writing and thinking. I joined you in this. And we wrote a piece called "Criminalizing Revenge Porn."

Mary Anne Franks: Yes.

Danielle Citron: And we chose that not because we were enamored with the idea of revenge porn, but--

Mary Anne Franks: So we had this discussion about this--

Danielle Citron: Yes, of course.

Mary Anne Franks: --what call this article. Because it was going to be the first law review article that took this issue on. And both you and I were uncomfortable with the term because it's a perpetrator's term. It's the kind of thing that you say when you're trying to insult the victims. But the term. So I thought, as much as we're uncomfortable with it, it probably should be in the title. Because we need people to understand what this is. And then we will make clear in the article itself why that's a bad term for at least two reasons.

There are multiple reasons, but one, the biggest one from our perspective, being that revenge is as such the wrong way to think about this. Because revenge, first of all implies that the person who's on the receiving end of this has done something that should be-- that you should take revenge for. But also, wrongly assumes that people are personally motivated necessarily against the person that they're victimizing. Because sometimes it's strangers and people who have no personal animus towards the person at all. But also, it was just not a respectful term in many ways about-- to try to capture what was happening here. And the porn term was tricky.

Danielle Citron: Yeah.

Mary Anne Franks: Because we are talking about sexually explicit material. But as Hany well knows, the nomenclature over these things is so important. Because you don't want to trivialize and you don't want to misinterpret, and you don't want to mis-frame. In the child sexual abuse material context, it took so long to get to that-- to get to that terminology.

Danielle Citron: Would you speak to that?
HANY FARID: You know what's so amazing about this story is my entry into this space is almost exactly the same. So back in 2005, somebody at Microsoft read an article that I wrote about detecting manipulated images. And on a whim, called me to ask if I could help in their battle against what we then called child pornography and we now call child sexual abuse material, I didn't anything about this space. I started learning about it. And I thought, wow, we should do something about that. So somebody reading my paper, one of five people who read it, the same thing.

We set off to doing it. And the same thing, we developed photo DNA, as you mentioned in the beginning. We got the same pushback. You are going to destroy the internet. You hate the internet. You hate free speech, the same thing. And then was the fight about the terminology. We never like the term child pornography. By the way, god forbid that people used to use the word kiddie porn, which was particularly offensive. And we didn't like it because the then head of National Center for Missing and Exploited Children used to say, this isn't pornography. This is a crime scene photo. And I think words matter. I think-- what you said, it's a framing of how you think about this. These photos are evidence of a crime against a child.

And so when we developed photo DNA, we got exactly the same blowback-- you are going to destroy the internet, which, by the way, we didn't. I mean, the internet is terrible, but it's not because of us. And it was this-- and so then when I started learning about your work-- and I knew about guys way before you reached out to me-- it was, again, the same thing. I didn't really about this space. I didn't about-- and I felt awful about not knowing about it.

And so when you reached out, I was so happy to bring some of the expertise that we had learned in the previous five years from the child sexual abuse space. And the parallels are fascinating. Because it's all, more or less, the same problems and actually the same solutions. You need better regulation. Fortunately, in the child sexual abuse space, that content is actually illegal. So we were working on a good foundation. But even then, we were struggling, which tells you how hard these problems are. We couldn't get the tech industry--

DANIELLE CITRON: [INAUDIBLE]

HANY FARID: Yeah, we couldn't get the tech industry to wrap their heads around eight-year-olds being sexually abused. How are they going to wrap their heads around adult women being abused?

MARY ANNE FRANKS: And believe me, that's what they said.

DANIELLE CITRON: Yes.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: Because by the time we entered the space, and we're now trying to talk to companies, because one of the great things that comes out of the collaboration early on, between Holly, and Danielle, and myself is part of the conversation has to be the platforms. Because that's where a lot of this material is.

And the index-- Google is a huge player here. Because some of this material wouldn't-- not that it would ever be harmless, but once you can put it next to someone's name, and it becomes attached to them in a certain way for their search engines results, as you were saying-- I think in hate crimes and cyberspace, that it's like a digital CV. It's something that everyone is going to about you.

We talked to these companies, and they say, look, we're too busy cracking down on CSAM.
DANIELLE CITRON: Yes.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: That's a serious issue. We're talking about minors.

DANIELLE CITRON: That's how they trivialized our--

HANY FARID: And that was a lie.

DANIELLE CITRON: --us.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: Which is amazing.

HANY FARID: It was a lie that they cracking down. They weren't cracking down on CSAM.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: Right, but that was their excuse--

HANY FARID: That's right.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: --to tell us why they weren't going to do anything about this issue, was to say because we're too busy doing something real.

HANY FARID: Yeah.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: And constantly part of the pushback we got from lawyers, and a lot of public defenders, and people like that, and defense lawyers, generally were saying, this isn't like a real crime, the way that child porn is a crime. This is just women making bad choices. And so we constantly had to deal with the specter of how, as you say, it's very similar in some ways. It's obviously meaningfully different in the sense that--

DANIELLE CITRON: Of course.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: --a lot of the-- what's being portrayed in the actual material is not a crime in the context of what we were calling at the time non-consensual pornography. But it was interesting that we had to thread this needle around that issue that was casting this really long shadow. But yeah, so that was one of the key aspects of trying to figure out how is this meaningfully different from, but also in some ways extremely mirrors in some ways these--

HANY FARID: And I have to say it was infuriating when the tech companies hid behind this argument to be ineffective in dealing with these real harms. We were furious of that, yeah.

DANIELLE CITRON: So joining forces. I have to say is so meaningful.

HANY FARID: Yeah.
Because we're all seeking together to, of course, protect privacy, protect against abuse of sexual exploitation, and to do it together is really meaningful.

Yeah. And to see how-- and to have the experience or the expertise that each of us brings into it, to refine the project over these 10 years. And to see what works and what doesn't work and the kinds of arguments that you can make that will get traction and which ones won't.

We almost can learn-- there's so much we could have learned that we tried the hard way. We were--

Well, we were pioneers in some ways, right?

Yes

Although, we probably could have learned a lot more if we had had you earlier on.

Can I say something? There's a lesson here too. And I've always been fascinated by this. But you are a group of what, half a dozen people, who completely changed the way we thought about this space. In the child sexual abuse space, it was about a half a dozen of us. And I am reminded that don't underestimate the power of a small group of people who are incredibly dedicated to change the world. Because you don't need a giant movement sometimes. Sometimes, it's just a small number of people who are willing to lay down on the tracks year, after year, after year. And that's how change happens.

And I'm glad that you've mentioned that because it is, I think, such a credit to Holly's vision to begin with.

That's right.

Because I cannot imagine-- I cannot imagine being on the receiving end of this abuse. You're living in it in this moment. And at the same time that you are trying to figure out how to rebuild your life and to survive, you were willing to step in front of a camera and say. and this is who I am.

And that was a process. Recall, her self negotiation, which she shared with us.

Yes.

Of--

Should I go public?
Right, that terrible-- knowing the cost.

Yes.

Knowing if she comes forward in her new name that she's putting herself out there. And then wrestling--

To remember that she had changed her name legally because of this abuse. And then she was going to come public. And that name was going to get attached to this.

Yes, and that bravery is--

And that she knew that every single time she came forward, someone else was going to be looking at her photos. And I will say-- I'm a little ashamed to say that part of the reason why I agreed to help her was because I was shamed by her example. Because I was insulated from this problem in a way that she just wasn't. This was happening to her.

And I didn't want to get involved in some ways because I thought this is a deeply unpopular area to be involved with. I had previously done a lot of work as a graduate student on pornography and about-- and I just-- I didn't want to talk about it anymore. And it was knowing that she was going to put everything on the line for--

But you did too, my friend.

Yeah.

Well, I mean, I think part of the reasons why--

Can I remind-- OK, go ahead, you say why.

Well, just because it was--

But then I'm going to remind us of the legal story.

However hard it was going to be-- however hard it was going to be, I couldn't-- she was going to be putting everything into this. And I thought, I can't say-- I can't say no to this because of the sacrifices she's going to make. And I think all of us, though, in this effort, we've all had to experience the blowback from it. Because people get very angry about it.
And it’s not just the lone cranks out there, it's also-- it's lawyers, it is politicians. It is corporations that have gotten really upset and have made all of our lives really miserable. So it is-- I wish that were not part of the story, because this is-- when you make a-- when you make this kind of change or you agitate for a change, certainly people can disagree with it and think that this isn't the right approach or this isn't really an issue. That's one kind of response.

The response of rape and death threats, or I'm going to find out where you live, and I'm going to send people there to take-- I'm going to-- I'm going to have you sexually assaulted and I'm going to take pictures of it so that you will stop doing your work, which are some of the things that happened some of us on the board. That is not an acceptable response.

HANY FARID: Yep, I agree.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: And yet, that was the response.

HANY FARID: But that is the response.

DANIELLE CITRON: And that was the-- just to highlight the-- that was a real cost.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: Yeah.

DANIELLE CITRON: But we achieved some really important successes that I want to highlight. So in 2013 or '14, as we were writing “Criminalizing Revenge Porn,” and we had your model statute in mind-- we knew that was out there-- there were three states that criminalized the practice of the non-consensual distribution of intimate images. And that within-- I want to say six years--

MARY ANNE FRANKS: About.

DANIELLE CITRON: We went to 47 or 48 states.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: We're now at 48.

DANIELLE CITRON: Now at 48. DC and Guam.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: And DC and Guam, and, I think, Puerto Rico.

DANIELLE CITRON: OK, so-- so if you think-- it's more than even 50.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: And the Uniform Code of Military Justice as well, which is always a really important win to keep in mind.
DANIELLE CITRON: That is.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: So we've gone from-- yes, from the-- it's flipped. So it used to be this tiny minority of states that had laws against revenge porn, what was at the time called revenge porn. And now there's only a tiny handful of states that don't. There's only two states left that are the holdouts--

DANIELLE CITRON: Massachusetts being--

MARY ANNE FRANKS: South Carolina and Massachusetts, if you're listening.

DANIELLE CITRON: --shockingly.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: Yes, it's really shocking, but yes, within the space of seven years or so, we saw the bulk of this happen, 35 or so states really getting with the program. That being said--

DANIELLE CITRON: We still have our work to do.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: --not all of the laws are good, but the fact that there was--

DANIELLE CITRON: Yes, of course.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: --this kind of sea change, you're right, we were up against really powerful forces. Because the tech industry didn't like what we were doing. And lots of really powerful politicians did not like what we were doing. The ACLU did not like what we were doing. They continue to not like what we're doing.

And this is all to say that there are really powerful, deep pocketed resources that were arranged against us. And yet, as you say, looking back in 10 years, to go from 3 to 48, plus these territories and the UCMJ, that's tremendous. And when we talk about the kinds of responses that Holly got when she was trying to get help, it's not that those things don't still happen and we don't still experience victim blaming.

DANIELLE CITRON: Of course, they do.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: But there's actually now a whole discourse that says, hey, it's not the victim's fault. It's actually the perpetrator's fault. And privacy is an important value. And we need to understand that it needs to be protected. And so, so much has changed just in the collective understanding of it. I think that, yes, it's a real testament to the power of advocacy there.
Because, yes, at the time of the celebrity hack, people were still just making jokes about how, oh, it's funny that Jennifer Lawrence's private photos are out there and everybody is sharing them. And when she tries to give an interview that says that's a sex crime and you shouldn't be looking at these photos, that she's mocked for that. I think that the tone now is a lot different. It's certainly not perfect, but it has changed a lot.

HANY FARID: I agree. I think one of the things that has shifted in the 20 years of this internet is that we used to think about the internet like Las Vegas. What happens on the internet, stays on the internet. That there's no harm, it's just a bunch of pixels. And the reality is, there is no more online and offline world. There is this one world. It's fully integrated. And online harms and offline harms are harms, period, end of story. And I think we are, slowly, as a society starting to come to grips with that, in part because of the work that CCRI has done.

And by the way, people should not underestimate how hard that is to pass law in 10 years in 48 states. That's insane. If you would have asked me 10 years ago, I would have said, you'll be lucky to have a handful of states. So a phenomenal accomplishment. And I think it also sets the grounds for the next line of harms, and the next line of harms, and the next line of harms. Because now we have a scaffolding for us to think about.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: We do, and that's-- it's so key that you are now part of our organization. Because one of the things we desperately needed-- because we had-- we had law professors. Because law professors were joining in fairly early. But what we didn't really have, we didn't have anybody who was a technologist. We didn't have anyone who really understood that aspect of it or understood it as an expert.

And so discovering more about your work, not just with photo DNA, but I think the first time we met actually was over-- was at an event that dealt with deepfakes and the digital manipulation, which is-- when you made reference to the next step, on the one hand, we have today, or we had 10 years ago, actual private photos that are released. And now we have-- well, maybe there were no photos, but now it looks like there were because it's really easy for anyone to create that. That's the next-- this is one of the next forms of exploitation.

How are we going to deal with that as a-- not just as a legal matter, but also as a technological matter? And it was so good to have you. And it's so good to continue to have you to weigh in on this. Because this isn't just a question about morality or about legality, it's also a question of the technology.

HANY FARID: Yeah, that's right. And by the way, everybody now has exposure to non-consensual sexual imagery. Anybody who has an image of themselves online, which is everybody, can now be inserted digitally into sexual material-- sexually explicit material. And that material can be carpet bombed on the internet.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: Yes.

HANY FARID: And that is a phenomenal threat vector that is very different than it was 10 years ago.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: And it really does, in some ways-- I think we said this at the time, but it's so much more powerful now, to say that when we were responding to the victim blaming, the idea, of well, just don't ever-- their advice was don't ever take nude photos.

HANY FARID: Now tell me what that excuse is.
MARY ANNE FRANKS: Well, what we said at the time was, this is wrong on so many levels. That's the new, you shouldn't have worn that skirt, to try to, in some ways, push the blame of sexual assault on victims. So we always held the line to say, that is not an answer. And by the way, for those people who are supposedly gung-ho about free speech, that's such a strange answer to give. Because you're essentially telling people to censor themselves.

DANIELLE CITRON: Yeah, shut up.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: And that there's a punishment for their speech, right? So that was all a problem. But the other thing was we were trying to say the problem with misogyny and the problem with sexual exploitation is you think, and you are trying to make a generation of people think that they can avoid it just if they're careful enough.

HANY FARID: That's right.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: The thing is, misogyny is a root cause. And if you don't actually confront it, it will find another way.

HANY FARID: And it did.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: And it did. So a couple of years later, the next thing you know is that, oh, I never actually did share a nude photo, and yet--

HANY FARID: There I am.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: There I am. So now anyone can take-- as you say, all they need is a profile photo from your Facebook page or whatever, or just any photo, and now it can look like were in an intimate setting or that you were engaged in some kind of sexual activity. And so there is no protecting you from that.

So if we had taken this seriously when it was happening to women, that maybe people weren't being sympathetic to, we wouldn't be in such a big mess right now. We could have been better prepared to take on this new fight, which, yes, as you say, everybody can be a victim.

HANY FARID: Yeah.

DANIELLE CITRON: And some of that fight that we're doing at CCRI is law.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: Yeah.

DANIELLE CITRON: Some of that fight is working with companies. And using your technology in ways that relate to nonconsensual imagery, as well as fakery. And some of that is just education that we try to do.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: Yeah, the approach that we-- I think we, in some ways, pioneered. So that we had a law, policy, and technology approach, which is to say, we've got we've got to have legislative reform. That's obvious, because the law has not really kept up. But that also means that we have to think about the gatekeepers and the amplifiers, so that's technological reform. We've got to get these companies to work harder on these issues, especially in the absence of any real legal incentive to do so.
And then we've just got to change hearts and minds about this, which is a big part of this. Because we want people to not do this to each other. And the other-- and the flip side of that is offer support to the people who are experiencing it, so our crisis helpline and the safety guides that we have. And as you say, now we have that in place to try to deal with the deepfakes problem and the other kinds of issues that are evolving now, to say we have to recognize that that's going to be a three-part process. It's not just going to be law. It's also going to be technology and it's also going to be society.

DANIELLE CITRON: So with that, it's been an amazing 10 years. And I feel like I'm looking forward to the next--

HANY FARID: In a weird way.

DANIELLE CITRON: In a weird way, but hopefully-- there's so much we've accomplished, there's so much to do. And it's been such an honor to do it with you.

HANY FARID: Likewise.

MARY ANNE FRANKS: Likewise, yeah.