

# Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Deposition Summary

---

*State of Missouri, et al. v. Joseph R. Biden, Jr., et al.*

## **DEPOSITION ABSTRACT**

In this deposition, Dr. Fauci discussed various topics related to his professional roles, communications, and public statements. Dr. Fauci is the director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) and the Chief Medical Advisor to President Biden. Throughout the deposition, Dr. Fauci addressed his involvement in discussions and decisions regarding COVID-19, including the use of masks, the efficacy of hydroxychloroquine, the origins of the virus, and the Great Barrington Declaration. He also spoke about his interactions with social media platforms and the spread of misinformation and disinformation.

Dr. Fauci emphasized his limited involvement with social media and his lack of expertise in legal matters related to content moderation on these platforms. He expressed concern about the spread of false information that could deter people from lifesaving interventions, such as vaccination. Dr. Fauci also discussed his communication with other scientists and government officials, as well as his approach to combating misinformation by providing accurate information through various media channels.

The deposition also touches on Dr. Fauci's interactions with individuals like Mark Zuckerberg, CEO of Meta, and his participation in Public Service Announcements (PSAs) to encourage vaccination. Additionally, Dr. Fauci addressed the issue of fake social media accounts impersonating him and the actions taken by his communications staff to address this problem.

Throughout the deposition, Dr. Fauci reiterated his commitment to public health and the importance of relying on scientific evidence and expert consensus when making public health recommendations.

## **KEY ADMISSIONS**

### **Dr. Fauci - Chief Medical Advisor to President Biden**

- Dr. Fauci is a highly esteemed medical professional who serves as the director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases and the Chief Medical Advisor to President Biden. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [10:11 - 10:16](#))

### **Dr. Fauci's 38-Year Milestone at NIAID**

- Dr. Anthony Fauci has been the director of NIAID for 38 years prior to his deposition. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [10:23 - 11:1](#))

### **Lab-Created Virus Research: Risk-Benefit Balance**

- Dr. Fauci argued that creating a potentially dangerous virus in a lab can be beneficial, given the right context and conditions, as it could help protect the public from outbreaks. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [14:17 - 15:21](#))

### **Dr. Fauci Uncertain of EcoHealth Alliance Projects**

- Dr. Anthony S. Fauci was not aware of the initiation of the "Understanding the Risk of Bat Coronavirus Emergence" project in 2014, and confirmed that EcoHealth Alliance was the recipient of the project, but was unsure if they received funding under it. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [18:13 - 19:23](#))

*State of Missouri, et al. v. Joseph R. Biden, Jr., et al. -- Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Deposition Summary*

- Dr. Fauci acknowledged that there may have been a few exceptions to the pause on gain-of-function research, but he was unsure of their purpose and who authorized them. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [28:22 - 30:19](#))

#### **Dr. Fauci Questioned on Daszak's Access to WIV Genomes**

- Dr. Fauci was questioned about Peter Daszak's access to virus genomes from the Wuhan Institute of Virology and requested the question to be repeated to ensure accuracy of his answer. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [36:14 - 36:25](#))

#### **Fauci's Interaction with Anderson and Jeremy Regarding Coronavirus Genome**

- Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed knowing Christian Anderson, an internationally renowned scientist, and speculated that he and another scientist, Jeremy, contacted him due to his reputation as a top infectious disease expert, and he acknowledged sending an email to Anderson and Jeremy on January 31st, 2020, but could not recall if it referred to an article by Jon Cohen in Science Magazine. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [45:13 - 51:2](#))

#### **Dr. Fauci's China Research Funding Inquiry**

- Dr. Anthony S. Fauci was seeking more information about collaborations and funded work in China in order to prepare for a call with a group of established scientists. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [59:10 - 60:11](#))
- Dr. Fauci confirmed his email exchange with Hugh Auchincloss regarding research funding in China, and acknowledged his response to Hugh's email as "Okay, stay tuned." (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [68:5 - 72:19](#))

#### **Fauci Discusses Wellcome Trust, February 1st Meeting, and Natural Evolution of Virus**

- At a meeting on February 1st, Dr. Anthony S. Fauci and other participants discussed the potential for the virus to have originated in a lab or naturally, and agreed to further examine the sequences before reaching a definitive conclusion. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [76:6 - 78:24](#))
- Dr. Anthony Fauci does not recall any conversation on February 1st regarding worries that social media allegations of the virus originating from a lab could undermine scientific funding projects, but he does remember a concern about shifting focus away from the primary objective of addressing the outbreak for the benefit of public health. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [78:25 - 79:19](#))
- Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed that scientists found evidence of a natural evolution of the virus, and he did not recall any specific communications with Jeremy Farrar related to the subject. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [79:20 - 83:22](#))

#### **Dr. Fauci's FaceTime Discussions with Zuckerberg**

- Dr. Anthony S. Fauci held FaceTime discussions with Mark Zuckerberg to promote vaccination. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [99:11 - 99:19](#))

#### **Dr. Fauci's Limited Social Media Connections**

- Dr. Fauci confirmed that Mark Zuckerberg is the only social media platform employee he is aware of. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [99:20 - 99:22](#))
- Dr. Anthony Fauci discussed his limited connections with social media platforms, confirming his Instagram sessions with Steph Curry to promote vaccination and identifying an email from Jeremy Farrar with a neutral view. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [100:21 - 102:1](#))

#### **Dr. Fauci Worries About Misinformation on Social Media**

- Dr. Fauci expressed concern about the spread of false information on social media regarding the origins of the virus, which could impede global efforts to save lives. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [103:15 - 103:22](#))
- Dr. Anthony Fauci expressed his worry about the spread of misinformation and disinformation, including false claims about himself and Bill Gates, and confirmed having sent an email expressing his concern about the potential for further distortions on social media. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [104:18 - 105:24](#))
- Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed that Peter Daszak and Shi Zhengli's research at the Wuhan Institute of Virology is conducted at a BSL-2 safety level. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [117:7 - 117:12](#))

### Dr. Fauci on WHO, Misinformation, and Social Media

- Dr. Fauci denies any plans to pressure the WHO, instead emphasizing the intention to motivate them to organize a meeting for an open discussion about the virus's origins. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [137:17 - 138:6](#))
- Dr. Anthony S. Fauci does not recall making any public comments about the virus's origins in February 2020, and may have suggested Dr. Clifford Lane for a WHO-sponsored trip to China to investigate the virus. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [140:14 - 140:18](#))
- Dr. Anthony Fauci was confused when asked about the potential of misinformation and disinformation on social media leading to loss of life, and was asked to slow down by the court reporter. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [150:18 - 151:1](#))
- Dr. Anthony S. Fauci has not requested any social media companies to remove misinformation, but he is not aware of any actions taken by his staff at NIAID. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [151:21 - 152:16](#))

### Dr. Fauci on SARS-CoV-2 Origins and NIH-Funded Research

- Dr. Fauci believes the virus is likely a natural occurrence, but stressed the importance of remaining open to all possibilities, and clarified that the molecular differences between SARS-CoV-2 and the viruses studied under the NIAID-funded subaward to the Wuhan Institute make it impossible for the latter to become SARS-CoV-2. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [155:22 - 157:22](#))
- Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed his awareness of the removal of genomic sequences of viruses from a publicly accessible database at the Wuhan Institute of Virology in September 2019, but clarified that they were still published in literature. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [158:9 - 158:17](#))

### Dr. Fauci's Involvement in "Proximal Origins of COVID-19" Paper

- Dr. Anthony S. Fauci had minimal involvement in the preparation of the "Proximal Origins of COVID-19" paper, and his contribution to the paper was not substantial. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [171:11 - 171:25](#))
- Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed his invitation to comment on the "Proximal Origins of COVID-19" paper, but did not remember making any significant comments and suggested any compliments he may have given were likely courtesies. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [172:1 - 173:1](#))

### Dr. Fauci's Interactions with Zuckerberg

- Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed that he has interacted with Mark Zuckerberg multiple times on Facebook Zoom-type podcasts, but does not remember the details of their first meeting. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [175:10 - 175:18](#))
- Dr. Fauci confirmed that he read a document about conducting a series of live-streamed Q and As with Mark Zuckerberg, and acknowledged that Facebook had allocated technical resources and millions of dollars of free ad credits for the U.S. Government to use for Public Service Announcements (PSAs). (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [176:11 - 177:16](#))

### Dr. Fauci Uncertain of Awareness of Collins' Blog Post

- Dr. Fauci acknowledged awareness of a statement by Director Collins regarding the origin of the coronavirus, but could not recall if he had read or discussed it with Collins prior to its publication. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [182:19 - 185:1](#))

### Exhibit Mix-Up with Dr. Fauci

- Dr. Fauci was shown Exhibit 26, which was a media coverage of the article "Proximal Origins of COVID-19", but there was a mix-up about the exhibit number before he could answer questions about his awareness of the coverage. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [185:2 - 185:19](#))

### Dr. Fauci Confirms ABC News Article on COVID-19 Origins

- Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed the accuracy of an ABC News article from March 27th, 2020, which concluded that COVID-19 was not a laboratory construct. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [185:20 - 186:4](#))

- Dr. Anthony S. Fauci does not remember discussing the "Proximal Origins of COVID-19" article from Nature Medicine with the media when it was released. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [186:5 - 186:10](#))

#### **Fauci Acknowledges Email Referring to Lab Leak Theory as "Destructive Conspiracy"**

- Dr. Fauci acknowledged an email from Francis that referred to the lab leak theory of COVID-19's origins as a "very destructive conspiracy", and suggested that any further interpretation of Francis's words should be sought directly from Francis. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [188:19 - 191:18](#))

#### **Dr. Fauci on "Shiny Object" Theory & Misinformation**

- Dr. Fauci referred to the theory of the virus being manufactured by the Chinese as a "shiny object" due to its lack of evidence but high attention, and was uncertain when asked if he considered it to be misinformation or disinformation that could potentially cause loss of life. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [191:23 - 193:21](#))
- Dr. Anthony Fauci expressed his concern that misinformation about the origin of the virus could hinder the pursuit of accurate information, while confirming his familiarity with the Nature Medicine article. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [194:4 - 195:22](#))

#### **Dr. Fauci Confirms Coronavirus Task Force Membership at White House Press Briefing**

- Dr. Anthony S. Fauci confirmed his membership in the Coronavirus Task Force during a White House press briefing on April 17th, 2020. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [196:20 - 197:10](#))
- Dr. Anthony S. Fauci confirmed his attendance at the Coronavirus Task Force press briefing at the White House on April 17th, 2020, and acknowledged being asked about the virus potentially being manmade and originating from a Chinese lab, verifying that the transcript showed him discussing a study by evolutionary virologists which concluded that the virus's evolution and mutations were in line with a species jump from an animal to a human. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [197:11 - 199:1](#))

#### **Dr. Fauci Unaware of Social Media Suppression**

- Dr. Anthony S. Fauci was unaware of any suppression of speech on social media regarding the lab leak hypothesis and did not recall being aware of Twitter removing content related to it. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [207:24 - 209:2](#))

#### **Dr. Fauci's Social Media Involvement and Hydroxychloroquine Discussions**

- Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed that Twitter had suspended the accounts of a Chinese virologist who suggested the coronavirus was made in a lab, as reported by The Hill. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [209:3 - 209:11](#))
- Dr. Anthony Fauci does not pay attention to social media, but he does remember the document from Meta titled "Update on our work to keep people informed and limit misinformation about COVID-19". (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [209:19 - 210:24](#))
- Dr. Anthony S. Fauci was made aware that someone is part of or owns Facebook. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [212:11 - 212:14](#))
- Dr. Anthony Fauci has no involvement with social media and does not remember discussing the removal of conversations about the lab leak theory of COVID-19 origins from social media platforms. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [213:7 - 213:16](#))
- Dr. Anthony S. Fauci discussed the potential efficacy of hydroxychloroquine against coronavirus with Dr. Cliff Lane and other individuals within NIAID, despite the lack of supporting data. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [215:20 - 216:16](#))

#### **Dr. Fauci Confirms Removal of False COVID-19 Info Post**

- Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed the removal of a Facebook post by Breitbart News for sharing false information about COVID-19 cures and treatments, despite an objection from Mr. Sauer. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [237:17 - 237:24](#))

### **Dr. Fauci No Recall of Facebook Communication on COVID-19 Video**

- Dr. Anthony S. Fauci does not recall any communication with Facebook regarding the removal of a video spreading false information about COVID-19 cures and treatments, although he acknowledges it may have occurred. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [237:25 - 238:5](#))
- Dr. Anthony S. Fauci does not recall any communication between the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases and social media platforms, such as Facebook, nor any communication from the federal government to Facebook about a specific decision. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [238:6 - 238:20](#))

### **Dr. Fauci Unaware of Social Media Censorship Policies**

- Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed his lack of involvement or attention to social media organizations' actions, including Google, YouTube, and Twitter, and stressed his lack of attention to what gets posted or removed on social media. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [239:8 - 241:13](#))
- Dr. Anthony S. Fauci does not use social media, but is aware of the potential of encountering related content due to his work environment. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [241:18 - 242:9](#))

### **Dr. Fauci - Infectious Disease & YouTube**

- Dr. Anthony S. Fauci is an experienced infectious disease specialist and epidemiologist. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [279:1 - 279:3](#))
- Dr. Anthony Fauci is aware of YouTube as a social media platform. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [282:21 - 282:23](#))

### **Dr. Fauci Confirms Participation in Facebook PSAs, Requests Clarification on Interrogatory and Communications with Zuckerberg**

- Dr. Anthony S. Fauci confirmed his participation in Facebook Public Service Announcements (PSAs) related to the virus, but was unsure of the exact date and requested to see a document for clarification regarding the term "interrogatory" and the mention of 13 communications with Mark Zuckerberg in 2020. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [286:21 - 287:23](#))

### **Fauci-Zuckerberg Discussions & FOIA Request**

- Dr. Anthony S. Fauci acknowledged his communications with Mark Zuckerberg of Meta in 2020, but was uncertain about the exact number of interactions and recalled a discussion about a misinformation policy document. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [287:24 - 288:13](#))
- Dr. Anthony S. Fauci had discussions with Mark Zuckerberg regarding Public Service Announcements (PSAs), but was uncertain if he was presented as a respected public health authority during these talks. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [289:6 - 290:3](#))
- Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed seeing an email from Twitter to Carol Crawford on March 14th, 2020, but expressed confusion and did not recognize anything on the document. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [298:21 - 299:5](#))

### **Dr. Fauci's Social Media Strategy to Combat Misinformation**

- Dr. Anthony S. Fauci expressed uncertainty about his communication staff liaising with social media platforms to eliminate false and misleading content, and specified that he does not focus on issues concerning social media accounts. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [301:5 - 301:12](#))
- Dr. Anthony S. Fauci confirmed that he was made aware of several fake accounts of himself on Facebook and Instagram by an email from Judith Lavelle of his communications staff at NIAID, NIH. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [309:4 - 309:7](#))
- Dr. Fauci believes his communications staff does not try to influence social media, and it is appropriate for them to show concern when he is impersonated online. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [312:14 - 313:5](#))

- Dr. Fauci weighed the pros and cons of masks in preventing the spread of COVID-19, taking into account the potential mask shortage, and ultimately decided to not encourage the public to purchase and wear masks. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [319:22 - 321:25](#))
- Dr. Anthony S. Fauci acknowledged his awareness of Alex Berenson, but clarified that he does not focus on social media issues involving individuals being banned or hindered. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [334:23 - 335:13](#))
- Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed that President Biden expressed his frustration with social media platforms for allowing the spread of disinformation about the coronavirus vaccine. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [344:3 - 344:16](#))
- Dr. Fauci uses various platforms to promote vaccination and counter misinformation and disinformation, and his deposition concluded on November 23rd, 2022. (Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Depo. [358:20 - 359:22](#))

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

10:8 - 10:10	<a href="#"><u>Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Verifies His Identity in a Deposition Testimony</u></a>
10:11 - 10:16	<a href="#"><u>Dr. Fauci, Director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, Is Also Chief Medical Advisor to President Biden</u></a>
10:17 - 11:10	<a href="#"><u>Dr. Anthony Fauci Is the Chief Medical Advisor to the President and Has Directed NIAID for 38 Years</u></a>
11:11 - 16:20	<a href="#"><u>Dr. Fauci Testified About the Necessity of Creating Potentially Dangerous Viruses in Labs for Outbreak Prevention</u></a>
16:21 - 28:21	<a href="#"><u>Dr. Fauci Testified About Safety Measures for Dangerous Research, Discussed a Bat Coronavirus Project, and the Applications of Reverse Genetics</u></a>
28:22 - 105:24	<a href="#"><u>Dr. Anthony Fauci Testified About Potential Exceptions to Research Pauses, Discussions About COVID-19 Origins, Funding in China, and Concerns About Misinformation</u></a>
105:25 - 119:7	<a href="#"><u>Dr. Anthony Fauci Testified About Virus Origins, Social Media Distortions, Who's Role, Safety in Virus Research, and Denied Knowledge of "gain-of-function" Research</u></a>
119:8 - 119:17	<a href="#"><u>Dr. Fauci Testified That He Was Not Familiar with the 2015 Shi and Baric Paper or Its Restrictions</u></a>
119:18 - 149:18	<a href="#"><u>Dr. Anthony Fauci Testified About Receiving a Virology Draft Paper, His Limited Involvement in Interpreting Information, Suggesting Names for a WHO Group, and Discussing Coronavirus Origins</u></a>
149:19 - 153:20	<a href="#"><u>Dr. Fauci Testified That Misinformation About Vaccinations Can Be Deadly and He Doesn't Recall Receiving an Email from Ian Lipkin</u></a>
153:21 - 170:8	<a href="#"><u>Dr. Anthony Fauci Testified About Covid-19's Origin, Dismissing Lab Leak Theories, and Emphasized the Importance of Social Distancing and Lockdowns</u></a>
170:9 - 178:4	<a href="#"><u>Dr. Anthony Fauci Testified About His Limited Role in a COVID-19 Paper, Interactions with Mark Zuckerberg, and Refusal of Facebook's Ad Credit Offer</u></a>
178:5 - 213:20	<a href="#"><u>Dr. Anthony Fauci Testified About the Origins of COVID-19, Denying It Was Lab-made or Purposely Manipulated, and Denied Involvement in Social Media Censorship</u></a>
213:21 - 230:24	<a href="#"><u>Dr. Anthony Fauci Testified Against Claims of Hydroxychloroquine's Effectiveness for COVID-19, Citing Lack of Evidence and Potential Harm</u></a>
230:25 - 232:15	<a href="#"><u>Dr. Fauci Testified That the NIH Found No Evidence of Hydroxychloroquine's Efficacy in Treating Infectious Diseases</u></a>
232:16 - 241:17	<a href="#"><u>Dr. Anthony Fauci Testified About Seeing a Censored COVID-19 Video, Expressed Concern About False Information, but Denied Communicating with Facebook About Content Removal</u></a>
241:18 - 242:9	<a href="#"><u>Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Testified That He Ignores Social Media Policies and Doesn't Own a Social Media Account</u></a>

- 242:10 - 242:13 [Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Testified, with Exhibit No. 39 Identified by Mr. Sauer](#)
- 242:14 - 244:14 [Dr. Anthony Fauci Testified on the Closure of "america's Frontline Doctors" Website and Reaffirmed Hydroxychloroquine's Inefficacy](#)
- 244:15 - 247:14 [Dr. Anthony Fauci Expressed Doubts About a Hydroxychloroquine Study, Emphasizing the Need for Randomized Placebo Control Groups](#)
- 247:15 - 248:12 [Dr. Fauci Testified That Top Infectious Disease Physicians Found No Evidence of Hydroxychloroquine's Effectiveness and Potential Harm](#)
- 248:13 - 262:16 [Dr. Anthony Fauci Testified About His Limited Involvement and Uncertain Recollection Regarding the Great Barrington Declaration](#)
- 262:17 - 282:23 [Dr. Anthony Fauci Testified About Discussing Social Distancing, Debunking Theories, and Critiquing the Great Barrington Declaration's Herd Immunity Approach to COVID-19](#)
- 282:24 - 286:6 [Dr. Anthony Fauci Testified He Didn't Know About Youtube's 2020 Policy to Remove Great Barrington Declaration Content](#)
- 286:7 - 327:14 [Dr. Anthony Fauci Testified About His Communications with Meta CEO, His Stance on Mask-wearing, and His Team's Handling of Misinformation and Imposter Accounts](#)
- 327:15 - 329:19 [Dr. Anthony Fauci Testified He Was Unaware of Plans to Remove a Fake Instagram Account Impersonating Him](#)
- 329:20 - 330:9 [Dr. Fauci Testifies About a Fake Instagram Account Impersonating Him, Mentioned by the White House's Digital Director](#)
- 330:10 - 335:16 [Dr. Fauci Confirmed in a Deposition That the CDC Informed Facebook About the Inaccuracy of Ivermectin's Effectiveness Against COVID-19](#)
- 335:17 - 343:15 [Dr. Anthony Fauci Testified He Doesn't Recall Discussions About Vaccine Misinformation on Twitter and Finds Vaccine Rejection Alarming](#)
- 343:16 - 344:2 [Dr. Fauci Testified He Doesn't Remember Discussing Conservative Author Alex Berenson with Any Government Officials](#)
- 344:3 - 346:7 [Dr. Fauci Confirmed President Biden's Frustration with Social Media Spreading Vaccine Misinformation, Leading to Unnecessary Deaths](#)
- 346:8 - 346:13 [Dr. Fauci Testified That Disinformation Spread Via Social Media, Causing Avoidance of Lifesaving Measures, Harms Public Health](#)
- 346:14 - 346:20 [During His Deposition, Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Was Requested to Review Exhibit 62](#)
- 346:21 - 358:4 [Dr. Anthony Fauci Testified About His Knowledge of Scott Gottlieb, His Limited Twitter Connections, His Endorsement of a COVID-19 Drug, and Countering Misinformation](#)
- 358:5 - 358:19 [Dr. Fauci Advocates for Honest COVID-19 Debates, Cautioning Against Misinformation Causing Harmful Actions](#)

358:20 - 359:22 [Dr. Fauci Testified That He Combats Vaccine Misinformation by Spreading Accurate Information Via Multiple Media Outlets](#)

## DR. ANTHONY FAUCI

### EXAMINATION BY MR. SAUER

#### Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Verifies His Identity in a Deposition Testimony

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
- Fauci Testimony	Anthony S. Fauci provided his name for the record. <a href="#">(10:8 - 10:10)</a>

#### Dr. Fauci, Director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, Is Also Chief Medical Advisor to President Biden

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
- COVID-19 Expert Advisor	Dr. Fauci is the director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases at the National Institutes of Health and the Chief Medical Advisor to President Biden. <a href="#">(10:11 - 10:16)</a>

#### Dr. Anthony Fauci Is the Chief Medical Advisor to the President and Has Directed NIAID for 38 Years

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
- Chief Medical Advisor to President	Dr. Anthony Fauci assumed the position of Chief Medical Advisor to the President shortly after the President's inauguration. He was invited to take on the role between the time of the election and the inauguration, and formally took up the position after the inauguration. <a href="#">(10:17 - 10:22)</a>
- Fauci's 38-Year Milestone at NIAID	Dr. Anthony Fauci has served as the director of NIAID for 38 years, a milestone he reached a few weeks prior to the deposition. <a href="#">(10:23 - 11:1)</a>
- Fauci Deposition Estimate	Dr. Anthony Fauci has previously given a deposition, which he estimated took place between 15 and 20-plus years ago. However, he did not recall the exact time. <a href="#">(11:2 - 11:10)</a>

#### Dr. Fauci Testified About the Necessity of Creating Potentially Dangerous Viruses in Labs for Outbreak Prevention

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
- Reviewing Guidelines	Dr. Anthony Fauci consented to review some basic guidelines. <a href="#">(11:11 - 11:12)</a>
- Avoiding Interruptions	Dr. Fauci agreed to avoid interrupting when a question is being asked to maintain clarity in the record. <a href="#">(11:13 - 11:16)</a>
- Fauci seeks clarification.	Dr. Fauci agreed to seek clarification for any question he does not understand to ensure his response accurately addresses the intended inquiry. <a href="#">(11:17 - 11:22)</a>
- Fauci's Verbal Responses	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci committed to giving verbal responses, specifically affirming or denying with a "yes" or "no", rather than just nodding or using non-verbal expressions like "uh-huh," "huh-uh," to the questions posed. <a href="#">(11:23 - 12:2)</a>
- Slow Speech Agreement	Dr. Fauci agreed to speak slowly to ensure accurate transcription. <a href="#">(12:3 - 12:8)</a>

- Objection to Document Identification	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci was shown a document, labeled as Exhibit 1, for identification. Mr. Kirschner, another attorney present, objected, arguing that Dr. Fauci's recognition of the document should not be related to his preparation for the deposition. He added that he wouldn't stop Dr. Fauci from responding if the document was identified outside of the deposition preparation context. Mr. Sauer, the attorney questioning Dr. Fauci, accepted Mr. Kirschner's argument. <a href="#">(12:9 - 12:25)</a>
- Reviewing documents in preparation for deposition, objection on work product.	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci confirmed reviewing several documents in preparation for his deposition. However, when asked to identify these documents, his legal representative, Mr. Kirschner, objected on the basis of work product and instructed Dr. Fauci not to respond. <a href="#">(13:1 - 13:8)</a>
- Fauci's Recognition of Exhibit 1	Dr. Anthony Fauci acknowledged and carefully read the document marked as Exhibit 1, confirming his recognition of it. <a href="#">(13:9 - 13:12)</a>
- Fauci-Collins op-ed on flu virus risk.	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci confirmed his co-authorship of a 2011 Washington Post op-ed titled "A Flu Virus Risk Worth Taking" with Francis Collins. He mentioned his vague recollection of the piece, attributing this to the volume of his written work, which totals 1300 articles. Upon being queried about a specific sentence in the op-ed, he asked for time to review the document before providing additional responses. <a href="#">(13:13 - 14:16)</a>
- Researching Virus Transmission Biology	Dr. Fauci stated his belief that valuable insights can be obtained from creating a potentially dangerous virus in a lab, given the right context. He detailed that this typically involves studying viruses such as H5N1 in ways that could potentially increase their danger, but only under strict conditions. These conditions act as safeguards for experiments that could potentially create a dangerous virus. He cited a paper he co-authored with Dr. Collins and Dr. Nabel, arguing that understanding virus transmission biology has implications for predicting, preventing, and treating outbreaks. They asserted that there is a risk-benefit balance to such research, and the risk is worth taking if the benefit is protecting the American and global public. He also outlined the conditions under which such research should be conducted. <a href="#">(14:17 - 15:21)</a>
- "Misleading 'Gain of Function' Research"	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci explained that the term "gain of function" can be potentially misleading in the context of research involving the generation of potentially dangerous viruses. He stated that this was the reason why, several years ago, outside groups, not the NIH, decided to more strictly define the parameters of experiments that would require additional oversight and ceased using the term "gain of function". <a href="#">(15:22 - 16:10)</a>
- Pause on Influenza Research	Dr. Anthony Fauci indicated that the term "gain of function" might have been discontinued between 2011 and 2014, but he was unsure of the precise timeline. He noted that a pause was implemented on research involving the manipulation of the influenza virus during this time to set more definitive guidelines for the scope of the research. <a href="#">(16:11 - 16:20)</a>

### Dr. Fauci Testified About Safety Measures for Dangerous Research, Discussed a Bat Coronavirus Project, and the Applications of Reverse Genetics

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
- P3CO: Pandemic Potential Pathogens Care and Oversight	Dr. Anthony Fauci stated his belief that the level of biosafety was a component of the guardrails for experiments requiring extra oversight, though he was uncertain if this was explicitly mentioned. He identified two key elements of these guardrails: a halt on research with potentially hazardous aspects, and the creation of clearer oversight guidelines by entities outside of the NIH. These entities, which included the Office of Science and Technology Policy, the academies of science, engineering and medicine, and various working groups, established the P3CO, or pandemic potential pathogens care and oversight. This was due to the ambiguity of the

	term "gain of function," which was frequently misunderstood. These external groups deemed it crucial to clarify the kinds of experiments that necessitated additional oversight. <a href="#">(16:21 - 17:17)</a>
- Exhibit 2 Reviewed	Dr. Fauci reviewed a second document, labeled as Exhibit 2, during his examination. <a href="#">(17:18 - 18:3)</a>
- Bat Coronavirus Emergence Study	Dr. Anthony Fauci has a general understanding of the "Understanding the Risk of Bat Coronavirus Emergence" project, which is carried out by EcoHealth Alliance and centers on the study of the emergence of the bat coronavirus. <a href="#">(18:4 - 18:12)</a>
- Bat Coronavirus Emergence Project grant review.	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci did not know if the "Understanding the Risk of Bat Coronavirus Emergence" project was initiated in 2014, as he did not follow it closely. He clarified that he does not approve grants individually as the head of NIAID, as they undergo multiple levels of peer review. He had no memory of the initiation of this grant. He confirmed that EcoHealth Alliance was the recipient of the project as mentioned in the project details. However, he did not understand the question about whether his understanding was that they received funding under this project and asked for it to be repeated. <a href="#">(18:13 - 19:23)</a>
- Funding of EcoHealth Alliance by NIAID	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci could not confirm if the EcoHealth Alliance received funding from NIAID for the project "Understanding the Risk of Bat Coronavirus Emergence". He acknowledged that NIAID has funded EcoHealth Alliance, but he could not specifically link it to this particular grant as it was his first time seeing the related document. He was uncertain about the pronunciation of the name Peter Daszak, but suggested it might be pronounced "Daszak". <a href="#">(19:24 - 20:14)</a>
- Fauci-Daszak Interaction and NIAID Funding	Dr. Anthony Fauci has met Mr. Daszak once or twice, possibly at a scientific meeting, but does not consider him an acquaintance. He has received an email from Mr. Daszak, but does not remember the content and does not interact with him regularly. He became aware of the NIAID funding for a project related to the risk of bat Coronavirus emergence only after it was highlighted in early 2020 and does not recall knowing about the grant when it was first funded. <a href="#">(20:15 - 22:23)</a>
- Fauci acknowledges abstract text.	Dr. Anthony Fauci acknowledged that he had seen the large paragraph that covers most of the first page in the abstract text of the document under discussion. <a href="#">(22:24 - 23:2)</a>
- Reverse Genetics and Coronavirus	Dr. Anthony Fauci identified a reference to testing predictions of Coronavirus interspecies transmission using reverse genetics in a document. He expressed uncertainty about the specific context of "reverse genetics" in this case, but noted that it generally could refer to various processes such as virus manipulation or recombination. He confirmed that reverse genetics is a broad term with multiple applications, including the production of the influenza virus vaccine. He also agreed that it could refer to the genetic manipulation of a virus, potentially used to create an attenuated influenza virus or to amplify the virus's function. However, he did not confirm if it could enhance a virus's transmissibility or virulence. <a href="#">(23:3 - 25:1)</a>
- Gain-of-Function Pause	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci did not recognize Exhibit 3 presented to him by MR. SAUER's legal team, but he was familiar with the concept of the gain-of-function pause involving influenza, MERS, and SARS viruses. The document mentioned a "U.S. government gain-of-function deliberative process and research funding pause." Dr. Fauci was asked about a period starting in 2014 where there was a pause on gain-of-function research, but he expressed confusion over the questions. MR. KIRSCHNER requested that Dr. Fauci be allowed to familiarize himself with the document before being asked more questions. Dr. Fauci then asked for a moment to understand what a footnote in the document was referring to. <a href="#">(25:2 - 27:1)</a>
- U.S. Government Research Policy Exception	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci confirmed his knowledge of the 2014 U.S. Government policy that temporarily halted gain-of-function research on specific viruses. He became aware of an exception in the policy either at its inception or later. The pause applied to all such research until a new government research policy could be established. The exception to this pause was based

on the necessity to continue certain vital research. The exception clause, which he read aloud, stated that a pause exception could be granted if the head of a U.S. Government funding agency deemed the research crucial for public health or national security. He confirmed that he was the head of such a funding agency.  
[\(27:2 - 28:21\)](#)

**Dr. Anthony Fauci Testified About Potential Exceptions to Research Pauses, Discussions About COVID-19 Origins, Funding in China, and Concerns About Misinformation**

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
- Pause on Gain-of-Function Exceptions	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci acknowledged that during the pause on gain-of-function research, a few experiments were granted exceptions. He does not remember personally approving any exceptions, suggesting it was likely managed by staff or deputy level. His recollection is unclear on whether anyone at NIAID authorized any research during this pause, but he believes there may have been a few exceptions for research deemed necessary for public health or national security. Regarding projects related to virus research conducted by EcoHealth Alliance, Dr. Fauci expressed uncertainty and lack of specific recollection. He noted that he was later informed that there were exceptions, but he was unsure of their purpose. He indicated that the authorization for these exceptions could have been given by various individuals in his agency, including program level staff, his deputy, program managers, and division directors. <a href="#">(28:22 - 30:19)</a>
- Funding Agency Deputy Head	Dr. Hugh Auchincloss serves as the deputy head of a U.S. Government funding agency. His surname is spelled as A-U-C-H-I-N-C-L-O-S-S. <a href="#">(30:20 - 30:23)</a>
- Principal Deputy Director	Dr. Hugh Auchincloss serves as the Principal Deputy Director. <a href="#">(30:24 - 30:25)</a>
- Exhibit 4.	Dr. Anthony Fauci was presented with a document, marked as Exhibit 4, by Mr. Sauer during the examination. <a href="#">(31:1 - 31:5)</a>
- Awareness of SARS-like Cluster Article	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed his awareness of the "Nature Medicine" article titled "A SARS-like cluster of circulating bat coronaviruses shows potential for human emergence", but clarified that he did not know about it at the time of its publication in 2015. He first learned about the article when Congress members raised questions about experiments funded by the NIAID, following the onset of the COVID-19 outbreak. He estimated this to be several months into the outbreak, though he was unsure of the exact timing. He recognized Ralph Baric, one of the last two authors of the article, as a scientist at North Carolina and a long-term grantee of NIAID. <a href="#">(31:6 - 32:14)</a>
- Fauci's Awareness of UNC and WIV Scientists	Dr. Anthony Fauci is aware of Ralph Baric, a scientist at the University of North Carolina, but does not remember ever meeting him personally. He confirmed that Baric receives funding from NIAID. He also thinks that Zhengli Shi, another scientist, is linked with the Wuhan Institute of Virology, but he is not entirely sure. <a href="#">(32:15 - 33:12)</a>
- Awareness of "Bat Woman" Scientist	Dr. Anthony Fauci acknowledged his awareness of a scientist named Shi Zhengli, associated with the Wuhan Institute of Virology and often referred to as the "bat woman" in the media due to her research on bat coronaviruses. He expressed uncertainty about whether the name listed as Zhengli Shi is the same person, citing potential name reversal in Asian cultures. He stated he does not remember meeting Shi Zhengli personally but did not rule out the possibility of encountering her at scientific meetings. <a href="#">(33:13 - 34:2)</a>
- Awareness of Coronavirus Outbreak in China, Dec. 31, 2019/Early 2020	Dr. Anthony Fauci became aware of the new coronavirus outbreak in China either on December 31st, 2019, or within the first couple of days of 2020. <a href="#">(34:3 - 34:11)</a>

- Concerns of Virus Manipulation	Dr. Anthony Fauci remembered receiving a phone call in late January 2020 from Jeremy Farrar and possibly Christian Anderson. They expressed their worry about the molecular configuration of the virus, hinting at potential manipulation. Before this call, no one had brought up such a concern to Dr. Fauci. <a href="#">(34:12 - 35:4)</a>
- CDC director's lack of contact in January 2020	Dr. Anthony Fauci stated that Robert Redfield was the director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention during the time in question. He does not remember Redfield contacting him in mid-January 2020 to discuss concerns about the virus's origin, whether natural or laboratory-made. While he acknowledges that Redfield currently discusses this topic, he cannot confirm his participation in any discussions about the virus's manipulation in January 2020. <a href="#">(35:5 - 35:15)</a>
- Fauci discusses NIAID-funded Daszak and WIV's Shi Zhengli.	Dr. Anthony Fauci discussed the relationship between Peter Daszak, funded by NIAID, and Shi Zhengli, a scientist at the Wuhan Institute of Virology. He also addressed their involvement in a study referenced in Exhibit 4, but asked for the question to be repeated for clarity. <a href="#">(35:16 - 35:24)</a>
- Fauci-Shi Zhengli-Daszak Relationship	Dr. Anthony Fauci is now aware of a working relationship between Shi Zhengli, a scientist at the Wuhan Institute of Virology, and Peter Daszak, which he was not aware of when it was established. He also explained that EcoHealth has a subaward from their original grant that goes to Shi Zhengli at the Wuhan Institute of Virology. <a href="#">(35:25 - 36:6)</a>
- NIAID-funded EcoHealth project with Shi Zhengli and Peter Daszak.	Shi Zhengli and Peter Daszak are collaborators on a research project funded by the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID). The funding is given to EcoHealth, which subsequently provides a subaward. Dr. Fauci remembers that this grant spans five years and ranges from \$500,000 to \$600,000, averaging around \$120,000 to \$130,000 per year. <a href="#">(36:7 - 36:13)</a>
- Fauci's Knowledge of Daszak's Access to WIV Genomes	Dr. Anthony Fauci was questioned about his knowledge regarding Peter Daszak's access to the genomes of viruses generated by Shi Zhengli at the Wuhan Institute of Virology, with whom Daszak collaborates on NIAID-funded research. Dr. Fauci asked for the question to be repeated to ensure his answer was accurate. <a href="#">(36:14 - 36:25)</a>
- Probable access to Coronavirus genomes	Dr. Anthony Fauci expressed uncertainty about whether Peter Daszak, a collaborator with Shi Zhengli on NIAID-funded research, has access to data produced by Zhengli, including Coronavirus genomes. Despite this, he suggested that such access is probable due to the standard practices of scientific collaboration. Fauci confirmed that Daszak and Zhengli seem to be collaborators, with Daszak having a subaward to the Wuhan Institute that is presumed to go to Dr. Shi. He also concurred that it would be typical and probable for someone in Daszak's position, who is essentially funding Zhengli through subawards, to have access to her data. <a href="#">(37:1 - 37:18)</a>
- Exhibit 5.	Mr. Sauer presented Dr. Anthony S. Fauci with Exhibit 5, which had been premarked for identification. <a href="#">(37:19 - 37:23)</a>
- Fauci's Chief of Staff	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci identified Greg Folkers as a member of his inner office and his immediate chief of staff in his office group. <a href="#">(37:24 - 38:4)</a>
- Communications Staff Member	Jennifer Routh is a member of the communications staff. <a href="#">(38:5 - 38:7)</a>
- Inner Office Talking Points for NIAID Director	Courtney Billet is a member of the communications staff and serves as the director of the Office of Communication, Legislative Affairs, and Government Outreach. The individuals listed on the CC line of a certain document are part of the immediate office of the director, also known as the inner office. An attachment was recognized, containing talking points for the NIAID director, Dr. Fauci. <a href="#">(38:8 - 38:21)</a>
- Fauci's Team of Nonhuman	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci acknowledged that his chief of staff, Greg Folkers, often prepares talking points for him for meetings or congressional briefings, particularly on unfamiliar subjects. He

Coronavirus Experts	<p>recognized an email from Folkers that referenced a team of nonhuman coronavirus experts, including Peter Daszak, Ralph Baric, and Ian Lipkin. Fauci interpreted Folkers' reference to these individuals as "their team" to mean they were either part of their group, known colleagues, or grantees. He also proposed that the "Vincent" mentioned in the email could be Vincent Munster, a scientist at NIAID.</p> <p><a href="#">(38:22 - 40:18)</a></p>
- Grant for Coronavirus Research in China	<p>Dr. Anthony Fauci is acquainted with Ian Lipkin, a scientist at the Columbia School of Public Health, whom he identifies as a grantee. He affirms that Peter Daszak's group has received funding from the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) for research on coronavirus in China over the past five years. The grant, titled "Understanding the risk of bat coronavirus emergence", is the same as the one mentioned in Exhibit 2, as confirmed by Fauci. Despite this, he does not remember the grant being specifically highlighted to him on January 27th, 2020. While he acknowledges the grant's mention in an email, he does not believe it was emphasized to the extent of requiring his focused attention. The grant's objective, as explained by Fauci, was to identify groups of people in China who had been exposed to bats to ascertain if they were contracting COVID-19. The Wuhan Institute was among the collaborators in this project, which aimed to investigate the potential for bat viruses to spill over to humans in a manner related to SARS-CoV-2.</p> <p><a href="#">(40:19 - 43:6)</a></p>
- Acknowledging Exhibit 6.	<p>Dr. Anthony S. Fauci acknowledged and noted the date of a document, labeled as Exhibit 6, that was presented to him during the examination.</p> <p><a href="#">(43:7 - 43:16)</a></p>
- International virologists' call on virus manipulation.	<p>Dr. Anthony S. Fauci became aware of the potential manipulation of the virus during a call with Christian Anderson and Jeremy Farrar, where it was suggested that the virus's unusual nature might indicate manipulation. In response, Fauci, possibly along with Farrar and Anderson, proposed forming a group of international evolutionary virologists to discuss the matter and plan the next steps. The call was scheduled for the next day, February 1st. Eddie Holmes might have participated in the call, but Fauci was not completely sure.</p> <p><a href="#">(43:17 - 45:1)</a></p>
- Fauci recognizes Holmes as evolutionary virologist.	<p>Dr. Anthony Fauci identified Eddie Holmes as a well-recognized evolutionary virologist based in Australia. He expressed uncertainty regarding whether Holmes receives funding from his agency.</p> <p><a href="#">(45:2 - 45:8)</a></p>
- Awareness of Eddie Holmes	<p>Dr. Anthony Fauci acknowledged awareness of Eddie Holmes, an esteemed evolutionary virologist based in Australia, but clarified that he does not have a personal acquaintance with him.</p> <p><a href="#">(45:9 - 45:12)</a></p>
- Fauci's knowledge of Anderson and virus origin/manipulation	<p>Dr. Anthony Fauci mentioned Christian Anderson in relation to a discussion about the origin and potential manipulation of the virus. He confirmed knowing Anderson, an internationally renowned scientist, but not well. He speculated that his first interaction with Anderson might have been during a phone call about the virus's origin and potential manipulation. He suggested that Anderson and another scientist, Jeremy, might have contacted him due to his reputation as a top infectious disease expert and the director of a major research institution for infectious diseases. Fauci agreed to answer questions directly and concisely during the deposition. He acknowledged sending an email to Anderson and Jeremy on January 31st, 2020, but could not recall if it referred to an article by Jon Cohen in Science Magazine. He confirmed sending a message, but could not recall if it was in reference to a specific article by Jon Cohen. He suggested that the article he sent might have been the one by Jon Cohen on mining coronavirus genomes for clues in the outbreak, given its proximity to his message in Exhibit 6. He speculated that the article might have been of interest because it discusses the genomic makeup of the virus, a topic of discussion at the time. He confirmed seeing a response email from Dr. Anderson, which mentioned that the genome was inconsistent with expectations from evolutionary theory.</p> <p><a href="#">(45:13 - 51:2)</a></p>
- Likely Eddie	<p>"Eddie" referred to in the second paragraph of the response email from Dr. Anderson is likely</p>

Holmes	Eddie Holmes, according to Dr. Anthony Fauci. <a href="#">(51:3 - 51:4)</a>
- Uncertain Identity of Bob Garry	Dr. Anthony Fauci expressed uncertainty regarding whether the individual known as "Bob" could be identified as Bob Garry. <a href="#">(51:5 - 51:6)</a>
- Unusual virus features and changing opinions.	Dr. Anthony Fauci was uncertain if the "Mike" referred to in Dr. Anderson's email was Mike Larabee. He confirmed that Dr. Anderson had noted unusual features in a virus that could potentially appear engineered, necessitating further scrutiny. This was discussed during their call on January 31st. Dr. Fauci highlighted that Dr. Anderson's email also indicated the possibility of changing opinions upon further analysis. He did not find this alarming but considered it interesting and significant. He concurred with the suggestion of involving a larger group of qualified evolutionary virologists to study the virus for a few days to ascertain if the concern was valid or if there was an alternative explanation. <a href="#">(51:7 - 52:19)</a>
- Fauci Examines Exhibit 6.	Dr. Fauci was directed to the eighth page of Exhibit 6, a document labeled with Bates Number 2432. Mr. Kirschner interjected due to confusion about the exhibit, which seemed to be a compilation of several documents. He asked for Dr. Fauci to be allowed adequate time to comprehend the exhibit. <a href="#">(52:20 - 53:4)</a>
- Fauci Review Exhibit 6 Page 8	Dr. Fauci was instructed to review the eighth page of Exhibit 6. Mr. Kirschner intervened, requesting that Dr. Fauci acquaint himself with the exhibit prior to responding to any inquiries. Mr. Sauer specified that his request was solely for Dr. Fauci to examine the eighth page. <a href="#">(53:5 - 53:13)</a>
- Incorrect Bates Stamping	Dr. Anthony Fauci had difficulty finding page 2432 in a document, observing that the pages were not in sequential order, with page 2430 followed by 2431 and then 2421. Mr. Kirschner concurred with Dr. Fauci's observation, noting that the Bates stamping was incorrect and page 2432 was placed between pages 2402 and 2426, which he objected to as misleading. A brief recess was taken at 9:04 a.m. before resuming at 9:05 a.m. <a href="#">(53:14 - 54:14)</a>
- Essential Conversation	Dr. Fauci acknowledged that he had seen the eighth page of Exhibit 6 and identified an email he sent to Hugh Auchincloss, which stated, "Hugh, it's essential that we speak." <a href="#">(54:15 - 54:23)</a>
- Email to Hugh Auchincloss	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed sending an email to Hugh Auchincloss, his principal deputy, at 12:29 a.m. on Saturday, February 1st. He did not remember who else was CC'd on this email and denied the likelihood of including one of his personal email addresses, as he rarely does so. <a href="#">(54:24 - 55:11)</a>
- Fauci uncertain about attachment content and authorship.	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci does not remember using his personal email for work-related matters. He acknowledges noticing an attachment on an email with the titles "SARS Baric, Shi, et al., Nature Medicine" and "SARS Gain of Function". He is uncertain about the exact content of the attachment but suggests it might be Exhibit No. 4. He verifies that the attachment could be the 2015 article coauthored by Ralph Baric and Shi Zhengli. Despite not recalling specifically attaching the exhibit to an email to Hugh, he considers it probable and in line with the attachment title. <a href="#">(55:12 - 56:19)</a>
- Nature Medicine article on SARS gain-of-function	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci confirmed that Exhibit 4 is an article from Nature Medicine and acknowledged that Baric and Shi are two of the co-authors. He also stated that the article seems to have been described as a SARS gain-of-function article. <a href="#">(56:20 - 57:7)</a>
- Fauci's memory unclear on article title and gain of function.	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci does not recall if he authored the title "SARS Baric, Shi, et al., Nature Medicine" for a 2015 article coauthored by Ralph Baric and Shi Zhengli, as referenced in Exhibit No. 4. He suggested the title might have been proposed by Baric, but his memory is unclear due to the elapsed time. He also does not remember if the article discusses the gain of function. <a href="#">(57:8 - 57:16)</a>

<p>- Funding surveillance research in China</p>	<p>Dr. Anthony Fauci sent an email to his principal deputy, Hugh, attaching a 2015 article coauthored by Ralph Baric and Shi Zhengli. He believes the email was related to the funding of surveillance research in China and was aimed at understanding the scope of the funding and the specific work being done by EcoHealth and others. Fauci requested Hugh to keep his cell phone on for a call with a group of evolutionary virologists, intending to gain a better understanding of collaborations with different scientists. However, he does not recall if he called Hugh's cell phone that day or if they had a conversation. He also asked Hugh to read the attached paper and an email he planned to forward. <a href="#">(57:17 - 59:9)</a></p>
<p>- Fauci's China Collaborations Inquiry</p>	<p>Dr. Anthony S. Fauci asked for briefings on the scope of collaborations and the nature of work funded in China. His concern was not that the funded work could have led to the creation of the coronavirus, but rather his lack of complete information about the work. He was preparing for a call with a group of established scientists and wanted to understand the extent of their activities. He did not remember discussing a 2015 Nature Medicine paper in a previous call or how the paper came to his attention. <a href="#">(59:10 - 60:11)</a></p>
<p>- Fauci's lack of recollection.</p>	<p>Dr. Anthony S. Fauci did not remember how he came to know about the Shi, Baric Nature Medicine paper. He also lacked recollection of the specifics of an email, labeled as Exhibit 5, related to a grant for coronavirus research funded in China. <a href="#">(60:12 - 60:25)</a></p>
<p>- Awareness of SARS Gain-of-Function and China Grants</p>	<p>Dr. Anthony Fauci became aware of the Shi, Baric Nature Medicine paper on SARS gain-of-function, but does not recall the specific day. He sent an email to Hugh Auchincloss, forwarding him the Jon Cohen article that he had previously sent to Christian Anderson and Farrar, but does not remember why. He also forwarded the Baric, Shi Nature Medicine article to Auchincloss, but does not recall the reason. He suggested that he might have wanted Auchincloss to be aware of their work in China due to concerns about a virus, but does not remember discussing this concern with Auchincloss. He was going to be on a call with a group of people knowledgeable in the field and wanted to understand the scope of their relationship regarding funding of grants in China, with which he was not familiar. He does not believe he raised the issue of these grants during the call, and was relatively silent during the discussion. He does not recall what he might have said during the call, as he was more interested in hearing what others had to say. He saw an email from himself to Lawrence Tabak. <a href="#">(61:1 - 65:5)</a></p>
<p>- NIH Deputy Director and Acting Director awareness of discussions.</p>	<p>Dr. Fauci identified Lawrence Tabak as the deputy director of the National Institutes of Health at the time and currently the acting director. He confirmed forwarding an article to Tabak, but could not recall the exact reason, suggesting it was likely for awareness of ongoing discussions. He mentioned that Francis Collins, the then director of NIH, was part of a phone call on the morning of February 1st, but was unsure if Tabak was also on the call. He could not recall if he sent the article to Tabak for Collins. He denied discussing with Collins on that day about the possibility that NIAID had funded research in China, stating it was common knowledge that they fund research in China. However, he was unsure if they discussed the specific issue of NIAID possibly funding coronavirus-related research in China. <a href="#">(65:6 - 68:4)</a></p>
<p>- Fauci's Exchange with Auchincloss on China Research Funding</p>	<p>Dr. Anthony S. Fauci confirmed his email exchange with Hugh Auchincloss on February 1st, 2020, though he was unsure of the exact context. He assumed it was about understanding the scope of research funding in China and had asked Hugh for information on all ongoing activities. Hugh's response indicated that all activities were approved by the NIH. Emily Erbeling, the director of the Division of Microbiology and Infectious Diseases, was identified as the person with the most knowledge of their funding activities in China. Fauci might have raised a concern about a 2015 research paper being inconsistent with the 2014 gain-of-function moratorium. He emphasized his interest in understanding their research funding in China, noting the grant in question was \$120,000 a year in a \$6.3 billion portfolio. He acknowledged his response to Hugh's email as "Okay, stay tuned." Fauci confirmed his response to Hugh's email but does not remember any follow-up communications or if he spoke to Emily Erbeling about it. He believes</p>

	Hugh did, as indicated in the email. He confirmed Emily's position at NIAID. <a href="#">(68:5 - 72:19)</a>
- Fauci Confirms Email from Farrar, Acknowledges Date Difference, Suggests Sensitive Information Discussions.	Dr. Fauci confirmed his ability to turn one page in an email from Hugh and acknowledged seeing an email from Jeremy Farrar dated February 1st, 2020, at 1524 at the bottom part of the page. He agreed that Eddie, located in Australia, would be on a different date than everyone else. He confirmed seeing the statement, "Information and discussion is shared in total confidence and not to be shared until agreement on next steps." Despite this, he did not remember any discussions with Jeremy Farrar about the call being kept in total confidence. He suggested that Jeremy might have wanted to ensure sensitive information was not shared without proper discussion first. He did not remember Jeremy mentioning anything about keeping the information in confidence, but he considered it possible and understandable. <a href="#">(72:20 - 74:11)</a>
- Confidentiality and Participants of Phone Call	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci mentioned keeping certain information confidential as discussed in Jeremy Farrar's email, but his memory of this is unclear. He saw a list of participants for a call in a document, and recalls that the selection of these participants was primarily done by individuals named Christian and Jeremy. Fauci does not believe he played a role in choosing the participants, but felt that Francis Collins, the director of NIH, should be included. He may have sent an email or connected Collins with the pending phone call. He recognizes Patrick Vallance, listed at the bottom of the document, as Sir Patrick Vallance, the chief scientific officer who reports to the prime minister of the United Kingdom. <a href="#">(74:12 - 75:17)</a>
- Government affiliation confirmation.	Dr. Anthony Fauci did not recognize any affiliations with any government for the individuals on the provided list of call participants. He acknowledged that many international scientists have government affiliations, but he could not confirm this for the individuals on the list. <a href="#">(75:18 - 75:25)</a>
- Wellcome Trust Director	Jeremy Farrar is the chief person at the Wellcome Trust in the United Kingdom. His exact title is unclear, being referred to as the director, CEO, or head of the organization. <a href="#">(76:1 - 76:5)</a>
- Good faith exchange on virus origin	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci stated that the Wellcome Trust, led by Jeremy Farrar, provides grants for scientific research, but the exact annual amount is not known. He mentioned a meeting on February 1st, where participants debated whether the virus originated in a lab or naturally. The discussion was characterized as a good faith exchange between individuals who respected each other's views. They discussed suspicions of potential manipulation and counter-arguments about compatibility with natural evolution. The meeting concluded with an agreement to further examine the sequences before reaching a definitive conclusion. Dr. Fauci did not remember any specific talk about the potential for conspiracy theories to be spread in the media or on social media during the call. <a href="#">(76:6 - 78:24)</a>
- Fauci's faint memory of distraction from public health.	Dr. Anthony Fauci does not recall any conversation on February 1st regarding worries that social media allegations of the virus originating from a lab could undermine scientific funding projects. He is unsure if he ever had this discussion with Jeremy Farrar. He has a faint memory of a concern, not related to social media, about shifting focus away from the primary objective of addressing the outbreak for the benefit of public health, which he describes as a distraction. <a href="#">(78:25 - 79:19)</a>
- Investigation of Natural Origin of Virus	Dr. Anthony Fauci stated that the theory of the virus escaping from a lab was not seen as a distraction from the response to the virus's spread. He highlighted that the scientists were focused on evidence and data, and any speculation not based on these could divert from more crucial tasks. The consensus was to spend more time investigating the virus's origin. Fauci confirmed that some scientists, including Christian, spent more time on this issue and concluded that their initial concern about the molecular basis was unwarranted, finding evidence suggestive of a natural evolution. He was later involved when a group of scientists, including Christian, published a preprint stating their findings. He also received a preprint of the article from Congress and others, which concluded that the molecular configuration of the virus was compatible with a natural occurrence. However, he did not recall any specific communications

	<p>with Jeremy Farrar after the call. He acknowledged the possibility of such communications due to their acquaintance but did not remember any communication specifically related to the subject in question. After the last question on this topic, a short break was taken at 9:37 a.m., and the proceedings resumed at 9:50 a.m.</p> <p><a href="#">(79:20 - 83:22)</a></p>
- Fauci's Email Exchange	<p>Dr. Anthony S. Fauci confirmed receiving an email from Jeremy and Christian Anderson, though he could not recall its content due to a large redaction. He acknowledged receiving an email from Jeremy Farrar on January 30th, thanking him for a conversation, to which he responded, mentioning a conversation with Jeremy and Patrick. However, he could not recall the details of this conversation or why he mentioned staying in close touch. Fauci confirmed receiving an email from Jeremy on February 1st, inviting him to a conference call, which he assumed was an invitation to a call that took place on February 1st. He acknowledged a line in Jeremy's email expressing a preference for a small group, but did not know why this preference was expressed.</p> <p>Fauci confirmed being asked to treat a matter in total confidence, speculating that this was due to the sensitive nature of the topic and the potential for widespread speculation without concrete evidence. He believed the intention was to have a group of qualified international evolutionary virologists discuss the matter before it was widely disseminated. He could not confirm whether the request was to prevent Dr. Anderson from sharing his concerns about the virus's origins potentially being from a lab.</p> <p>Fauci confirmed an email exchange with Jeremy Farrar and Francis Collins. He did not specifically recall discussing with Francis Collins about his involvement in a conference call, but acknowledged that his intention was to ensure the NIH director was on the call. He could not confirm whether Collins and Farrar spoke to each other.</p> <p>Fauci confirmed sending an email on February 1, 2020, at 20:30, with the subject "teleconference," and receiving an email from Jeremy Farrar sent to him, Francis Collins, Patrick Vallance, and Mike Ferguson.</p> <p><a href="#">(83:23 - 92:5)</a></p>
- Agreement to pause call, email from Jeremy Farrar.	<p>Dr. Anthony Fauci recognized the name Mike Ferguson but was unsure of who he was. He confirmed his agreement to Jeremy's proposal to pause a call for five to ten minutes, but could not recall if the call was indeed paused. He also did not remember the reason for Jeremy's request to pause the call or whether Jeremy had a conversation with him and Dr. Collins during the call. He identified an email from Jeremy Farrar dated February 1st, 2020, which included the same list of participants such as Francis Collins, Patrick Vallance, and Mike Ferguson.</p> <p><a href="#">(92:6 - 93:17)</a></p>
- Email chain review 2013.	<p>Dr. Anthony S. Fauci reviewed an email from 2013 involving Francis Collins, Patrick Vallance, and Mike Ferguson. He stated that he did not recall any details about Francis Collins responding to an email about shutting down a conference call. He also confirmed his involvement in an email chain at 22-06-26 between him, Jeremy, and Francis Collins.</p> <p><a href="#">(93:18 - 94:12)</a></p>
- "24/7 Availability for Tedros Call"	<p>Dr. Fauci acknowledged an email from Francis Collins to him and Jeremy, labeled at 2050, in a document. He confirmed the email stated, "Hi, Jeremy. I can make myself available at any time, 24/7, for the call with Tedros".</p> <p><a href="#">(94:13 - 95:4)</a></p>
- Fauci-Tedros Call Plan	<p>Dr. Anthony S. Fauci identified "Tedros" as the director general of the World Health Organization and confirmed a plan to have a call with him. The purpose of this call was to inform various relevant individuals about an ongoing investigation. While there was a discussion about contacting Tedros, Dr. Fauci clarified that it was not his responsibility, suggesting it was likely Jeremy's responsibility to contact and explain the deliberations to Tedros.</p> <p><a href="#">(95:5 - 96:7)</a></p>
- Exhibit 8 Request	<p>Mr. Sauer presented a document, marked as Exhibit 8, to Dr. Anthony S. Fauci during the examination. Mr. Kirschner requested copies of this document for both himself and Dr. Fauci.</p>

	<a href="#">(96:8 - 96:14)</a>
- No communications with WHO Director General	Dr. Anthony Fauci stated he does not remember any direct or indirect communications with Dr. Tedros, the director general of the World Health Organization. <a href="#">(96:15 - 96:21)</a>
- Involvement of WHO in Discussions	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci does not recall specifically if he contributed to the decision to involve the World Health Organization in the matter under discussion. He does remember, however, that during a phone call on February 9th, there was a general agreement that it would be advantageous to notify or involve key figures, such as the director general of the WHO, in the discussions. <a href="#">(96:22 - 97:6)</a>
- "Von An Interpretation"	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci identified a German phrase "von an" on Exhibit 8, which he interpreted as "to" and "from." He examined the document starting from the last page and moving one page forward to the second-to-last page. <a href="#">(97:7 - 97:18)</a>
- Fauci's review of document and Farrar's email.	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci confirmed his review of a document's second-to-last page, recognizing names like Jeremy Farrar, Fauci, Vallance, Dorsten, and Coopman as call participants. He also identified a sentence in Jeremy Farrar's email indicating the preparation of papers, existing media interest, and ongoing discussions on Twitter and WeChat. <a href="#">(97:19 - 98:9)</a>
- Fauci's unfamiliarity with WeChat.	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci confirmed that Twitter is a social media platform but expressed uncertainty about WeChat's status as a social media platform due to his lack of familiarity with it, as he does not use social media. <a href="#">(98:10 - 98:16)</a>
- Unknown Chinese Platform	Dr. Anthony Fauci does not know if the referred entity is a Chinese-based social media platform. <a href="#">(98:17 - 98:19)</a>
- Fauci not involved with social media.	Dr. Anthony Fauci does not remember Jeremy Farrar expressing worries about conversations concerning the virus's origins on social media. He also mentions that he is not involved with social media, as he does not have a Twitter account or use Facebook, and is not aware of any discussions on these platforms about the virus's origin. <a href="#">(98:20 - 99:10)</a>
- Encouraging Vaccination via FaceTime	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci communicated with Mark Zuckerberg and conducted three outward FaceTime discussions with him to encourage people to get vaccinated. <a href="#">(99:11 - 99:19)</a>
- Fauci's Knowledge of Social Media Platforms	Dr. Fauci stated that he did not know anyone else who works for a social media platform other than Mark Zuckerberg. <a href="#">(99:20 - 99:22)</a>
- Fauci's daughter at Twitter	Dr. Fauci's daughter previously held a position as a software engineer at Twitter. <a href="#">(99:23 - 100:1)</a>
- Fauci's daughter, Twitter software engineer	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci's daughter previously worked as a software engineer for Twitter. <a href="#">(100:2 - 100:3)</a>
- Fauci's daughter's lack of interest in virus origins	Dr. Anthony Fauci never discussed the content of posts on Twitter or other social media platforms with his daughter. He also never discussed with her the origins of the virus or concerns about the virus's origins, as she has no interest in that. <a href="#">(100:4 - 100:11)</a>
- Fauci's Daughter's Former Employment at Twitter	Dr. Fauci stated that his daughter previously worked as a software engineer for Twitter, but she ceased her employment with the company over a year ago. <a href="#">(100:12 - 100:17)</a>
- Fauci's Social Media Connections	Dr. Anthony Fauci does not know anyone else who works at a social media platform, apart from Mark Zuckerberg and his daughter, who previously worked as a software engineer for Twitter. <a href="#">(100:18 - 100:20)</a>
- Fauci's limited social media connections and	Dr. Anthony Fauci disclosed his limited connections with social media platforms, stating he only knows Mark Zuckerberg and his daughter from such platforms. He clarified that despite conducting numerous podcasts and interviews on Instagram, he does not consider the individuals

promotion of vaccination with Steph Curry.	involved as employees of the platform. He specifically cited his Instagram sessions with basketball player Steph Curry, aimed at promoting vaccination. Additionally, Fauci confirmed identifying an email from Jeremy Farrar in Exhibit 8, which started with the phrase "My view is completely neutral on this." <a href="#">(100:21 - 102:1)</a>
- Fauci Acknowledges Politicians and Media Questioning Scientific Literature	Dr. Anthony Fauci acknowledged that he saw a line in an email where Jeremy Farrar mentioned that politicians and media outlets were questioning based on scientific literature. He also sought clarification on who the email was sent to. <a href="#">(102:2 - 102:12)</a>
- Farrar's apprehension of Chinese blame and social media claims.	Dr. Anthony Fauci stated that he does not remember Jeremy Farrar expressing worries about discussions on social media concerning the virus's origins. He understood that Farrar was apprehensive about the Chinese being blamed, which could escalate tensions and obstruct necessary future cooperation. Farrar proposed the assembly of a reputable body to neutrally and transparently investigate the virus's evolutionary origins, aiming to curb unfounded claims. Fauci perceived Farrar's worry to be about these unfounded claims on both traditional and social media. Despite this, Fauci confessed to being detached from social media and is unaware of how to access a tweet. <a href="#">(102:13 - 103:14)</a>
- Misinformation Disruption	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci expressed his worry about the dissemination of misinformation or disinformation on social media about the origins of the virus. He indicated that these false claims have the potential to disrupt global efforts to save lives. <a href="#">(103:15 - 103:22)</a>
- Importance of Open Mind on Origins	Dr. Anthony Fauci emphasized the importance of maintaining an open mind regarding the origins of the virus and acknowledged that there are numerous discussions on the subject. <a href="#">(103:23 - 104:2)</a>
- Misinformation/Disinformation Dangers	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci did not express concern about the general spread of misinformation and disinformation about the virus. His concern was specific to certain types of misinformation and disinformation, such as the false claim that he and Bill Gates inserted a chip into the vaccine. He emphasized the potential danger of such misinformation, as it could deter people from getting vaccinated and potentially lead to loss of life. As a physician and scientist, he found this possibility troubling. <a href="#">(104:3 - 104:17)</a>
- Misinformation and Disinformation Spread on Social Media	Dr. Anthony Fauci expressed his worry about the dissemination of misinformation and disinformation, including false claims that he and Bill Gates inserted a chip into the vaccine. He recognized the role of social media in spreading information. He confirmed having sent an email on February 2, 2020, stating, "Like all of us, I do not know how this evolved." In the same email, he also expressed his concern about the potential for further distortions on social media. <a href="#">(104:18 - 105:24)</a>

**Dr. Anthony Fauci Testified About Virus Origins, Social Media Distortions, Who's Role, Safety in Virus Research, and Denied Knowledge of "gain-of-function" Research**

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
- Countering Social Media Distortions	Dr. Anthony Fauci expressed his concerns about the distortions on social media, including speculations and accusations blaming the Chinese for the pandemic and a claim that he had inserted a chip into the vaccine for monitoring purposes. He emphasized that there was no evidence to support these claims and stressed the need to counter these distortions swiftly with facts. Fauci proposed that the World Health Organization (WHO) should assemble an unbiased body to thoroughly scrutinize the information and ascertain the truth. He believed that swift truth-finding could help prevent and counter distortions. However, he was uncertain if the WHO had actually convened such a group. He acknowledged a general sentiment that the WHO should be involved due to the international implications of the situation. <a href="#">(105:25 - 107:25)</a>

- WHO Director General Tedros	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci identifies Tedros as the director general of the WHO. <a href="#">(108:1 - 108:5)</a>
- WHO involvement and Jeremy's responsibility	Dr. Fauci identified Bernard as a high-ranking official at the World Health Organization (WHO), possibly a close senior associate of Tedros, but could not recall Bernard's last name. He was uncertain about the meaning of the term "going into conclave," and did not know what decision was supposed to be made on the day in question, as referenced in a statement by Jeremy. He found Jeremy's use of words like "conclave" and "prevaricate" confusing and did not understand what Jeremy was referring to. He did not remember any follow-up call between himself, Jeremy Farrar, and Francis Collins. Dr. Fauci believed that Jeremy was going to take the lead on getting the WHO involved and that his own involvement with the WHO likely diminished or stopped at that time. He doubted there was any further communication between him and the WHO about this matter, considering it primarily Jeremy's responsibility. <a href="#">(108:6 - 110:8)</a>
- Email from Jeremy Farrar to Drs. Fauci, Tedros, Collins, and Shortlander	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci confirmed his receipt of an email from Jeremy Farrar, which was also sent to Dr. Tedros, Francis Collins, and Bernard Shortlander. He acknowledged viewing a list of bullet points within the email, including a specific point about collecting evidence from scientific literature and both mainstream and social media concerning the origins of the virus. <a href="#">(110:9 - 110:23)</a>
- Fauci's lack of knowledge on Farrar's WHO conversations	Dr. Anthony Fauci has no recollection or knowledge of Jeremy Farrar's conversations with the World Health Organization about social media discussions on the virus's origins. He saw this referenced in an email but has no additional information about Jeremy's interest in collecting evidence from scientific literature about the virus's origin. <a href="#">(110:24 - 111:8)</a>
- Exhibit 9	Dr. Anthony Fauci received a document labeled as Exhibit 9 while giving his testimony. <a href="#">(111:9 - 111:13)</a>
- Agreement to WHO Convening	Dr. Anthony Fauci acknowledged seeing the second page of Exhibit 9, an email he had sent to Francis Collins and Jeremy Farrar. He confirmed that he had agreed with a summary and analysis in the email and stressed the importance of initiating the World Health Organization's convening. However, he did not remember the specific summary and analysis he was referring to, citing the large volume of documents he receives. <a href="#">(111:14 - 112:11)</a>
- Review of Exhibit 9.	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed that he had reviewed the page preceding the first page of the document known as Exhibit 9. <a href="#">(112:12 - 112:14)</a>
- Email from Eddie Holmes to Jeremy Farrar	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed the existence of an email from Eddie Holmes to Jeremy Farrar. <a href="#">(112:15 - 112:17)</a>
- Fauci's Agreement and Uncertainty	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed his agreement with a summary mentioned in an email from Eddie Holmes to Jeremy Farrar, but clarified that he was unsure of the summary's context, whether it was a summary of a meeting discussion or post-meeting deliberations. He acknowledged Holmes' statements about the summary being "fundamental science and completely neutral as written" and not mentioning "other anomalies as this will make us look like loons," but expressed uncertainty about what Holmes was referring to. Fauci also expressed uncertainty about the meaning of "anomalies" in relation to a virus discussed in a February 1st call. He confirmed that he and Francis received a draft of a manuscript on evolutionary virology, outside his area of expertise, and while he remembered reviewing it, he did not recall making any significant comments on it. <a href="#">(112:18 - 114:15)</a>
- Merging Documents Concerns	Dr. Anthony Fauci was shown a document associated with a meeting and a paper Eddie was working on, labeled as Exhibit 10. Mr. Kirschner objected to these documents being marked as exhibits, stating that merging numerous documents could potentially distort the record. He voiced his worry about possibly unrelated documents being grouped together and pointed out that several exhibits, including Exhibit 10, had been marked in this way. <a href="#">(114:16 - 115:3)</a>

- Serial Passage in ACE2 Transgenic Mice	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci was part of an email chain on February 4th with Francis Collins and Jeremy Farrar, as indicated in Exhibit 10. He did not remember the specific context of his email that mentioned "serial passage in ACE2 transgenic mice." He clarified that "serial passage" is the term used for the sequential passage of a virus in mice. <a href="#">(115:4 - 116:3)</a>
- Serial Passage in Mice and BSL-2 Lab Concerns	Dr. Anthony Fauci stated that the sequential passage of a virus in mice, also known as "serial passage," could lead to the virus gaining function, losing function, or undergoing other changes. He did not remember the context or meaning of his previous mention of "serial passage in ACE2 transgenic mice." He acknowledged seeing a comment by Francis Collins about not conducting certain studies in a BSL-2 lab, but was unsure why Collins brought up this concern. Fauci speculated that Collins might have been implying that studies involving potentially dangerous viruses should be carried out in a higher level of containment. However, he confessed that he did not comprehend the context of the emails and they did not jog his memory of anything specific. <a href="#">(116:4 - 117:6)</a>
- BSL-2 safety research at Wuhan Institute of Virology	Dr. Anthony Fauci stated that the research conducted by Peter Daszak and Shi Zhengli at the Wuhan Institute of Virology, which involves pseudo viruses and in vitro things, is generally conducted at a BSL-2 safety level. <a href="#">(117:7 - 117:12)</a>
- Research safety levels and emails.	Dr. Anthony Fauci stated that the safety level for conducting "serial passage in ACE2 transgenic mice" varies by country and that in vivo experiments are usually done in a BSL-3 environment. He expressed uncertainty about the link between various emails. He confirmed the use of the term "Wild West" in an email from Jeremy but did not know its meaning. He also confirmed that Jeremy was referring to research conducted under BSL-2 safety conditions. However, he clarified that the term "gain-of-function" has a wide range of interpretations and he would need to know the specifics of the experiment to express concerns about conducting such research in BSL-2 conditions. <a href="#">(117:13 - 119:2)</a>
- Gain-of-Function Research & Serial Passage in ACE2 Transgenic Mice	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed that the experiments labeled as "gain-of-function research on viruses" and "serial passage in ACE2 transgenic mice", as outlined in the 2015 Shi (Peter Daszak and Shi Zhengli in the Wuhan Institute of Virology) and Baric paper, are indeed the type of experiments under discussion. <a href="#">(119:3 - 119:7)</a>

#### Dr. Fauci Testified That He Was Not Familiar with the 2015 Shi and Baric Paper or Its Restrictions

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
- Fauci's unfamiliarity with 2015 paper	Dr. Anthony Fauci was unfamiliar with the 2015 Shi and Baric paper, also known as Exhibit 2, and may not have read it thoroughly. He stated that he would need about an hour to review the paper to determine the level of restriction it would require. As a result, he could not provide an answer regarding the appropriateness of performing BSL-2 functions related to the experiment outlined in the paper. <a href="#">(119:8 - 119:17)</a>

#### Dr. Anthony Fauci Testified About Receiving a Virology Draft Paper, His Limited Involvement in Interpreting Information, Suggesting Names for a WHO Group, and Discussing Coronavirus Origins

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
- Initial lack of evidence	Dr. Fauci initially stated that he didn't have anything in front of him when presented with Exhibit 11. Exhibit No. 11 was subsequently marked for identification. <a href="#">(119:18 - 120:1)</a>
- Revised Draft Email Attachment	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci received an email on February 7th, 2020 from Jeremy. The email had a subject line "revised draft" and included an attachment titled "Summary, Feb 7 PDF". <a href="#">(120:2 - 120:9)</a>
- Draft Summary of Complex	Dr. Anthony Fauci does not have a clear memory of receiving a draft of a paper from Jeremy, which Eddie Holmes was working on and originated from a February 1st conference call. He

Evolutionary Virology	vaguely remembers receiving a draft summary and did not provide significant comments on it. He also clarified that the draft might have involved complex evolutionary virology, a subject outside his area of expertise. <a href="#">(120:10 - 120:20)</a>
- Awareness of Virus Origin, FOIA Requests	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed his awareness of the "overview" section in Dr. Fauci Exhibit No. 11, specifically acknowledging a sentence stating that the virus is not a laboratory construct or experimentally manipulated. However, he clarified that he is not qualified to definitively determine if a genome could be a laboratory construct or experimentally manipulated, as he is not an evolutionary virologist, and relies on experts in that field for such conclusions.  On the topic of Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests for his emails from NIAID and NIH, Dr. Fauci clarified that he was not directly involved in the process. He stated that he does not receive FOIA requests directly, nor does he decide which emails are provided in response. He also does not approve redactions to the emails and has no involvement in deciding what gets redacted, as these decisions are made at multiple levels beyond him. <a href="#">(120:21 - 122:23)</a>
- Exhibit 12 to Fauci	Mr. Sauer identified Exhibit 12 to Dr. Anthony Fauci during the examination. <a href="#">(122:24 - 123:2)</a>
- Email chain on February 4th with attachment "Summary.DOCX"	Dr. Anthony Fauci was part of an email chain on February 4th with Jeremy Farrar and Francis Collins, which included an attachment titled "Summary.DOCX", a rough first draft from Eddie and his team. The email requested confidentiality and promised an edited version later. Fauci confirmed that a January call consensus was to take more time for consideration. By February 4th, he had received a rough draft of a paper to be authored, but he did not recall receiving it specifically and stated he wouldn't have contributed much due to the complex nature of the paper's subject, evolutionary virology, a field he is not an expert in. He also confirmed that an email from Eddie Holmes had been forwarded to him by Jeremy. <a href="#">(123:3 - 124:20)</a>
- Pushing WHO for Open and Transparent Discussion	Dr. Anthony Fauci might have reviewed a draft paper forwarded to him by Jeremy, but did not make significant comments as it was outside his area of expertise. He saw an email from Jeremy stating "Pushing WHO again today", but denied having direct involvement with the World Health Organization (WHO) at that time. Despite this, he acknowledged sending an email stating the need to get the WHO moving. He clarified that while he did not directly interact with the WHO, the general consensus was that they wanted the WHO involved due to its status and convening power. The aim was to ensure an open and transparent discussion involving the international global health authority. <a href="#">(124:21 - 126:18)</a>
- Email with "Summary.PDF" attachment and "tidied up" content	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed receiving an email on February 4th from Jeremy, also sent to Francis Collins, with an attachment named "Summary.PDF" and the content stating "tidied up". He did not recall receiving a second draft of the "tidied up" document on the same day. The email did not significantly jog his memory as the information was not within his area of expertise and he was unsure about what "tidied up" meant. He agreed to refrain from going on long tangents and to answer the questions directly, clarifying that his intention was to provide appropriate context. <a href="#">(126:19 - 128:8)</a>
- Revised Drafts Exchange	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed that he turned to the next page of a document during the examination and acknowledged an email dated February 5th from Jeremy to him and Francis, which contained a revised draft from Eddie. He stated that he was not keeping up with the different drafts he received on February 4th and 5th and could not confirm the exact number due to the speed of the questioning. He agreed that there were a couple of drafts sent back and forth, but could not specify the exact number. He stated that he did not recall if he was aware that Peter Daszak was organizing a statement for The Lancet about the origins of the virus during the same time frame. <a href="#">(128:9 - 129:18)</a>
- Fauci's Lack of	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci does not remember a letter that was published in The Lancet in February

Recall	of 2020 and organized by Peter Daszak. He attributes this to the high volume of information he was dealing with at the time, making it hard to recall specific details about Peter Daszak's Lancet letter. He indicates that his memory might be refreshed if he were to see the letter again, but he does not assure this. <a href="#">(129:19 - 130:5)</a>
- Fauci's Break Confirmation	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci received Exhibit 13 for identification. Upon being asked by Mr. Kirschner about his need for a break, he confirmed that he was okay. <a href="#">(130:6 - 130:12)</a>
- WHO-convened group email exchange	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed receiving an email from Jeremy, which discussed contact with the World Health Organization (WHO) and an invitation for him and Francis Collins to join a call about the work of a WHO-convened group. He did not remember if this call occurred. The email also suggested putting forward names for the group and applying team pressure on the group. Dr. Fauci confirmed suggesting Pardis Sabeti, an expert on coronavirus evolution from the Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, for the working group in an email exchange, and that he provided this list to Jeremy. <a href="#">(130:13 - 132:25)</a>
- Fauci's WHO Name Proposals	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed his involvement in proposing names for inclusion in the World Health Organization's work. He doesn't remember consulting anyone prior to suggesting these names to Jeremy. The selection of these individuals was likely based on his familiarity with them or their proficiency in molecular virology, potentially following inquiries within his institute. <a href="#">(133:1 - 133:9)</a>
- Research Institution Backed by UCSF and Email List of Names	Dr. Anthony Fauci identified the Chan Zuckerberg Biohub as a research institution backed by the University of California at San Francisco. He acknowledged sending an email with a list of names, including Joseph DeRisi, to a person named Jeremy. He clarified that many names on the list were probably recommended by his institute's members, particularly from the division of microbiology and infectious diseases. He stressed the need for context regarding the list, noting that there were names he did not recognize. <a href="#">(133:10 - 134:22)</a>
- Fauci's lack of recognition for DeRisi	Dr. Anthony Fauci stated that he does not recognize the name Joseph DeRisi, suggesting that it was likely provided to him by someone in his institute. He acknowledged familiarity with Harold Varmus and Dan Gannon, but denied knowing Eugene Koonin. He stressed the high probability that these names were given to him by others and reiterated his lack of recognition for the name Joseph DeRisi. <a href="#">(134:23 - 135:14)</a>
- Well-known virologist Pardis Sabeti	Dr. Anthony Fauci identified Pardis Sabeti as a well-known virologist. <a href="#">(135:15 - 135:18)</a>
- Fauci's Consultation for WHO Group	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci likely did not consult Pardis Sabeti before including her in an email to Jeremy for the WHO group due to her well-known status in molecular virology. He probably did not speak to Don Gannon before adding his name to the list for Jeremy. He did not believe he had spoken to anyone on the list, and selected some names he knew, like Varmus and Nabel, while others were likely suggested by his staff. When asked about an email from Jeremy about framing the work of a group, Fauci was not certain what Jeremy meant, but inferred that it usually involves defining the theme and the question being asked. <a href="#">(135:19 - 136:25)</a>
- Fauci's WHO Group Conversations	Dr. Anthony Fauci does not remember any conversations about intending to shape the work of the WHO group mentioned in Jeremy's email to him and Francis. <a href="#">(137:1 - 137:4)</a>
- WHO pressure confusion	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci does not know what Jeremy was referring to when he mentioned pressure on the WHO group from his and their teams. <a href="#">(137:5 - 137:16)</a>
- WHO investigation collaboration	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci does not remember any talks about pressuring the World Health Organization (WHO) concerning the investigation into the virus's origins. He mentions a general agreement for the WHO's involvement due to its convening power and credibility. The goal was

	to foster an open discussion, with the WHO viewed as the most suitable platform. He refutes any plans to pressure the WHO, instead stating the intention was to motivate them to organize a meeting. <a href="#">(137:17 - 138:6)</a>
- WHO trip to China investigation	Dr. Anthony Fauci does not remember if there was a conversation about the World Health Organization (WHO) sponsoring a trip to China to investigate the virus during the specific time frame in question. He does recall that the WHO sent a team to China, but he is unsure if discussions about this team's departure coincided with the time frame under discussion. He knows that there was an intention to form a WHO team and that the Health and Human Services (HHS) and the National Institutes of Health (NIH) were likely approached for suggestions on suitable individuals to travel to China for data collection. <a href="#">(138:7 - 139:11)</a>
- Fauci's recommendation of Lane for China virus investigation	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci suggested that he may have recommended Dr. Clifford Lane to investigate the virus in China around February 2020 due to Dr. Lane's international experience, including his work with Ebola in Africa and in Southeast Asia. However, he could not recall this recommendation specifically. He was uncertain about the reason for receiving an email titled "WHO advance team on way to China, Tedros tweet". He confirmed that Dr. Lane did participate in the trip to China. <a href="#">(139:12 - 140:13)</a>
- Fauci's February 2020 Comments on Virus Origins and WHO Trip	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci does not remember making any public comments about the virus's origins in February 2020, which coincides with the period when a World Health Organization-sponsored trip to China to investigate the virus was being discussed. He also may have suggested Dr. Clifford Lane for this trip. <a href="#">(140:14 - 140:18)</a>
- Fauci-Daszak Contact/Conversations	Dr. Anthony Fauci may have had contact or conversations with Peter Daszak about the origins of the virus, but he does not recall. He also does not know Peter Daszak very well. <a href="#">(140:19 - 141:1)</a>
- Fauci's Hundreds of Podcasts	Dr. Anthony Fauci participated in an interview with Peter Daszak, but he would not have remembered it if it hadn't been brought to his attention. He has participated in several hundred podcasts. <a href="#">(141:2 - 141:14)</a>
- Fauci's NIAID Website Media Appearances	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci was shown Exhibit 15, a document related to a podcast he participated in with Newt Gingrich and Peter Daszak on February 9th, 2020. He admitted that he likely wouldn't have remembered the podcast without the document, as he has participated in several hundred podcasts in recent years. Even after viewing the document, he did not remember this specific podcast. He clarified that his comment "Definitely for the director's page" on the document referred to a section on the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases website where media appearances, podcasts, and papers are posted for public access. <a href="#">(141:15 - 142:17)</a>
- Fauci Dismisses Wuhan Theory as Conspiracy	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed his review of Exhibit 16, an informal transcription of his podcast remarks. The document accurately quoted him responding to Newt Gingrich's question about the coronavirus's origin and a theory of its escape from a Wuhan biological warfare center. Fauci dismissed the Wuhan theory as a conspiracy and stated that such diseases typically originate from an animal reservoir. Although he did not remember making this specific statement, he acknowledged its accuracy if the transcript was correct. He further illustrated his belief by citing the evolution of SARS-CoV-1 from a bat to a civet cat to a human. <a href="#">(142:18 - 144:19)</a>
- Animal-origin of COVID-19	Dr. Fauci clarified that diseases predominantly originate from animal reservoirs based on historical experience. He acknowledged a suggestion that the coronavirus may have originated from a flea market or potentially a biological weapons laboratory in Wuhan. He confirmed seeing a quote from Daszak stating, "All the evidence says that is what happened," but did not recall Daszak making that statement, citing the numerous podcasts he participates in and the difficulty in remembering specifics from each one. <a href="#">(144:20 - 146:25)</a>

<p>- Fauci-Daszak-Baric Discussions</p>	<p>Dr. Anthony Fauci did not remember having direct conversations with Peter Daszak about the origins of the SARS-CoV-2 virus in February 2020. He admitted the possibility of discussions with Daszak but did not specifically recall them. He considered being on a podcast with Daszak discussing the virus origins as a form of discussion. However, he did not remember having a discussion about the origins at the time the question was asked.</p> <p>As for Dr. Ralph Baric, Fauci knows of him but wouldn't claim to know him personally. He was uncertain if he had met Baric at a meeting. He recognized Baric as a well-established scientist but could not confirm if they had ever met. He did not remember having a one-on-one meeting with Baric, although he considered it possible given the number of scientists he has met over the years in his position. <a href="#">(147:1 - 148:3)</a></p>
<p>- Receipt of Exhibit 17</p>	<p>Dr. Anthony S. Fauci received Exhibit 17 during the examination. A break was requested by Mr. Kirschner, which Mr. Sauer agreed to take after the exhibit. Mr. Kirschner also requested to have the exhibit. Dr. Fauci confirmed that he received Exhibit 17. <a href="#">(148:4 - 148:17)</a></p>
<p>- Fauci's Outlook Calendar Meeting</p>	<p>Dr. Anthony S. Fauci confirmed that he saw an exhibit showing a page from his official Outlook calendar dated February 11th, 2020, which marked a meeting at 2:30 p.m. with Dr. Ralph Baric, and the invitation came from Emily Erbelding. However, he did not remember if the meeting with Dr. Baric actually occurred, despite it being on his calendar. He explained his difficulty in remembering specific meetings due to the hundreds of meetings he had in conference room 7A-18 with various scientists. <a href="#">(148:18 - 149:18)</a></p>

**Dr. Fauci Testified That Misinformation About Vaccinations Can Be Deadly and He Doesn't Recall Receiving an Email from Ian Lipkin**

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
<p>- Fauci's Outlook Calendar Conversation</p>	<p>Dr. Anthony Fauci does not recall the conversation he had with Dr. Ralph Baric on February 11th, 2020, as noted in his official Outlook calendar. Following this statement, a break was taken in the proceedings. <a href="#">(149:19 - 150:7)</a></p>
<p>- Misinformation and Disinformation Leading to Loss of Life</p>	<p>Dr. Fauci confirmed that the spread of misinformation and disinformation, particularly through platforms like social media, can lead to loss of life. He clarified that the method of dissemination does not change the potential for such misinformation and disinformation to result in loss of life. <a href="#">(150:8 - 150:17)</a></p>
<p>- Fauci's confusion on social media misinformation.</p>	<p>Dr. Anthony Fauci expressed confusion when questioned about his belief on whether misinformation and disinformation on social media can lead to loss of life. He also observed that the court reporter was shaking their head and was informed that the counsel needed to slow down. <a href="#">(150:18 - 151:1)</a></p>
<p>- Social Media Misinformation Risk</p>	<p>Dr. Fauci stated his belief that misinformation and disinformation on social media can result in loss of life. He specifically pointed out the danger of egregious misinformation that discourages vaccination, asserting that such misinformation could lead to preventable deaths if it dissuades people from pursuing life-saving interventions. <a href="#">(151:2 - 151:11)</a></p>
<p>- Freedom of Speech &amp; Vaccinations</p>	<p>Dr. Anthony Fauci does not hold an opinion on the necessity of measures to limit the spread of misinformation and disinformation that might deter individuals from receiving vaccinations. He is aware of the principle of freedom of speech, but emphasizes that the restriction of this freedom is a legal issue, which is not his area of expertise. <a href="#">(151:12 - 151:20)</a></p>
<p>- Fauci's Vaccination Promotion on Facebook Podcast</p>	<p>Dr. Anthony S. Fauci has never requested a social media company to remove misinformation from their platforms. His interactions with Mark Zuckerberg were only about appearing on a Facebook podcast to promote vaccination. He is not aware of anyone from his staff at NIAID</p>

	contacting a social media platform to request content removal or blocking, but he admitted that he might not be aware of all actions taken by his staff. <a href="#">(151:21 - 152:16)</a>
- Email from Ian Lipkin, Feb 11, 2020	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci was shown Exhibit 18, an email from Ian Lipkin dated February 11th, 2020. Before confirming whether he was copied on this email, he asked to read the email to ascertain if it was addressed to him. <a href="#">(152:17 - 153:7)</a>
- Fauci unable to confirm email from Lipkin	Dr. Anthony Fauci could not definitively confirm if an email he received on February 11th, 2020 was from Ian Lipkin, citing the high volume of emails he receives daily as the reason. Despite having regular communication with Ian Lipkin, he did not recall this specific email. <a href="#">(153:8 - 153:20)</a>

### Dr. Anthony Fauci Testified About Covid-19's Origin, Dismissing Lab Leak Theories, and Emphasized the Importance of Social Distancing and Lockdowns

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
- Circumstantial Evidence and Outbreak Origins	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci acknowledged seeing Ian Lipkin's statement about the "nightmare of circumstantial evidence" concerning bat coronavirus research at the Wuhan Institute and the emergence of the first human cases in the same location. He expressed uncertainty about Lipkin's comment's exact meaning, suggesting that Lipkin might be referring to the tendency to associate an outbreak with ongoing research in the same area. Fauci stated that he does not typically consider circumstantial evidence. He noted that there's always concern about an outbreak's origin, and if a research institution is involved, there's often speculation about its role. He mentioned people questioning activities in Frederick, Maryland, despite his belief that nothing concerning is happening there. <a href="#">(153:21 - 155:14)</a>
- "Varying Interpretations of 'Nightmare'"	Dr. Anthony Fauci refrained from directly responding to the hypothetical scenario of the virus escaping from the lab in the context of bat coronavirus research at the Institute in Wuhan. He provided commentary on the term "nightmare," characterizing it as a subjective term with varying interpretations. <a href="#">(155:15 - 155:21)</a>
- Natural Occurrence vs Lab Leak Possibility	Dr. Anthony Fauci expressed his belief that the evidence suggests the virus is likely a natural occurrence, but stressed the importance of remaining open to all possibilities regarding its origins. If the virus did escape from a lab, he emphasized the need to prevent such incidents in the future. Addressing a hypothetical scenario where the virus was not naturally occurring and had escaped from a lab, with the research creating the virus partly funded by NIAID, he explained the significant molecular differences between SARS-CoV-2 and the viruses studied under the NIAID-funded subaward to the Wuhan Institute. He clarified that these differences make it molecularly impossible for the latter to become SARS-CoV-2. While he acknowledged a possible leak from a Chinese lab, he stated it could not have resulted from the experiments funded by the NIH due to these molecular differences. <a href="#">(155:22 - 157:22)</a>
- Removal of Genomic Sequences from WIV Website	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci was queried about his knowledge regarding the removal of a significant number of genomic sequences from the Wuhan Institute of Virology's website in September 2019. He sought further clarification on the question's specifics. <a href="#">(157:23 - 158:8)</a>
- Removal of Virus Sequences from WIV Database, Sept 2019	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed his awareness of the removal of genomic sequences of viruses, potentially linked to NIH-funded research and experiments, from publicly accessible databases at the Wuhan Institute of Virology in September 2019. He clarified that despite their removal from a database not associated with his institute, these sequences were published in literature and were not unknown. <a href="#">(158:9 - 158:17)</a>
- Exhibit 19 Confusion	Mr. Sauer presented Exhibit 19 to Dr. Fauci during the examination. There was a brief confusion about the exhibit number, which was clarified as 19, not 20.

	<a href="#">(158:18 - 159:1)</a>
- Preprint of SARS-CoV-2 Origin	Dr. Anthony Fauci identified FAUCI Exhibit No. 19 as the preprint version of the proximal origin of SARS-CoV-2 from February 17th, 2020. He believed a copy was likely sent to him and Dr. Collins, but he did not remember it specifically. He likely skimmed the preprint but did not fully comprehend its molecular virology due to his lack of expertise in evolutionary virology. He also likely refrained from making substantive comments on it due to this lack of expertise. <a href="#">(159:2 - 160:12)</a>
- Fauci's involvement in SARS-CoV-2 paper	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci was copied on four drafts of the preprint version of the proximal origin of SARS-CoV-2 paper on February 4th, 5th, and 7th, sent to him by Jeremy Farrar. He was unsure if Eddie Holmes wrote these drafts, but acknowledged that both Holmes and Farrar are associated with the paper, which has five authors in total. Fauci believed all these individuals were present on a call organized by Farrar on February 1st at 2:00 p.m., but was uncertain if Ian Lipkin was also on the call. He identified Lipkin as the person who had sent an email six days prior, expressing concern about a "nightmare of circumstantial evidence" to address. <a href="#">(160:13 - 161:22)</a>
- Fauci's awareness of SARS-CoV-2 document	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed his awareness of a document associated with Eddie Holmes and Jeremy Farrar, which stated that SARS-CoV-2 is neither a laboratory construct nor a purposely manipulated virus. He did not remember discussing this conclusion with the authors, but he did not rule out the possibility of discussing it with Francis Collins, the director of NIH, given their close acquaintance. <a href="#">(161:23 - 162:24)</a>
- Fauci-Collins-Farrar Discussions on SARS-CoV-2 Origin	Dr. Anthony Fauci does not remember discussing with Jeremy Farrar the conclusion that "SARS-CoV-2 is not a laboratory construct nor a purposely manipulated virus". He wouldn't be surprised if such discussions took place. He thinks it's more probable that he had this type of conversation with Dr. Collins, and maybe with Dr. Farrar, but he can't confirm it. <a href="#">(162:25 - 163:6)</a>
- Fauci-Sauer Presentation	Exhibit 20 was presented to Dr. Anthony Fauci by Mr. Sauer during the examination. <a href="#">(163:7 - 163:10)</a>
- WHO mission to China with Dr. Lane.	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed that he had seen an article from the NIH record titled "NIAID's Lane Discusses WHO COVID-19 Mission to China". He agreed that the first paragraph of this article discusses Dr. Cliff Lane, who was the patient in the previously discussed WHO mission. <a href="#">(163:11 - 163:21)</a>
- COVID-19 Mission to China	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed that he saw a quote from Dr. Cliff Lane at the bottom of page 5 in the document titled "NIAID's Lane Discusses WHO COVID-19 Mission to China". <a href="#">(163:22 - 164:6)</a>
- Chinese management of situation.	Dr. Fauci confirmed that the Chinese were managing a situation in a very structured, organized way, as stated on page 5 of an NIH report. This statement was made in reference to an observation by Mr. Lane following his trip. <a href="#">(164:7 - 164:19)</a>
- China's Outbreak Control and Global Lessons Learned	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed that Dr. Cliff Lane had expressed that upon their arrival, the outbreak was already being controlled in China due to effective measures. Dr. Lane also believed that the Chinese felt they had learned lessons they wished to share globally. <a href="#">(164:20 - 165:1)</a>
- Chinese outbreak response evaluation	Dr. Anthony Fauci discussed Dr. Cliff Lane's trip to China and his impressions of the Chinese approach to handling an outbreak. This included methods such as isolation, contact tracing, and facility construction. Dr. Lane suggested that extreme social distancing measures might be necessary to control the outbreak, a conclusion Dr. Fauci agreed with, despite not having personally witnessed the situation in China. Dr. Fauci expressed confidence in Dr. Lane's evaluation but was unsure if Dr. Lane had communicated with Chinese officials during his trip and could not remember the identities of any officials Dr. Lane might have interacted with. <a href="#">(165:2 - 167:13)</a>
- Email from Cliff Lane, Feb. 22, 2020	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed seeing an email from Cliff Lane on February 22, 2020. <a href="#">(167:14 - 167:21)</a>
- China's extreme	Dr. Anthony Fauci received an email from Cliff Lane on February 22nd, 2020, indicating that

methods for infection control.	China had shown the capacity to control the infection, but at a significant cost. He interpreted "great cost" as the implementation of extreme methods. He agreed that China had used such extreme methods to control the infection, although he could not remember the precise details of his conversation with Dr. Lane. <a href="#">(167:22 - 168:9)</a>
- "Extreme Lockdown and Social Distancing to Control Virus Spread"	Dr. Anthony Fauci expressed that extreme lockdowns, including home confinement, were used to control the infection. He emphasized the importance of social distancing in managing the virus spread, particularly during the early stages of the epidemic when New York was heavily impacted. He highlighted the severity of the situation by referring to instances where freezer trucks were filled with dead bodies from hospitals. Fauci stressed the need for social distancing to prevent hospitals from reaching capacity and having to decide who would live and die. He also stated that to effectively interrupt the virus spread, which has a high potential for fatalities, social distancing measures should involve the entire community, not just high-risk individuals. <a href="#">(168:10 - 170:8)</a>

**Dr. Anthony Fauci Testified About His Limited Role in a COVID-19 Paper, Interactions with Mark Zuckerberg, and Refusal of Facebook's Ad Credit Offer**

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
- Email Chain Involving Fauci, Anderson, Farrar, and Collins	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed his involvement in an email chain, labeled as Exhibit 22, along with Christian Anderson, Jeremy Farrar, and Francis Collins. <a href="#">(170:9 - 170:16)</a>
- Fauci's Involvement in Email Chain	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed his involvement in an email chain with the other authors of the "Proximal Origins of COVID-19" paper. He acknowledged receiving an email from Anderson on March 6th, 2020, at 4:23 p.m., in which Anderson expressed gratitude towards Jeremy, Tony, and Francis for their guidance and leadership on the SARS-CoV-2 origin paper. <a href="#">(170:17 - 171:4)</a>
- Jeremy Farrar email	Jeremy, mentioned in the March 6th, 2020 4:23 p.m. email from Anderson, is identified as Jeremy Farrar. <a href="#">(171:5 - 171:6)</a>
- "Tony and Francis"	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci confirmed that the names "Tony" and "Francis" refer to himself and Francis Collins, respectively. <a href="#">(171:7 - 171:10)</a>
- Fauci's minimal involvement in paper	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci had minimal involvement in the preparation of the "Proximal Origins of COVID-19" paper, as mentioned in Anderson's March 6th, 2020 email. Anderson's gratitude towards Fauci for his advice and leadership was more a polite gesture and possibly acknowledged Fauci's efforts in disseminating information. Fauci's contribution to the paper was not substantial. <a href="#">(171:11 - 171:25)</a>
- COVID-19 paper input possibility acknowledged.	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed his invitation to comment on the "Proximal Origins of COVID-19" paper, as referenced in a March 6th, 2020 email from Anderson. He acknowledged the possibility of making changes to the paper at that time. However, he did not remember making any significant comments on the paper. He suggested that any compliments he may have given were likely courtesies and did not indicate substantial input into the paper. <a href="#">(172:1 - 173:1)</a>
- Zuckerberg's "Tony" Email	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci received an email from Mark Zuckerberg on February 27, 2020, where Zuckerberg addressed him as "Tony" and expressed gratitude for Fauci's statement on the COVID-19 vaccine. Fauci mentioned that it's common for people, including those he hasn't met, to call him "Tony". He couldn't remember the first time he met Zuckerberg and wasn't certain if they had ever met face-to-face, but he did confirm his participation in Zoom and Facebook events with Zuckerberg. <a href="#">(173:2 - 174:5)</a>
- Fauci's SFGH	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci has connections with researchers at the San Francisco General Hospital, a

Connections	facility backed by the Chan Zuckerberg Institute. His level of acquaintance with these researchers ranges from mere recognition to active interaction over the years within the medical and scientific community. He acknowledged knowing these researchers and stated that his institute frequently interacts with them. However, he was unsure about the meaning of "Bio Club" and the exact definition of "relationship" in this context. <a href="#">(174:6 - 175:9)</a>
- Zuckerberg-Fauci Zoom Interaction	Dr. Anthony Fauci stated that he does not remember the specific details of his first meeting with Mark Zuckerberg, which was initiated by an email from Zuckerberg on February 27, 2020. He suggested that their first interaction was probably via a Zoom call and he does not believe they have met in person. He confirmed that he has interacted with Zuckerberg multiple times on Facebook Zoom-type podcasts. <a href="#">(175:10 - 175:18)</a>
- Fauci-Zuckerberg Interaction	Dr. Anthony Fauci stated he does not remember interacting with Mark Zuckerberg before the COVID-19 outbreak, although he did not rule out the possibility of such an encounter. He was shown an email from Zuckerberg dated March 15th, 2020, in the document he was reviewing. <a href="#">(175:19 - 176:10)</a>
- Fauci's Q&A with Zuckerberg on virus measures and PSAs	Dr. Fauci confirmed that he read a paragraph from a document about conducting a series of live-streamed Q and As. He participated in three of these with Mark Zuckerberg, during which he answered important questions about public health measures and the virus. He acknowledged that the document stated that Facebook had allocated technical resources and millions of dollars of free ad credits for the U.S. Government to use for Public Service Announcements (PSAs). He agreed that the platform mentioned in the document was likely Facebook. <a href="#">(176:11 - 177:16)</a>
- Fauci declines Facebook donation, uncertain of PSA funds	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci declined Facebook's offer to donate millions of dollars in free ad credit, citing his lack of authority to accept such funds and stating that such a transaction would need to follow a different process. He expressed uncertainty about whether Facebook had given any money to the U.S. government for public service announcements (PSAs). Although he remembered an offer from Facebook to assist in spreading information, he did not remember any funds being specifically allocated for PSAs. <a href="#">(177:17 - 178:4)</a>

### **Dr. Anthony Fauci Testified About the Origins of COVID-19, Denying It Was Lab-made or Purposely Manipulated, and Denied Involvement in Social Media Censorship**

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
- Redacted Confidential Document	Exhibit 24, presented during the deposition, included what seemed to be Mark Zuckerberg's personal cell phone number. This document, marked as confidential, was obtained from the government. There was consensus on redacting the phone number before making the document public. <a href="#">(178:5 - 178:16)</a>
- Fauci Exhibit No. 24	Fauci Exhibit No. 24 was marked for identification during the examination. <a href="#">(178:17 - 178:20)</a>
- SARS-CoV-2 Nature Medicine Article	Dr. Anthony Fauci could not initially confirm if Exhibit 24 was the published version of the "Proximal Origin of SARS-CoV-2" without viewing the document. After receiving more information, he recognized the document as the original, published, peer-reviewed article from Nature Medicine, Volume 27, April 2020. He was unable to definitively confirm if this was the same document that Dr. Anderson had previously sent him a preprint version of. However, he made a reasonable assumption that Exhibit 24 was the peer-reviewed version of the preprint, based on the matching title and authors. <a href="#">(178:21 - 180:3)</a>
- SARS-CoV-2 Origin	SARS-CoV-2, the virus responsible for COVID-19, is neither a laboratory construct nor a purposely manipulated virus. This information is based on the analyses of the published version of the "Proximal Origin of SARS-CoV-2" which was made available online on March 17th, 2020.

	<a href="#">(180:4 - 180:7)</a>
- COVID-19 not laboratory construct	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci had minimal input, if any, into the conclusion that SARS-CoV-2 is not a laboratory construct or a purposely manipulated virus. He did not remember specific discussions about this conclusion, but he had read the preprint and was aware of the conclusion. He also suggested that he might have discussed the conclusion with others since it was public knowledge, but he could not recall any specific individuals. He confirmed the authenticity of a blog post by Francis Collins, the NIH director, dated March 26th, 2020, and had no reason to doubt that it was posted on Dr. Collins' director's page. <a href="#">(180:8 - 182:18)</a>
- Natural Origin of COVID-19 Uncertainty	Dr. Anthony Fauci acknowledged awareness of a statement by Director Collins regarding claims that the new coronavirus was engineered in a lab. He confirmed that Collins referenced a study providing evidence of the virus's natural origin and described these findings as reassuring, citing the Nature Medicine article "Proximal Origins of COVID-19". Fauci, however, expressed uncertainty about his awareness of Collins preparing this blog post, stating he might have been aware but did not recall reading or discussing it with Collins prior to its publication. He suggested the possibility of having read it, but did not specifically remember doing so. <a href="#">(182:19 - 185:1)</a>
- Media Coverage of "Proximal Origins of COVID-19"	Dr. Fauci was shown Exhibit 26, which pertained to the media coverage of the article "Proximal Origins of COVID-19". Before he could respond to questions about his awareness of this coverage at the time of publication, there was a mix-up about the exhibit number and whether Dr. Fauci had the right document. The exhibit was subsequently identified as FAUCI Exhibit No. 26. <a href="#">(185:2 - 185:19)</a>
- COVID-19 not a laboratory construct	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed that he saw an ABC News article titled "Sorry, conspiracy theorists. Study concludes COVID-19 is not a laboratory construct". He also confirmed the article's date as March 27th, 2020, which was a day after the NIH director's blog post that was previously discussed. <a href="#">(185:20 - 186:4)</a>
- COVID-19 media communication	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci does not recall communicating with the media about the "Proximal Origins of COVID-19" article from Nature Medicine at the time of its publication. <a href="#">(186:5 - 186:10)</a>
- Awareness of Communication with Media	Dr. Anthony Fauci is unaware if Dr. Francis Collins communicated with the media about the Nature Medicine article "Proximal Origins of COVID-19". <a href="#">(186:11 - 186:13)</a>
- NIAID staff and media interaction regarding COVID-19 article	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci does not recall if any staff from the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, which he supervises, interacted with the media regarding "the Nature Medicine article" (Proximal Origins of COVID-19). However, he does not rule out the possibility that such communication may have occurred. <a href="#">(186:14 - 186:18)</a>
- No contact from Collins on article.	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci did not receive any contact from Dr. Francis Collins regarding the Nature Medicine article "Proximal Origins of COVID-19" following Collins' blog post about the same article on March 26th. <a href="#">(186:19 - 187:7)</a>
- Familiarity with Exhibit 27.	Dr. Anthony Fauci received Exhibits 26 and 27, which were documents pertinent to the deposition. He clarified to Mr. Sauer that the document under discussion was Exhibit 27, an email from Francis Collins to him. After requesting and taking time to read the email, he confirmed his familiarity with it. <a href="#">(187:8 - 188:1)</a>
- Fauci's lack of recall of Collins' email on misinformation.	Dr. Anthony Fauci did not remember receiving a particular email from Dr. Francis Collins on April 14th, 2020 at 5:02 p.m. The email, shown to him during the deposition, was a communication from Collins to Fauci, expressing worry about misinformation and inquiring if the national academy could do more to intervene. The email also included a statement from Collins questioning if the NIH could assist in calming a rising and harmful conspiracy. Although Fauci did not recall the email, he recognized that Collins was evidently worried about these

	<p>matters.  <a href="#">(188:2 - 188:18)</a></p>
- Email reference to lab leak theory as "destructive conspiracy"	<p>Dr. Anthony S. Fauci acknowledged an email he received that referred to the lab leak theory of COVID-19's origins as a "very destructive conspiracy". He indicated that the sender, Francis, seemed to believe that the scientific data strongly suggested a natural occurrence of the virus. Fauci did not recall Francis using the term "destructive conspiracy" in person, but confirmed its use in the email. He suggested that any further interpretation of Francis's words should be sought directly from Francis. Fauci was unable to read a linked Bret Baier report in the email due to visibility issues. He confirmed that Francis asked if there was anything more they could do to dispel the conspiracy theory, possibly by increasing the visibility of a Nature Medicine article on the genomic sequence of the virus. Fauci interpreted this as Francis's desire to focus on scientific data rather than unfounded hypotheses.  <a href="#">(188:19 - 191:18)</a></p>
- Fauci's preoccupation with other responsibilities.	<p>Dr. Anthony S. Fauci did not make efforts to enhance the visibility of the Nature Medicine article on the genomic sequence after getting an email from Dr. Collins due to his preoccupation with numerous other responsibilities.  <a href="#">(191:19 - 191:22)</a></p>
- "Shiny Object Theory"	<p>Dr. Anthony S. Fauci does not remember responding to an email from Dr. Collins. Upon reviewing an email he sent on April 17, 2022, he confirmed that he advised against taking action on the issue at hand, referring to it as a "shiny object" that would eventually lose attention. He clarified that a "shiny object" is a topic that generates widespread discussion, such as the theory that the virus was manufactured by the Chinese. As a scientist, he believes he should focus on the science and let the data from the Nature Medicine article prevail. He referred to the theory of the virus being manufactured by the Chinese as a "shiny object" due to its lack of evidence but high attention. He was uncertain when asked if he considered this theory to be misinformation or disinformation that could potentially cause loss of life.  <a href="#">(191:23 - 193:21)</a></p>
- Destructive Conspiracy	<p>Dr. Fauci confirmed Dr. Collins' description of a situation as a very destructive conspiracy.  <a href="#">(193:22 - 193:24)</a></p>
- "Destructive Conspiracy Theory"	<p>Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed that the "destructive conspiracy theory" mentioned by Dr. Collins refers to the theory that the virus, which is the subject of the Nature Medicine article and the "shiny object" he referred to, originated from a lab.  <a href="#">(193:25 - 194:3)</a></p>
- Misinformation vs Disinformation	<p>Dr. Anthony Fauci expressed his view that the theory of the virus originating from a lab could be seen as misinformation due to lack of evidence. He differentiated between misinformation, which is untrue information not necessarily spread deliberately, and disinformation, which is false information knowingly propagated. He voiced his worry that such misinformation could hinder the pursuit of accurate information. He acknowledged that he likely discussed the Nature Medicine article with others given its relevance, but did not actively promote its spread due to his numerous other duties. He also confirmed his familiarity with the article in question.  <a href="#">(194:4 - 195:22)</a></p>
- Fauci's limited input on Nature Medicine article	<p>Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed that Christian Anderson was a corresponding author for the Nature Medicine article under discussion. He admitted to receiving a minimum of four drafts of the article, but emphasized his limited input. He also verified that he received a preprint of the article from Anderson, who expressed gratitude for Fauci's advice and leadership. However, whether Fauci's advice and leadership pertained to the article was neither confirmed nor denied due to an objection on the grounds of evidence mischaracterization.  <a href="#">(195:23 - 196:17)</a></p>
- Fauci's knowledge of Nature Medicine article	<p>Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed his awareness of the "Proximal Origins of COVID-19" article, which was sent to him as a preprint by Christian Anderson. Anderson also thanked him for his advice and leadership on the article. Despite having minimal input into the article, where Anderson is a corresponding author, Dr. Fauci acknowledged his knowledge of the Nature Medicine article.  <a href="#">(196:18 - 196:19)</a></p>

- Task Force Membership Confirmation	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci confirmed his membership in the Coronavirus Task Force during the time of a press briefing in the White House on April 17th, 2020, referencing Exhibit No. 28, an excerpt from the transcript of that briefing. <a href="#">(196:20 - 197:10)</a>
- Manmade Virus Origin Study	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci confirmed his attendance at the Coronavirus Task Force press briefing at the White House on April 17th, 2020, as indicated by his name in the transcript (FAUCI Exhibit No. 28). He acknowledged being asked by a media member about the virus potentially being manmade and originating from a Chinese lab, and that the president asked him to answer this question. He verified that the transcript showed him discussing a study by evolutionary virologists, which concluded that the virus's evolution and mutations were in line with a species jump from an animal to a human. Despite not remembering specifically stating this due to his frequent presence at White House press conferences, he did not dispute the transcript's accuracy. <a href="#">(197:11 - 199:1)</a>
- Manmade Virus Theory "Shiny Object"	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci confirmed that he had sent an email to Dr. Collins on April 17, the same day as the Coronavirus Task Force press briefing at the White House. In this email, he referred to the theory that the virus was manmade and possibly originated from a laboratory in China as a "shiny object" that would fade over time. He verified that the date on Exhibit 27 was indeed April 17, which aligns with the date of the press conference. He also acknowledged that he had watched the video of his specific comment. <a href="#">(199:2 - 199:20)</a>
- Virus mutations and transition from animal to human species.	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci does not remember emphasizing the term "totally consistent" in a press conference about virus mutations aligning with a transition from an animal to a human species. He acknowledged that he has conducted numerous press conferences and does not recall the specific pauses or emphasis in his speeches. He also admitted to stating that a paper would be forthcoming, but he did not possess the authors' details at that moment. <a href="#">(199:21 - 200:20)</a>
- Fauci's confusion about April 17 email exchange.	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci expressed confusion about a question related to an email exchange with Dr. Collins on April 17, specifically concerning a paper mentioned in a previous exhibit. He was uncertain about the meaning of the question. <a href="#">(200:21 - 201:1)</a>
- Fauci's uncertainty regarding paper referenced at White House briefing.	Dr. Anthony Fauci expressed uncertainty regarding the specific paper he referenced during his remarks from the White House podium at the task force briefing on April 17th, but he assumed it was the Nature Medicine paper. <a href="#">(201:2 - 201:6)</a>
- Fauci's Knowledge of Paper Availability	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci stated that, to his knowledge, he did not make the Nature Medicine paper available to any reporters after the press conference on April 17th. <a href="#">(201:7 - 201:15)</a>
- Email request for scientific paper on coronavirus origin	Dr. Anthony Fauci acknowledged receiving an email from a reporter at The Times on April 19th, 2020, requesting a copy of a scientific paper on the origin of the coronavirus. The email was forwarded to Katie Miller, who Fauci identified as the vice president's press person. Despite not remembering the email, Fauci confirmed that he responded by sending a link, which he suggested could be the requested papers. <a href="#">(201:16 - 202:9)</a>
- Fauci sends scientific paper links to reporter.	Dr. Anthony Fauci sent a link to a scientific paper to Bill Gertz, a reporter, as requested during a press briefing. He believes that Katie Miller, the press person for Vice President Pence, likely contacted him to send the links to Bill Gertz. The email he sent contained links to the scientific papers and a commentary about the papers. He specified that there were two parts to the email: the original paper that had just come online and a commentary on it in the journal Cell. <a href="#">(202:10 - 203:1)</a>
- SARS-CoV-2 Origin Paper	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed the first paper discussed in the press briefing, "the proximal origin of SARS-CoV-2," is the same as the Nature Medicine paper previously mentioned, and is a peer-reviewed version of an earlier released preprint. He also acknowledged that Eddie Holmes, a contributor to the Nature Medicine paper, authored the other two cited papers. <a href="#">(203:2 - 203:23)</a>

- Daszak-Fauci email exchange	Dr. Fauci received an email from Peter Daszak on April 19th, 2020, which was a response to an email from Daszak sent on April 18th, 2020. This exchange happened the day after a coronavirus task force press conference. The email from Daszak contained a message for "Tony", intended to be relayed by "David", which Dr. Fauci confirmed referred to David Morens. <a href="#">(203:24 - 204:19)</a>
- Fauci's NIAID Scientist	Dr. Fauci stated that David Morens is a scientist who has been employed at NIAID for a significant period. <a href="#">(204:20 - 204:23)</a>
- Fauci-Morens-Daszak Connection	Dr. Anthony Fauci stated that David Morens, a long-time scientist at NIAID, is believed to be acquainted with Peter Daszak. <a href="#">(204:24 - 204:25)</a>
- Fauci-Daszak Interaction, NIAID Employees, NIH Global Accessibility	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci knows Peter Daszak, having interacted with him a few times and participated in a podcast together, but they do not share a personal relationship. He confirmed that Erik Stemmy and Emily Erbeling are employees at NIAID and he thinks Aleksei Chmura might be as well, but he is not completely certain. He mentioned that obtaining an email address from the global NIH, including his own, is straightforward as they are publicly accessible. He was puzzled about the redaction of a website, emphasizing that his email address is listed on the NIH global. <a href="#">(205:1 - 206:19)</a>
- Fauci's Email Response	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci confirmed his response to an email from Peter Daszak, stating that "Many thanks for your kind note" is a typical response from him. He receives a varying number of emails daily, from several hundred to two thousand, but does not respond to all, especially those deemed irrelevant or unnecessary. He receives many emails from different sources, some of which are distracting and irrelevant. However, emails from legitimate scientists deemed important are let through for his review. <a href="#">(206:20 - 207:15)</a>
- Scientist's Emails Permitted	Peter Daszak, a grantee of NIAID, is recognized as a legitimate scientist and his emails are permitted to be received. <a href="#">(207:16 - 207:23)</a>
- Social Media Suppression Unawareness	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci was not aware of any suppression of speech on social media related to his comments made during the White House April 17th coronavirus task force briefing about the lab leak hypothesis. He also did not recall being aware of Twitter removing content suggesting the virus may have escaped from a lab. He mentioned the possibility of receiving an email about it among thousands of others, but did not remember noting it. <a href="#">(207:24 - 209:2)</a>
- Chinese virologist's Twitter accounts suspended	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed that he had seen a report in The Hill which stated that Twitter had suspended the accounts of a Chinese virologist who claimed the coronavirus was made in a lab. <a href="#">(209:3 - 209:11)</a>
- Chinese virologist's Twitter suspension	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci confirmed his awareness of an incident where a Chinese virologist's Twitter account was suspended. <a href="#">(209:12 - 209:18)</a>
- Fauci's Social Media Inattention	Dr. Anthony Fauci might have been informed about the suspension of a Chinese virologist's Twitter account, but he does not remember it. He does not pay much attention to social media because he does not have a Twitter account or use Facebook. He confirmed the title of Exhibit No. 32, a document from Meta titled "Update on our work to keep people informed and limit misinformation about COVID-19". <a href="#">(209:19 - 210:24)</a>
- Reviewing COVID-19 Misinformation	Dr. Anthony Fauci was directed to review the third page of a Meta document titled "Update on our work to keep people informed and limit misinformation about COVID-19". <a href="#">(210:25 - 211:2)</a>
- Fauci's confusion about Meta/Facebook.	Dr. Fauci acknowledged a statement on the third page of a document from Meta, indicating that the company is expanding its list of false claims to remove, including additional debunked claims about the coronavirus and vaccine. He expressed confusion about what Meta is, which was clarified to be Facebook.

	<a href="#">(211:3 - 211:19)</a>
- Meta COVID-19 policy alteration	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci stated that he was not aware of Meta, the company controlling Facebook and Instagram, altering its policy to eliminate content claiming that COVID-19 is manufactured or manmade. He also mentioned that he was unfamiliar with what Meta is. <a href="#">(211:20 - 212:10)</a>
- Awareness of Facebook Ownership	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci acknowledged his awareness of Facebook, stating that he was informed by someone that they are part of or own Facebook. <a href="#">(212:11 - 212:14)</a>
- Fauci Exhibit 33	Exhibit 33 was identified during Dr. Anthony Fauci's testimony. <a href="#">(212:15 - 212:18)</a>
- "Facebook Censors Award-Winning Journalist"	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed that the title of Exhibit 33 is "Facebook (part of Meta or owns Meta) Censors Award-Winning Journalist for Criticizing the WHO." <a href="#">(212:19 - 212:23)</a>
- No knowledge of Ian Birrel	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci does not remember Ian Birrel, a multiaward-winning investigative reporter referenced in Exhibit 33. He indicated that he might have known about him previously, but at present, he has no knowledge of who Ian Birrel is. <a href="#">(212:24 - 213:6)</a>
- No Social Media Involvement	Dr. Anthony Fauci does not remember discussing the removal of conversations about the lab leak theory of COVID-19 origins from social media platforms. He stressed that he typically does not engage in such activities due to his minimal involvement with social media. He does not own an account, does not tweet, and generally ignores social media to the extent that he would not know how to access a tweet, even if he were financially incentivized to do so. <a href="#">(213:7 - 213:16)</a>
- Exhibit 34.	Mr. Sauer marked Exhibit 34 for identification during Dr. Anthony Fauci's testimony. <a href="#">(213:17 - 213:20)</a>

### Dr. Anthony Fauci Testified Against Claims of Hydroxychloroquine's Effectiveness for COVID-19, Citing Lack of Evidence and Potential Harm

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
- Hydroxychloroquine Ineffectiveness	In 2020, Dr. Anthony Fauci disputed claims that hydroxychloroquine was effective against coronavirus due to the absence of any supporting evidence. His stance was reinforced by clinical studies demonstrating the drug's ineffectiveness and statements from clinical trials guideline groups explicitly stating the lack of evidence for hydroxychloroquine's efficacy against the virus. <a href="#">(213:21 - 214:15)</a>
- Hydroxychloroquine efficacy based on anecdotal data.	Dr. Anthony Fauci did not personally collect or review the studies on the efficacy of hydroxychloroquine against coronavirus. His comments were based on anecdotal data, which he considered unscientific for determining drug effectiveness. He noted that later papers showed hydroxychloroquine had no effect. Fauci does not conduct drug efficacy research himself, but relies on data published in peer-reviewed journals by other researchers. <a href="#">(214:16 - 215:19)</a>
- Hydroxychloroquine Discussions at NIAID	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci engaged in intermittent discussions within the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) and the broader scientific community regarding the purported effectiveness of hydroxychloroquine against coronavirus, despite the lack of supporting data. He distinctly remembers discussing the drug's efficacy with Dr. Cliff Lane, the clinical director of his institute. He also thinks it's probable that he had similar conversations with other individuals within NIAID, but he cannot recall their specific identities. <a href="#">(215:20 - 216:16)</a>
- Hydroxychloroquine Effectiveness	Dr. Anthony Fauci may have discussed the effectiveness of hydroxychloroquine in treating COVID-19 with other government officials, but could not confirm this. He highlighted that hydroxychloroquine was a significant topic due to its potential harmful effects. Fauci expressed concern about people taking the drug based on unfounded claims of its effectiveness, which could potentially harm them. He clarified that spreading the idea that hydroxychloroquine is highly effective without substantial data could be seen as misinformation or disinformation,

	leading people to take a drug that would not help and could possibly harm them. <a href="#">(216:17 - 217:17)</a>
- Hydroxychloroquine Anecdotal Data	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci confirmed making public statements about the efficacy of hydroxychloroquine during a White House press conference. He could not recall the exact timing of these comments. He clarified that his comments were based on the fact that the data supporting the drug's effectiveness against coronavirus were anecdotal, with no definitive proof of its effectiveness. <a href="#">(217:18 - 218:3)</a>
- Hydroxychloroquine Ineffectiveness	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci confirmed his quote in a Politico article titled "Fauci: Hydroxychloroquine not effective against coronavirus," dated May 22nd, 2020, where he stated, "The scientific data is really quite evident now about lack of efficacy." He assumed his statement referred to hydroxychloroquine, given the context provided by the author, Zachary Brennan. Fauci acknowledged that his comments were made shortly after The Lancet published a study of 96,000 patients, concluding that hydroxychloroquine has no effect on COVID-19 and may have even caused harm. <a href="#">(218:4 - 219:15)</a>
- Hydroxychloroquine Ineffectiveness	Dr. Anthony Fauci indicated that his earlier assertion about hydroxychloroquine's ineffectiveness against COVID-19 might have been influenced by a 96,000-patient observational study published by The Lancet, although he was unsure if this was the exact study he had in mind. He stated that his claim was in line with the results of this study. He also pointed out that numerous other studies, both negative and positive, demonstrated that hydroxychloroquine was ineffective against COVID-19. <a href="#">(219:16 - 220:3)</a>
- Hydroxychloroquine EUA	Dr. Anthony Fauci believes that the FDA issued an Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) for the use of hydroxychloroquine in the context of COVID-19, but he does not recall the exact timeline. He also thinks that this EUA was later withdrawn, possibly in June 2020, but he does not remember the exact date. <a href="#">(220:4 - 220:16)</a>
- Fauci's Influence on FDA Decision	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci does not recall if he was consulted or had any influence on the FDA's decision to revoke the Emergency Use Authorization. <a href="#">(220:17 - 220:21)</a>
- Hydroxychloroquine EUA Withdrawal	Dr. Anthony Fauci does not remember the exact reason for the withdrawal of the Emergency Use Authorization for hydroxychloroquine. He speculates that it might have been because of increasing data from clinical trials demonstrating the drug's ineffectiveness. He elaborates that the conditions for an emergency use authorization necessitate that a drug's potential advantage must surpass the risk, even if the drug's effectiveness is not yet established. If data shows no benefit from the drug, this could be a reason for revoking the authorization. <a href="#">(220:22 - 221:9)</a>
- Fauci uncertain of Lancet study.	Dr. Fauci was uncertain whether the Lancet study mentioned was the same as the one discussed in the Politico article. <a href="#">(221:10 - 221:22)</a>
- Retraction of "May" in The Lancet Study	Dr. Anthony Fauci acknowledged that he saw the front page of The Lancet study published online on May 22nd, 2020, and confirmed that the word "May" was under the D and retracted. He also agreed that this date was five days prior to the Politico article dated May 27th. <a href="#">(221:23 - 222:9)</a>
- Hydroxychloroquine Ineffectiveness Evidence	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed his awareness of a study in The Lancet that surveyed 96,032 patients, as mentioned in a Politico article. He recognized the term "retracted" associated with the study, but could not remember the details of the retraction, though he conceded he might have been informed about it at the time. Fauci's stance on the ineffectiveness of hydroxychloroquine was based on data from various studies, the specifics of which he could not recall. He acknowledged that not all doctors agreed with his perspective on hydroxychloroquine, but insisted that there was substantial and growing evidence supporting its ineffectiveness. <a href="#">(222:10 - 224:4)</a>
- Fauci's Uncertainty	Dr. Anthony Fauci admitted his awareness of some doctors still prescribing hydroxychloroquine

on Qualified Judgment	for their COVID-19 patients. Yet, he expressed uncertainty when asked if he was qualified to question a doctor's clinical judgment, unsure of what being "qualified" in this context meant. <a href="#">(224:5 - 224:21)</a>
- Fauci's Concerns on Hydroxychloroquine Use	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci expressed his worry about doctors prescribing medicines like hydroxychloroquine for COVID-19 treatment, which have no proven effectiveness and could potentially be toxic. He clarified that his concern wouldn't lead him to protest outside a doctor's office, but he would question the suitability of such a prescription. He does not remember a specific incident in July 2020 where a group of doctors promoted the benefits of hydroxychloroquine in a video. He has a vague memory of a group of doctors discussing COVID-19, but he doesn't recall the specifics of their conversation. <a href="#">(224:22 - 226:8)</a>
- Fauci's Response to Antimalarial Drug Questions	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci does not remember being on Good Morning America around July 27th or 28th in 2020. Upon being shown Exhibit No. 36, he was directed to the fourth or fifth page of the document, which had a section titled "Responding to questions about an antimalarial drug." He was then allowed time to familiarize himself with the document. <a href="#">(226:9 - 227:6)</a>
- Ineffectiveness of Hydroxychloroquine	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci confirmed that the majority of clinical trials have indicated that hydroxychloroquine is not effective in treating coronavirus disease. <a href="#">(227:7 - 227:13)</a>
- "Fauci on America's Frontline Doctors' Claims"	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed his recollection of a group known as America's Frontline Doctors making statements in front of the Supreme Court, though he did not recall the specifics of their claims. He acknowledged concerns about the accuracy of these claims. Upon being shown Exhibit 37, a Bret Baier article titled "Fauci uncensored: Hydroxychloroquine video. A bunch of people spouting something that isn't true", he did not specifically remember saying that a video retweeted by President Trump, which featured doctors promoting hydroxychloroquine as a COVID-19 treatment, was "people spouting something that isn't true". However, he agreed that he might have said it, as the general consensus among physicians was that the claims made in the video lacked medical sense. <a href="#">(227:14 - 229:23)</a>
- Promotion of Hydroxychloroquine Misinformation/Disinformation Risk	Dr. Anthony Fauci expressed concern that the promotion of hydroxychloroquine as a coronavirus treatment by doctors in a video press conference could be misinformation or disinformation, potentially leading to loss of lives. He noted the press conference was met with significant negative response from the medical community and was seen as unorthodox. He hypothesized that a majority of physicians in established medical centers would likely find the statements made in the video lacking in medical sense. He clarified, however, that he did not personally conduct such a poll, but based his statement on reactions he observed from his community and others who viewed the video. <a href="#">(229:24 - 230:24)</a>

### Dr. Fauci Testified That the NIH Found No Evidence of Hydroxychloroquine's Efficacy in Treating Infectious Diseases

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
- NIH Treatment Guidelines Panel's hydroxychloroquine determination	Dr. Anthony Fauci engaged in discussions about the effectiveness of hydroxychloroquine with various individuals in the medical field, particularly the NIH Treatment Guidelines Panel. This panel, composed of around 40 healthcare providers and physicians who are leaders in infectious diseases across the country, includes chiefs of infectious diseases at medical centers like Harvard, Cornell, and San Francisco. After reviewing all the literature, the panel concluded that there was no evidence supporting the efficacy of hydroxychloroquine. Dr. Fauci could not recall the exact date of this determination but stressed that the panel embodies the leadership of infectious diseases nationwide. <a href="#">(230:25 - 232:11)</a>
- Exhibit 38.	Mr. Sauer presented Exhibit 38 to Dr. Anthony S. Fauci. <a href="#">(232:12 - 232:15)</a>

**Dr. Anthony Fauci Testified About Seeing a Censored COVID-19 Video, Expressed Concern About False Information, but Denied Communicating with Facebook About Content Removal**

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
- Censorship of Capitol Hill Coronavirus Press Conference Video	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed that he had seen a Breitbart report which stated that Facebook, Google, YouTube, and Twitter had censored a viral video of doctors at a Capitol Hill Coronavirus press conference. <a href="#">(232:16 - 232:21)</a>
- Fauci Confirms Breitbart Report, Expresses Concern Over False Information	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed the date of a Breitbart report and acknowledged seeing a statement about Facebook censoring a video posted by Breitbart News of a press conference held by America's Frontline Doctors. He suggested that this group and press conference were likely the ones he disagreed with in his previous statements, but could not confirm this with certainty. He confirmed seeing a statement about the video accumulating over 17 million views during the eight hours it was hosted on Facebook, but expressed indifference to the quantity of views. He stated that he does not pay much attention to social media and would not know how to interpret the significance of 17 million views. He did not provide a clear answer when asked if he would be bothered by 17 million people watching the video in which doctors touted the benefits of hydroxychloroquine.  Fauci expressed concern about a large number of people receiving information that was not only unsupported by data, but also contradicted by it. He referred to a video where doctors stood on the steps of the Supreme Court promoting the benefits of hydroxychloroquine. As a physician, he found it troubling when false information that could harm patients was disseminated. However, he clarified that being troubled did not necessarily mean he would take action against it. <a href="#">(232:22 - 237:16)</a>
- False COVID-19 Cures Post Removed	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed the removal of a Facebook post by Breitbart News for sharing false information about COVID-19 cures and treatments. The post contained a video of a press conference by America's Frontline Doctors. However, Mr. Sauer raised an objection due to a lack of foundation. <a href="#">(237:17 - 237:24)</a>
- No Facebook communication on COVID-19 cures.	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci does not remember any communication with Facebook regarding the removal of a video spreading false information about COVID-19 cures and treatments. He acknowledged the possibility of such communication but does not recall it. <a href="#">(237:25 - 238:5)</a>
- No NIAID-Facebook Communication	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci does not remember any communication between any individual at the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases and representatives or employees of social media platforms, specifically Facebook. He also has no recollection of anyone from the federal government communicating with Facebook about a specific decision. He noted that such communication could have happened, but he does not specifically remember it as he does not focus on these matters due to his significant daily responsibilities. <a href="#">(238:6 - 238:20)</a>
- Government-Social Media Interaction Unremembered	Dr. Anthony Fauci stated that he does not remember any instance where a federal official or someone associated with the U.S. Government communicated with social media platforms regarding what content is allowed or disallowed on their platform. While he did not deny the possibility of such an event occurring, he mentioned that it does not resonate with his memory. <a href="#">(238:21 - 239:7)</a>
- Fauci's lack of social media engagement	Dr. Anthony Fauci acknowledged awareness of Facebook and YouTube's decision to censor a Livestream, but clarified his lack of involvement or attention to social media organizations' actions, including Google, YouTube, and Twitter. He suggested that while someone might have informed him about the censorship, it likely didn't register due to his lack of focus on such matters. Upon being asked about Twitter's similar action to Facebook and YouTube in removing a video, he initially struggled to locate the reference in the document. Once guided to the correct page, he confirmed the document's statement but reiterated his unawareness at the time. He further explained that he likely ignored any mention of it as he does not engage with social

	media in any capacity, including owning an account, tweeting, or using Facebook. He stressed his lack of attention to what gets posted or removed on social media. <a href="#">(239:8 - 241:13)</a>
- Awareness of Content Moderation	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci questioned the term "terms of service" when asked about his general awareness of content moderation on social media platforms like Facebook, YouTube, and Twitter. <a href="#">(241:14 - 241:17)</a>

#### Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Testified That He Ignores Social Media Policies and Doesn't Own a Social Media Account

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
- No Social Media Engagement	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci does not engage with social media, lacking an account and not following any platforms. He is unsure about the policies of platforms such as Google, YouTube, Twitter, and Facebook concerning permissible content. Despite this, he acknowledged the potential of encountering social media-related content due to working in a place with thousands of people and receiving numerous emails, suggesting that someone might mention something related to it. <a href="#">(241:18 - 242:9)</a>

#### Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Testified, with Exhibit No. 39 Identified by Mr. Sauer

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
- Exhibit 39.	Mr. Sauer marked Exhibit 39 for identification during Dr. Anthony Fauci's testimony. <a href="#">(242:10 - 242:13)</a>

#### Dr. Anthony Fauci Testified on the Closure of "America's Frontline Doctors" Website and Reaffirmed Hydroxychloroquine's Inefficacy

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
- Frontline Doctors Website Shutdown Report	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci confirmed that he saw a report from the Washington Standard titled "America's Frontline Doctors website shut down" dated August 1st, 2020. However, he did not recall being aware of the website being taken down by their web hosting provider. He suggested that he might have been aware if someone pointed it out to him, but it was not something that would normally attract his attention or interest. <a href="#">(242:14 - 243:19)</a>
- No efficacy of hydroxychloroquine.	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed that there is still no evidence of the efficacy of hydroxychloroquine. <a href="#">(243:20 - 243:24)</a>
- Hydroxychloroquine Metaanalyses Shortcomings	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci stated he does not have specific knowledge of any global metaanalyses that study the efficacy of hydroxychloroquine. He also mentioned that metaanalyses can have significant shortcomings, and that statisticians frequently debunk some of these metaanalyses. <a href="#">(243:25 - 244:7)</a>
- Gold Standard for Hydroxychloroquine Study	Dr. Anthony Fauci remembered expressing that a randomized double-blind placebo-based study is typically viewed as the gold standard in conversations about hydroxychloroquine. He further clarified that although this approach isn't always required, it's generally regarded as the gold standard. <a href="#">(244:8 - 244:14)</a>

#### Dr. Anthony Fauci Expressed Doubts About a Hydroxychloroquine Study, Emphasizing the Need for Randomized Placebo Control Groups

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
- Fauci's Review of Hydroxychloroquine Study	Dr. Anthony Fauci does not remember if he publicly criticized a study by the Henry Ford Medical Center that observed a benefit to hydroxychloroquine. He clarified that he reviews hundreds of studies and cannot definitively express his opinion or comment on any particular study.

	<a href="#">(244:15 - 245:3)</a>
- Fauci Exhibit 40	Exhibit 40 was identified during Dr. Anthony Fauci's testimony. <a href="#">(245:4 - 245:7)</a>
- HCQ efficacy meta-analysis review.	Dr. Anthony Fauci reviewed FAUCI Exhibit No. 40, a meta-analysis of studies on the efficacy of hydroxychloroquine. He found the document and its summary confusing at first. He pointed out that negative evaluations often overlook treatment delay. He also mentioned some in vitro evidence suggesting that a therapeutic level could not be achieved, but he disagreed with this assertion. He affirmed the document's first sentence, which referenced 449 HCQ COVID-19 studies. <a href="#">(245:8 - 245:21)</a>
- HCQ efficacy studies with potential confounding variables.	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed HCQ as an abbreviation for hydroxychloroquine and acknowledged the existence of 449 studies, of which 351 are peer-reviewed and 371 involve comparison between treatment and control groups. He indicated that high dosage late treatment could be harmful, but early treatment generally yields positive outcomes. He clarified that comparing treatment and control groups doesn't necessarily mean a placebo-based double-blind study. He expressed doubts about the specifics of the control groups in these studies, highlighting that lack of randomization could lead to misleading or incorrect results. He stressed the need to consider potential confounding variables in control groups that could distort data. He noted that organizations like the NIH clinical trials guideline group often deem studies claiming efficacy as statistically invalid, but did not confirm if this applies to all 371 reported studies. <a href="#">(245:22 - 247:14)</a>

#### Dr. Fauci Testified That Top Infectious Disease Physicians Found No Evidence of Hydroxychloroquine's Effectiveness and Potential Harm

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
- Early hydroxychloroquine study review.	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed the existence of a study suggesting positive results from early treatment with hydroxychloroquine. He expressed a need to review the study and consult with statisticians who had previously examined it. Despite these findings, he noted that a panel of 30 to 40 top infectious disease physicians found no evidence of hydroxychloroquine's effectiveness and potential harm. Fauci emphasized the importance of understanding the study's methodology, including the definition and randomization of the control group, to assess the study's validity. <a href="#">(247:15 - 248:12)</a>

#### Dr. Anthony Fauci Testified About His Limited Involvement and Uncertain Recollection Regarding the Great Barrington Declaration

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
- Familiarity with Great Barrington Declaration	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed his familiarity with the Great Barrington Declaration. <a href="#">(248:13 - 248:15)</a>
- Herd Immunity Advocacy	Dr. Anthony Fauci explained the Great Barrington Declaration as a document signed by multiple individuals advocating for the unrestricted spread of a virus within a community. According to the declaration, it is possible to safeguard vulnerable individuals while permitting the virus to circulate freely, resulting in herd immunity. The virus would ultimately reach a significantly low level due to the attained herd immunity. <a href="#">(248:16 - 248:24)</a>
- Herd Immunity Proposal	Dr. Anthony Fauci reviewed Exhibit 41, the Great Barrington Declaration. This document, signed by various individuals, proposes allowing the virus to freely circulate in the community to achieve herd immunity, while simultaneously protecting vulnerable populations. The signatories believe this approach would ultimately lower the virus level due to acquired immunity. <a href="#">(248:25 - 249:8)</a>
- Great Barrington Declaration authenticity	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci acknowledged the document presented to him as Exhibit 41 was labeled as the Great Barrington Declaration. He expressed uncertainty about its authenticity but stated he had no reason to doubt it was the actual declaration.

	<a href="#">(249:9 - 249:13)</a>
- Great Barrington Declaration Focus Protection	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed his familiarity with the Great Barrington Declaration, having read it when it was initially released. He identified the document during the deposition and acknowledged its recommendation of an approach called focus protection, which he interpreted as circulating among certain populations while providing targeted protection for more vulnerable ones. He was unable to provide the exact publication date of the declaration but confirmed it was authored and signed on October 4th, 2020. He could not remember when he first became aware of the declaration post-publication. He did not personally know the three scientists who authored the declaration, Dr. Martin Kulldorff, Dr. Sunetra Gupta, and Dr. Jay Bhattacharya, and was not familiar with them at the time of the declaration's publication. He also did not know Dr. Michael Levitt, a Nobel Prize winner mentioned in the declaration, although he had heard of him. He could not remember how or when he first became aware of the Great Barrington Declaration. <a href="#">(249:14 - 252:21)</a>
- Awareness of Great Barrington Declaration	Dr. Anthony Fauci does not recall the circumstances under which he became aware of the Great Barrington Declaration. <a href="#">(252:22 - 253:13)</a>
- Email from Collins to Fauci and Lane with Tabak copy.	Dr. Anthony Fauci acknowledged an email dated October 8th, 2020, sent from Francis Collins to him and Cliff Lane, with a copy to Larry Tabak. He confirmed its existence after reading it, although he initially did not remember it. He vaguely recalled receiving the email, which was sent four days after the Great Barrington Declaration was offered and contained a link to the declaration. <a href="#">(253:14 - 254:22)</a>
- Link to Great Barrington Declaration Uncertainty	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci identified the link mentioned in the question as likely referring to the Great Barrington Declaration, based on its URL. He was uncertain if he first read the declaration upon receiving an email with the link, or if he clicked on the link when he got the email. His memory was also unclear on whether he knew about the meeting of the declaration's three authors with the Secretary. He suggested that this might have been his initial awareness of it, or he might have been slightly aware of it at the time. He was unsure if the reference to the three fringe epidemiologists pertained to a previous conversation or communication where he discussed them, stating he did not know and could not remember. <a href="#">(254:23 - 256:3)</a>
- Fauci's Uncertainty on Meeting and Takedown	Dr. Anthony Fauci does not remember if Dr. Bhattacharya, Gupta, and Dr. Kulldorff had a meeting with Secretary Azar. He thinks it was probably brought to his notice, but his focus was on vaccine development, so he might not have paid much attention. He is uncertain if he responded to an email about this issue or if it piqued his interest. He acknowledges that the issue was gaining attention, including from Nobel laureate Mike Levitt. He does not understand Dr. Collins' reference to a "quick and devastating takedown" of certain premises and speculates it could be about countering the argument that susceptible individuals could be selectively protected while allowing the virus to spread without causing significant harm. He does not remember discussing a "quick and devastating takedown" of the Great Barrington Declaration with Dr. Collins and does not think he used such language. He is unsure of Dr. Collins' exact meaning but thinks he was probably referring to writing a scholarly article to challenge some premises. He noticed that Dr. Collins mentioned not seeing anything like that online yet and asked if it was in progress.  Dr. Fauci confirmed seeing an email asking if a "swift and devastating takedown" of a declaration was in progress. However, he did not understand why the sender would assume that he and Cliff Lane would be aware of such an event. He suggested that the sender's question was probably a casual remark, as the sender's staff is more thorough in scouring the internet than they are. He also confirmed that there was no reason for the sender to think that he and Lane were working on the issue in question. <a href="#">(256:4 - 260:13)</a>
- Fauci's Responsibilities and	Dr. Anthony Fauci denied participating in a swift and damaging public critique of the Great Barrington Declaration, citing his responsibilities as the leader of a \$6.4 billion institute as a

Lane's China Trip	reason for his non-involvement. He expressed uncertainty about why he and Cliff Lane were included in an email, but noted that it was not uncommon due to Lane's roles as the Institute's clinical director and deputy director for clinical research. Fauci acknowledged that Lane, who had visited China in February 2020 on a WHO-sponsored trip and reported that severe lockdown measures were successful in controlling the virus, is a proponent of social distancing as a means to limit the virus's spread. <a href="#">(260:14 - 262:9)</a>
- Extreme Lockdown Conversations	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci remembers having conversations with Francis Collin and Cliff Lane about the effectiveness of extreme lockdown or social distancing measures, following Lane's return from a WHO-sponsored trip to China. <a href="#">(262:10 - 262:16)</a>

**Dr. Anthony Fauci Testified About Discussing Social Distancing, Debunking Theories, and Critiquing the Great Barrington Declaration's Herd Immunity Approach to COVID-19**

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
- Effectiveness of Social Distancing Discussed After China Visit	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci, Cliff Lane, and Francis Collins possibly discussed the effectiveness of severe social distancing in halting virus spread following Cliff Lane's visit to China in February 2020. Although Dr. Fauci does not distinctly remember this conversation, he mentioned that such a discussion would not be out of the ordinary, given their interest in understanding China's experiences. <a href="#">(262:17 - 263:6)</a>
- Fauci Exhibit 43	Exhibit 43 was identified during Dr. Anthony Fauci's testimony. <a href="#">(263:7 - 263:10)</a>
- Email exchange debunking theory	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci acknowledged an email exchange from October 8th, 2020, after initially not recalling it. He clarified that he receives thousands of emails, many of which are screened, resulting in him only seeing a few hundred. He confirmed that the email was sent to the same recipients as a previous email. In the email, he informed a person named Francis that he was including a piece from The Wire that debunks a certain theory. <a href="#">(263:11 - 264:5)</a>
- Great Barrington Declaration Response	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci confirmed the subject line of a specific document as the Great Barrington Declaration and also affirmed that Francis responded to him with the word "Excellent". <a href="#">(264:6 - 264:12)</a>
- Fauci Confirms Wired Article	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci confirmed pasting an article from Wired magazine by Matt Reynolds, but did not recall the method or person responsible for finding the article. <a href="#">(264:13 - 264:20)</a>
- Fauci's lack of recollection of Reynolds	Dr. Anthony Fauci does not have a clear recollection of Matt Reynolds, the author of a Wired magazine article referenced in an email exchange. Although he may have had interactions with Reynolds previously, the name does not particularly resonate with him. <a href="#">(264:21 - 264:24)</a>
- Fauci-Reynolds Interaction	Dr. Anthony Fauci stated he does not remember having any interactions with Matt Reynolds prior to the publication of an article by Mr. Reynolds in Wired magazine. <a href="#">(264:25 - 265:2)</a>
- Fauci-Gonsalves association	Dr. Anthony Fauci does not recall any communication between anyone at the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases and Matt Reynolds prior to the publication of an article. He acknowledges his acquaintance with Gregg Gonsalves, a faculty member at the Yale School of Public Health and former member of the AIDS activist group ACT UP and the therapy group, TAG. Fauci's association with Gonsalves dates back to the late 1980s or early 1990s. He does not categorize Gonsalves as a friend but recognizes him as an associate and a committed public health advocate with whom he has had significant interactions. <a href="#">(265:3 - 266:3)</a>
- Herd Immunity Refutation	Dr. Anthony Fauci forwarded an email to Francis Collins that included a commentary by Gregg Gonsalves on the concept of herd immunity and focused protection. He referred to this commentary as "another refutation of the herd immunity approach".

	<a href="#">(266:4 - 266:22)</a>
- Herd Immunity Approach Connection	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci acknowledged a possible connection between his reference to the herd immunity approach and the approach advocated by the authors of the Great Barrington Declaration, despite not seeing a specific reference to the declaration. He confirmed having seen the second paragraph of the Gonsalves article and a sentence beginning with "Fast forward to this week." He also verified the statement that Harvard professor Martin Kulldorff, Dr. Jay Bhattacharya from Stanford University, and Sunetra Gupta from the University of Oxford were in DC meeting with Scott Atlas and Health and Human Services Secretary Alex Azar. <a href="#">(266:23 - 267:25)</a>
- Focus Protection Strategy	Dr. Anthony Fauci acknowledged that Martin Kulldorff, Dr. Jay Bhattacharya from Stanford University, and Sunetra Gupta from the University of Oxford were promoting their new focus protection strategy. <a href="#">(268:1 - 268:4)</a>
- Fauci's response to Great Barrington Declaration	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed the use of the term "focus protection" in the Great Barrington Declaration. He indicated potential communications with Gregg Gonsalves prior to Gonsalves writing his piece, but could not recall specific interactions or if Gonsalves consulted with him or the NIAID staff about his piece. Fauci was uncertain about Francis Collins' plans for articles refuting the Great Barrington Declaration, suggesting that Collins might have been seeking a general response to the Declaration. He forwarded articles to Collins in response to a question about whether anyone else was refuting the Declaration's premise. <a href="#">(268:5 - 269:15)</a>
- Collins' office social media use	Dr. Anthony Fauci is unaware of any links between Francis Collins and social media companies. He noted that Francis Collins' office operates social media accounts and he believes Collins uses Twitter. However, Fauci does not have a Twitter account and does not view tweets. <a href="#">(269:16 - 270:4)</a>
- Exhibit 45	Exhibit 45 was identified during Dr. Anthony Fauci's examination. <a href="#">(270:5 - 270:9)</a>
- Fauci-Collins Social Media Conversation	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci was queried about whether he had conversed with Dr. Collins regarding the content of posts on social media. He sought further clarification of the question. <a href="#">(270:10 - 270:14)</a>
- Fauci-Collins social media conversation uncertainty	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci expressed uncertainty about whether he has ever conversed with Dr. Francis Collins regarding the content of social media posts. <a href="#">(270:15 - 270:20)</a>
- Fauci-Collins Social Media Discussions	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci does not have a specific memory of any discussions with Dr. Collins regarding any communications that Dr. Collins or his staff may have had with social media companies. He indicated that such a conversation might have occurred, but he does not distinctly remember it. <a href="#">(270:21 - 271:1)</a>
- Fauci Acknowledges Exhibit 45	Dr. Anthony Fauci acknowledged looking at Exhibit 45 presented to him. <a href="#">(271:2 - 271:4)</a>
- Herd Immunity Proposal Appalling to Scientists	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed the existence of a Washington Post article (Exhibit 45) from October 14th, 2020, titled "Proposal to hasten herd immunity to the coronavirus grabs White House attention but appalls the top scientists". He was directed to a quote from Dr. Collins in the fourth paragraph of the first page and took a moment to familiarize himself with the document. <a href="#">(271:5 - 271:18)</a>
- "Proposed Strategy Criticized as 'Fringe' and 'Dangerous'"	Dr. Fauci confirmed that he had seen a document's first page's fourth paragraph. This paragraph mentioned a proposed strategy informed to reporters by a senior administration official. The strategy was criticized by other infectious disease experts and was labeled as "fringe" and "dangerous" by NIH director Francis Collins. <a href="#">(271:19 - 272:3)</a>
- Fauci-Collins communication uncertainty	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci confirmed his consultation with Dr. Collins prior to Dr. Collins' statement to the Washington Post, as referenced in Exhibit 45. However, he expressed uncertainty about the specifics of the communication between Dr. Collins and the Washington Post, including

	<p>whether Dr. Collins directly labeled the proposed strategy as "fringe and dangerous" or if these were statements cited by the reporter from other sources.</p> <p><a href="#">(272:4 - 272:18)</a></p>
- Fauci Acknowledges Collins' Concerns on Fringe Viewpoint	<p>Dr. Anthony S. Fauci confirmed his reading of a quote from Dr. Collins in a Washington Post article, where Dr. Collins expressed concern about a certain viewpoint being presented as a major alternative view in the scientific community, describing it as a fringe component of epidemiology, not mainstream science, and dangerous. Dr. Fauci acknowledged Dr. Collins' belief that the premise of the declaration was ill-founded and dangerous, potentially leading to unnecessary infection, sickness, hospitalization, and death if the virus was allowed to circulate freely. However, he could not confirm if Dr. Collins consulted with him before making these statements, nor could he definitively link Dr. Collins' concerns to the spread of information on social media platforms. He also could not recall specific discussions with Dr. Collins about the implications of social media on the issue.</p> <p><a href="#">(272:19 - 275:11)</a></p>
- Fauci Confirms Collins' Quotes	<p>Dr. Anthony S. Fauci confirmed receiving a link to a Washington Post article from Dr. Francis Collins on October 13th. He acknowledged that Dr. Collins' email stated his quotes in the article were accurate, particularly his rejection of the premise of herd immunity, but would not be appreciated in the White House. Dr. Fauci did not remember any discussion about the White House's approval of Dr. Collins' quotes regarding the Great Barrington Declaration. He admitted to responding to Dr. Collins' email, stating, "They are too busy with other things to worry about this," and confirmed this statement was entirely correct.</p> <p><a href="#">(275:12 - 276:15)</a></p>
- Opposing the Great Barrington Declaration	<p>Dr. Anthony S. Fauci did not label the Great Barrington Declaration as a fringe and dangerous idea, but found its premise invalid. He opposed the concept of allowing the virus to circulate freely, asserting that it was impossible to selectively safeguard all vulnerable individuals. He concurred that the Great Barrington Declaration's premise was ill-conceived and incorrect, a sentiment echoed by most physicians, public health officials, and epidemiologists. He indicated that he might have called the declaration nonsense in a future email. He also recognized the introduction of FAUCI Exhibit No. 47.</p> <p><a href="#">(276:16 - 277:23)</a></p>
- Fauci Confirms NBC News Article	<p>Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed his ability to see FAUCI Exhibit No. 47, an NBC News article dated October 15, 2020.</p> <p><a href="#">(277:24 - 278:1)</a></p>
- Herd Immunity Nonsense & Dangerous	<p>Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed his previous statement that allowing the coronavirus to spread in order to achieve herd immunity is both "nonsense" and "dangerous". He affirmed the accuracy of a quote where he described the concept of letting everyone get infected for herd immunity as very dangerous. He also confirmed his belief that the premise of the Barrington Declaration, which suggests letting the virus spread freely leading to illness, hospitalization, and death, is nonsense and dangerous.</p> <p><a href="#">(278:2 - 278:25)</a></p>
- Infectious Disease Specialist & Epidemiologist	<p>Dr. Anthony S. Fauci identifies himself as an infectious disease specialist with substantial experience in epidemiology.</p> <p><a href="#">(279:1 - 279:3)</a></p>
- Verifying Credentials	<p>Dr. Fauci was unsure about the qualifications of Dr. Bhattacharya and Dr. Kulldorff, including whether they were epidemiologists, and recommended verifying their credentials.</p> <p><a href="#">(279:4 - 279:10)</a></p>
- "Epidemiology Nonsense"	<p>Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed that he made the statement, "Quite frankly, that is nonsense and anybody who knows anything about epidemiology will tell you that that is nonsense and very dangerous," within two days of Dr. Collins' statement.</p> <p><a href="#">(279:11 - 279:13)</a></p>
- Fauci-Collins coordination discussion.	<p>Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed making a statement referenced in the Washington Post within two days of Dr. Collins' statement. He denied coordinating with Dr. Collins on statements criticizing the Great Barrington Declaration, beyond the emails already seen. He mentioned that coordination was not their style, but did not dismiss the possibility of a discussion depending on</p>

	the interpretation of coordination. <a href="#">(279:14 - 279:24)</a>
- Awareness of Censorship on Social Media	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci was not aware of the Great Barrington Declaration being censored on social media. He does not follow social media activities, including any form of censorship, and does not pay attention to such matters. <a href="#">(279:25 - 280:10)</a>
- Review of Spiked Article on Google Censorship	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci confirmed that he reviewed exhibit 48, an article from the Spiked website titled "Why has Google censored the Great Barrington Declaration?" <a href="#">(280:11 - 280:18)</a>
- Google's alleged censoring of Great Barrington Declaration	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci likely did not know about Google allegedly deboosting the Great Barrington Declaration in search results. He may have heard about it in passing but does not pay much attention to social media activities. He stressed that he probably was not aware of or did not pay attention to Google's supposed censoring of the Great Barrington Declaration, as he does not participate in the culture of social media censoring. <a href="#">(280:19 - 282:4)</a>
- Familiarity with Reddit	Dr. Anthony Fauci acknowledged his familiarity with Reddit, a social media platform, without elaborating on his knowledge or usage of it. <a href="#">(282:5 - 282:9)</a>
- Unfamiliarity with Reddit Censorship	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci is unsure of what Reddit is and was not aware of its alleged censoring of the Great Barrington Declaration. He also mentioned that even if he had been aware, he did not consider it significant enough to remember. <a href="#">(282:10 - 282:20)</a>
- Awareness of YouTube	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed his awareness of the social media platform, YouTube. <a href="#">(282:21 - 282:23)</a>

#### Dr. Anthony Fauci Testified He Didn't Know About Youtube's 2020 Policy to Remove Great Barrington Declaration Content

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
- Fauci's Uncertainty on YouTube Amendment	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci expressed uncertainty about whether he was informed of YouTube's October 2020 amendment to its terms of service, which involved the removal of content related to the Great Barrington Declaration. He added that, even if he had been notified, he probably wouldn't have given it much consideration. <a href="#">(282:24 - 283:10)</a>
- Fauci Exhibit 49	Exhibit 49 was identified during Dr. Anthony Fauci's testimony. <a href="#">(283:11 - 283:14)</a>
- YouTube COVID-19 policy update October 2020	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci does not remember viewing YouTube's online site admissions relations policy. He has seen a rolling chronology on the document's second page, with 2020 marked in the center. He has also seen a link from October 2020 titled "fighting misinformation" on the document's third page. He concurs that this link suggests YouTube updated their COVID-19 medical misinformation policy in October 2020. <a href="#">(283:15 - 284:5)</a>
- Fauci did not respond.	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci did not respond to a question related to Exhibit 50, stating that he did not see any question. <a href="#">(284:6 - 284:11)</a>
- Fighting Misinformation on YouTube	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci acknowledged that he received Exhibit 50, a content accessed through a link from October 2020 titled "fighting misinformation on YouTube's online site admissions relations policy". <a href="#">(284:12 - 284:15)</a>
- COVID-19 medical misinformation policy not seen.	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci does not recall ever seeing the detailed version of the COVID-19 medical misinformation policy, referred to as Exhibit 50. <a href="#">(284:16 - 284:23)</a>
- Herd Immunity Through Natural	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed that he saw a statement in YouTube's online site admissions relations policy and its COVID-19 medical misinformation policy. The statement, located on

Infection vs Vaccination	page 4 of 5, fourth bullet point from the bottom, asserts that achieving herd immunity through natural infection is safer than vaccinating the population. <a href="#">(284:24 - 285:5)</a>
- Herd Immunity vs Vaccination.	Dr. Anthony Fauci stated that the Great Barrington Declaration's recommendations are paraphrased by the claim that achieving herd immunity through natural infection is safer than vaccinating the population. He denied being aware of any changes to YouTube's terms of service in October 2020 that included this as a disfavored claim. He also denied knowledge of anyone communicating with YouTube about this subject. <a href="#">(285:6 - 286:2)</a>
- Fauci Exhibit 51	Exhibit 51 was identified during Dr. Anthony Fauci's testimony. <a href="#">(286:3 - 286:6)</a>

**Dr. Anthony Fauci Testified About His Communications with Meta CEO, His Stance on Mask-wearing, and His Team's Handling of Misinformation and Imposter Accounts**

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
- Fauci's understanding of Meta's misinformation policy.	Dr. Anthony Fauci acknowledged his understanding of Meta and agreed to proceed with the conversation regarding Meta's online misinformation policy. <a href="#">(286:7 - 286:10)</a>
- Familiarity with Mark Zuckerberg.	Dr. Fauci confirmed his understanding that Meta refers to Facebook and Instagram. He acknowledged his familiarity with Mark Zuckerberg, the CEO of Meta, on a first-name basis, but clarified this is common with many individuals he knows. <a href="#">(286:11 - 286:20)</a>
- Fauci's Facebook PSAs and Questions	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci confirmed his participation in Facebook Public Service Announcements (PSAs) where he encouraged vaccination and answered virus-related questions, but was unsure of the exact date of these PSAs. He expressed uncertainty about the term "interrogatory" and the mention of 13 communications with Mark Zuckerberg in 2020, requesting to see a document for clarification. <a href="#">(286:21 - 287:23)</a>
- Fauci-Meta interactions and misinformation policy.	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci acknowledged his communications with Mark Zuckerberg, CEO of Meta, in 2020, but was uncertain about the exact number of interactions. He remembered these interactions being mentioned in the context of his numerous emails that were subject to a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request. He also recalled a discussion about a misinformation policy document from Meta. <a href="#">(287:24 - 288:13)</a>
- Vaccine Misinformation	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed that there is a section titled "Misinformation about vaccines" under Roman II, 'harmful health misinformation', on page 4 of 12 in the document related to Meta's online misinformation policy. <a href="#">(288:14 - 288:17)</a>
- Vaccine Misinformation Removal	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed that Meta's policy document on misinformation states that misinformation, primarily about vaccines, is removed when public health authorities determine the information to be false and likely to directly lead to imminent vaccine refusals. <a href="#">(288:18 - 288:23)</a>
- Public health authority unknown	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci does not know the public health authority that Meta, a company led by CEO Mark Zuckerberg, depends on for decisions regarding information removal. <a href="#">(288:24 - 289:5)</a>
- Zuckerberg-Fauci PSAs	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci had discussions with Mark Zuckerberg, as documented in their Public Service Announcements (PSAs). He was uncertain if Zuckerberg ever presented him as a respected public health authority during these talks. Their phone calls typically revolved around anticipation for the PSA and discussion of its technical aspects. Fauci denied knowing if he was referred to as a public health authority that platforms such as Meta and Facebook would depend on.

	<a href="#">(289:6 - 290:3)</a>
- Fauci's Social Media Influence	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci has never been informed of anyone citing his authority or reputation to influence content on social media platforms like Meta and Facebook. <a href="#">(290:4 - 290:9)</a>
- No Stanford communication post-publication.	Dr. Anthony Fauci does not recall communicating with anyone at Stanford about the Great Barrington Declaration post-publication. Despite the possibility due to the volume of his phone calls and emails, he expressed doubt about such communication. <a href="#">(290:10 - 290:15)</a>
- Fauci's relationship with Pizzo and discussion of Great Barrington Declaration.	Dr. Anthony Fauci may have discussed the Great Barrington Declaration with individuals outside of the government, but he could not remember specific instances. He acknowledged his acquaintance with Dr. Phil Pizzo, a pediatric infectious disease expert and former colleague at the National Institutes of Health (NIH), who later became the dean at Stanford's School of Medicine. Despite their long-standing relationship, Fauci could not remember if he had ever discussed the Great Barrington Declaration with Pizzo. <a href="#">(290:16 - 291:13)</a>
- Fauci-Pizzo-Bhattacharya discussion	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci does not remember discussing Dr. Jay Bhattacharya from Stanford with Dr. Phil Pizzo. <a href="#">(291:14 - 291:16)</a>
- Fauci-Minor Connection Unknown	Dr. Anthony Fauci acknowledged hearing the name Dr. Lloyd Minor, but stated that it does not evoke any connection for him. <a href="#">(291:17 - 291:20)</a>
- Fauci-Tessier-Lavigne Scientific Discussions	Dr. Anthony Fauci is acquainted with Mark Tessier-Lavigne, the current president of Stanford, from Tessier-Lavigne's tenure at the Rockefeller Institution. Their interactions have included scientific discussions and meetings, although Dr. Fauci does not remember the specifics of these conversations. He does not think he has ever talked about the Great Barrington Declaration with Tessier-Lavigne. <a href="#">(291:21 - 292:12)</a>
- Fauci's lack of recall on focused protection and herd immunity	Dr. Anthony Fauci stated that he does not remember discussing focused protection or herd immunity approaches. He acknowledged knowing Harry Greenberg, a scientist formerly at the NIH and now at Stanford, but expressed doubt about having discussed these topics with him. While not ruling out the possibility that these topics may have surfaced in other discussions, he confirmed that he does not recall such instances. <a href="#">(292:13 - 293:1)</a>
- Fauci-Rowe-Ioannides Connection	Dr. Anthony Fauci is acquainted with Jack Rowe, who he thinks was previously the CEO of a medical center, potentially in New York, but his knowledge of him is limited. He is aware of a scientist named Ioannides, but does not have a personal relationship with him. <a href="#">(293:2 - 293:10)</a>
- Fauci Unfamiliar with Ioannides Study	Dr. Anthony Fauci is not familiar with a serial prevalence study conducted by a scientist named Ioannides and others in Santa Clara County in March of 2020. <a href="#">(293:11 - 293:16)</a>
- Fauci's Study Prevalence in Santa Clara County	Dr. Anthony Fauci does not remember a study evaluating the prevalence of a virus in Santa Clara County at the beginning of the pandemic, even though it might have been brought to his attention. He mentions that he is presented with hundreds of studies. Exhibit 52 was subsequently marked for identification. <a href="#">(293:17 - 294:8)</a>
- Herd Immunity False Premise	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci confirmed receiving an email from Greg Folkers on November 1st, 2020. The email contained a list of articles, with Folkers highlighting the three he found most useful. Among the articles was one titled "Herd Immunity, the false premise of the herd immunity." <a href="#">(294:9 - 295:3)</a>
- Herd Immunity Criticism	Dr. Anthony Fauci received articles criticizing the herd immunity approach of the Great Barrington Declaration from Greg Folkers on November 1st, 2020. He did not remember the exact reason why Folkers sent him these articles, but he believed it was probably because he had asked for articles about herd immunity. He could not confirm whether he had forwarded these articles to Francis Collins.

	<a href="#">(295:4 - 295:22)</a>
- Herd Immunity Criticism Discussions	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci does not remember communicating with the authors of articles criticizing the herd immunity approach of the Great Barrington Declaration, which Greg Folkers sent to him on November 1st, 2020. He recognizes some of the authors, such as John Barry, Gregg Gonsalves, and Michelle, but does not recall having any discussions with them about these articles. <a href="#">(295:23 - 296:5)</a>
- Fauci's Connections to Great Barrington Declaration	Dr. Anthony Fauci is familiar with John Barry, Apoorva Mandavilli, Sheryl Stolberg, Mark Lipschitz, Gregg Gonsalves, Carlos del Rio, and Rochelle Walensky. He has been interviewed by Mandavilli and Stolberg from the New York Times. Despite these connections, he does not remember if he discussed the Great Barrington Declaration with any of them. <a href="#">(296:6 - 296:21)</a>
- Misguided and Potentially Harmful	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci did not recall influencing online criticism of the Great Barrington Declaration. He personally viewed the declaration as misguided and potentially harmful, potentially leading to unnecessary infection, hospitalization, and death if its premise is followed. He could not remember his exact words to the media about the declaration, but believed his opinion was widely known and shared by many scientists nationwide. <a href="#">(296:22 - 297:20)</a>
- Scientists disagree with Great Barrington Declaration	Dr. Anthony Fauci has not calculated the exact number of scientists who concur with the Great Barrington Declaration. He interacts with a large number of scientists, most of whom, according to him, disagree with the declaration. He acknowledged that the 15,000 scientists who signed the declaration are part of this group. However, he has not examined the list of these 15,000 signatories and proposed that many individuals sign petitions without fully comprehending their consequences. <a href="#">(297:21 - 298:16)</a>
- Fauci Exhibit 53	Exhibit 53 was identified during Dr. Anthony Fauci's testimony. <a href="#">(298:17 - 298:20)</a>
- Email dated March 14th, 2020 confusion	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed that he saw an email dated March 14th, 2020, on the second page of FAUCI Exhibit No. 53, which was sent from an unspecified person at Twitter to a Carol Crawford. Despite this, he expressed confusion and stated that he did not recognize anything on the document. <a href="#">(298:21 - 299:5)</a>
- Email from Twitter to Carol Cross	Dr. Anthony Fauci identified an email that was sent from an individual at Twitter to a person named Carol Cross, as pointed out by Mr. Sauer. <a href="#">(299:6 - 299:9)</a>
- Fauci confirms Twitter account.	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed that the client referred to earlier is the @anthonyfauci_ Twitter account. He acknowledged seeing a message from a Twitter user questioning the legitimacy of the @anthonyfauci_ account due to doubts raised about its authenticity. <a href="#">(299:10 - 299:17)</a>
- Fauci confirms Twitter email, response, and Prince's request.	Anthony Fauci confirmed that an email from a Twitter representative to Carol Cross referred to his Twitter account. He acknowledged Carol Crawford's response on March 14th, which included adding someone from NIH and HHS for verification. Although he did not personally know Scott Prince, the NIH individual mentioned in the email, he confirmed that Prince probably works in the NIH director's office and not directly under him. Fauci also confirmed that Prince had contacted Twitter to request the removal of a fake or imposter handle. <a href="#">(299:18 - 300:17)</a>
- Fake Fauci Twitter Account	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci has a vague recollection of a fake Twitter account impersonating him. He is uncertain about the specific actions taken in response to this account, but he believes his communication staff would have likely sought its removal if they deemed it false and misleading. He confirms that he did not personally request the removal of the account. <a href="#">(300:18 - 301:4)</a>
- Fauci's Uncertainty on Social Media Content	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci expressed uncertainty about whether his communication staff would liaise with social media platforms to eliminate false and misleading content, particularly a counterfeit account impersonating him. He further specified that he does not focus on issues concerning

	social media accounts. <a href="#">(301:5 - 301:12)</a>
- Communication Staff Size	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci stated that his communication staff is composed of a large number of people. <a href="#">(301:13 - 301:14)</a>
- Fauci Communication Staff Lead	Courtney Billet leads the communication staff of Dr. Anthony Fauci. <a href="#">(301:15 - 301:16)</a>
- Removing Fake Account	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci does not remember directing Courtney Billet, his communication staff leader, to communicate with a social media platform about eliminating a fraudulent account. He presumes that Billet would have independently acted to remove the fake account, possibly without his knowledge, except to inform him about the fake account's existence and assure him it would be addressed. While he does not recall a specific discussion about this with Billet, he vaguely remembers someone mentioning a fake account. He was not aware of the concept of a fake account and was surprised that such accounts could exist. Fauci does not personally engage in locating or handling fake accounts, as he has a specialized communication team to handle such matters. <a href="#">(301:17 - 302:15)</a>
- Fauci's Communication Staff Focus	Dr. Anthony Fauci stated that his communication staff, including Courtney Billet and others, focus on his wellbeing rather than on false or misleading impersonations of him on social media. He also clarified that his staff does not actively seek out potentially false information related to imposter or fake accounts impersonating him on social media platforms. <a href="#">(302:16 - 303:1)</a>
- Social Media Imposter Accounts	Dr. Anthony Fauci stated that his communication staff does not actively seek out imposter accounts on social media. He mentioned that if an imposter account, like the "@Anthony Fauci" account brought up by Lauren Duvall, is brought to their attention, they would express concern and take necessary action. <a href="#">(303:2 - 303:8)</a>
- Preventing Impersonations	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci confirmed that an HHS official expressed gratitude to a person named Lauren and showed an intention to prevent further impersonations of him, which he agreed is undesirable. He also confirmed that a Twitter official responded on March 14th, stating they would freeze his @ handle and some other variations to prevent anyone from impersonating him. <a href="#">(303:9 - 304:1)</a>
- Preventing Fauci Impersonation	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci was unsure about the meaning of a statement concerning Twitter officials freezing certain account handles to prevent his impersonation. He speculated that it could refer to efforts to prevent someone from impersonating him, which he agreed would be negative. However, he was confused about the specific method of preventing this impersonation by removing accounts from Twitter. He also mentioned that his communication staff would likely be upset if someone falsely claimed to be him. <a href="#">(304:2 - 304:22)</a>
- Misleading YouTube Video on Coronavirus	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci identified an email from Nicole Berkowitz in Exhibit 54, but did not recognize her name. He confirmed the email was sent to the NIH.gov list, but was unsure about the specifics of "@list.NIH.gov", only knowing it was related to the NIH. He discussed a paragraph in Berkowitz's email that referred to a misleading YouTube video titled "How to Kill Coronavirus", which was confused for a CDC video on COVID-19 due to an ad banner and the algorithm used. Dr. Fauci expressed a need to thoroughly read the document to understand it, as it seemed to be related to the CDC. <a href="#">(304:23 - 306:16)</a>
- Fauci's Awareness of EPA Video	Dr. Anthony Fauci acknowledged his awareness of Nicole Berkowitz's reference to the content of a video as incredibly dangerous information. He initially sought clarification on Berkowitz's identity, but after being informed that she was a communications lead for the EPA, he confirmed his understanding upon seeing it on the next page of a document from EPA.gov. <a href="#">(306:17 - 307:5)</a>
- Fauci's No Memory	Dr. Anthony Fauci has no memory of a communications lead for the EPA consulting with an

of EPA-NIH Consultation	NIH list to find a social media contact to remove harmful information, specifically the content of a YouTube video. He also indicated that he was confused about the subject under discussion. <a href="#">(307:6 - 307:17)</a>
- NIAID Email Chain Review	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed his review of an email chain from April 2020, which included an email sent by Judith Lavelle of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) to Facebook. <a href="#">(307:18 - 307:22)</a>
- NIAID, NIH employee	Dr. Anthony Fauci stated that Judith Lavelle is employed at his institute, the NIAID, NIH, where he is the director. He mentioned that he might have come across her due to the institute's large size, but he is not aware of her specific role or responsibilities. <a href="#">(307:23 - 308:3)</a>
- Fauci Confirms Lavelle Works at Different Building	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed that Judith Lavelle, a technical writer editor from NIAID, works at Fishers Lane, a different building from his location, making it unlikely for him to have encountered her. He also acknowledged that Jennifer Routh was copied on the same email as Judith Lavelle during the last CRC. <a href="#">(308:4 - 308:13)</a>
- Fauci Communications Team	Jennifer Routh is part of Dr. Anthony Fauci's communications team. <a href="#">(308:14 - 308:16)</a>
- Fauci identifies Lavelle as technical writer at NIAID.	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci identified Judith Lavelle as a technical writer editor at his institute, NIAID, NIH, and suggested that she is probably part of his communications staff. He further clarified that technical writers are typically part of the larger communications group, which is overseen by Courtney Billet. <a href="#">(308:17 - 309:3)</a>
- Fake Fauci Accounts	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci confirmed that he saw an email from Judith Lavelle, a technical writer editor likely from his communications staff at NIAID, NIH. The email informed Facebook about the existence of several fake Dr. Fauci accounts on Facebook and Instagram. <a href="#">(309:4 - 309:7)</a>
- Fake Fauci Accounts on Social Media	Judith Lavelle, from her position at the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) and her personal Facebook account, reported approximately eight fake Dr. Fauci accounts on Facebook and Instagram. <a href="#">(309:8 - 309:13)</a>
- Fauci Confirms Clarity Suggestion	Judith Lavelle, a technical writer editor at NIAID, made a comment about a page titled "Dr. Fauci the hero," suggesting it could have been clearer and might be more suitable as a fan page. Dr. Fauci confirmed her suggestion. <a href="#">(309:14 - 309:19)</a>
- Fake Facebook accounts flagged for removal	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci was not aware that his communications staff, including Judith Lavelle and Jennifer Routh, were flagging numerous fake Facebook accounts for removal. He recognized that his staff were working to eliminate these accounts due to their problematic nature. He pointed out that individuals were falsely using his name to create these fake accounts, which his communications staff found concerning. These accounts were engaged in activities such as selling masks. Dr. Fauci concurred that it was suitable for his staff to be worried about people falsely impersonating him. However, he expressed uncertainty about whether some of these accounts were parody accounts. <a href="#">(309:20 - 310:21)</a>
- Uncertainty about Fake Accounts	Dr. Fauci expressed uncertainty about the nature of some fake accounts flagged by the communications staff, specifically parody accounts. Even after having the concept of a parody account explained to him, he maintained his lack of knowledge about these accounts, stating that he had only received links to them. He confirmed seeing the mention of "one more" in a second email that flagged another account. <a href="#">(310:22 - 311:14)</a>
- Removal of Impersonations	Dr. Fauci confirmed that an individual from Facebook identified an issue to the fake accounts team, leading to the removal of all but two accounts impersonating him. He agreed that impersonations are undesirable.

	<a href="#">(311:15 - 311:21)</a>
- Scrutinizing Fake Accounts	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci expressed his belief that impersonation and fake accounts, especially those pretending to be him, should be closely scrutinized and potentially removed from social media. <a href="#">(311:22 - 312:1)</a>
- Scrutinizing Social Media False Statements	Dr. Anthony Fauci does not involve himself with or focus on issues related to false statements on social media. He does not have an opinion on whether someone should scrutinize such false statements and reiterated that he does not engage with social media issues. <a href="#">(312:2 - 312:9)</a>
- Fauci's communication staff not addressing false info.	Dr. Fauci stated that his communication staff, to his knowledge, does not engage in addressing false information or misinformation on social media. <a href="#">(312:10 - 312:13)</a>
- Fauci's Social Media Communications	Dr. Fauci stated his belief that his communications staff does not try to influence social media. He also expressed that it is appropriate for his team to show concern when he is impersonated online. <a href="#">(312:14 - 313:5)</a>
- Fauci-Burwell acquaintance	Dr. Anthony Fauci identified Sylvia Burwell as the former Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services and the current president of American University, confirming his acquaintance with her. <a href="#">(313:6 - 313:11)</a>
- Fauci-Burwell COVID-19 Advice	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed that over the past few years, Sylvia Burwell, the former Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services and the current president of American University, has sought his advice on personal safety during the COVID-19 pandemic. However, he did not remember a specific instance in February 2020 when she inquired via email about the need to wear a mask while traveling through an airport. <a href="#">(313:12 - 314:7)</a>
- Advising against mask use in low-risk locations	Dr. Anthony Fauci recalls advising Sylvia Burwell on mask safety, stating that masks primarily prevent infected individuals from spreading the virus, rather than protecting the uninfected. He mentioned that typical drugstore masks are not very effective against the virus due to its small size, but they might offer some protection against large droplets from direct coughs or sneezes. He had advised Burwell against wearing a mask, particularly as she was heading to a low-risk location. <a href="#">(314:8 - 314:25)</a>
- Advising against masks during outbreak	Dr. Anthony Fauci does not recall advising Sylvia Burwell against wearing a mask during travel, but admits the possibility of having done so due to his numerous interactions. He would not contest the assertion if shown an email from him with proper identification providing such advice. He confirms that he might have given such advice during the outbreak and agrees to having made several similar statements during that period, including claims that masks are not effective. <a href="#">(315:1 - 315:16)</a>
- Mask Usage Evolution	In the early months of 2020, Dr. Anthony Fauci, along with the surgeon general and the CDC, did not advocate for mask usage due to concerns about a mask shortage for medical professionals, lack of evidence supporting mask effectiveness outside medical settings, and unawareness of significant virus transmission from asymptomatic individuals. As circumstances evolved, it was determined that there was no mask shortage, asymptomatic spread was a significant factor, and masks were indeed effective in preventing transmission. Consequently, Dr. Fauci became a strong supporter of mask-wearing, aligning with a universal recommendation by April 3rd, 2020. <a href="#">(315:17 - 317:17)</a>
- Mask efficacy uncertainty	Dr. Anthony Fauci expressed uncertainty regarding the timeline of a recommendation for universal masking. He admitted to informing Ms. Burwell via email in February 2020 that standard drugstore masks were not highly effective in preventing virus transmission. Despite this, he was unable to remember the specific studies conducted on mask efficacy in halting the spread of COVID-19 between February and April 3rd, 2020. He proposed to locate and supply

	<p>this information, as it was not immediately accessible to him.  <a href="#">(317:18 - 318:11)</a></p>
- Government mask effectiveness consultation absence	<p>Dr. Anthony S. Fauci does not recall consulting with anyone in the government regarding the effectiveness of masks between February and April 3rd of 2020.  <a href="#">(318:12 - 318:15)</a></p>
- Evolution of Masking Stance	<p>Dr. Anthony S. Fauci's stance on masking evolved due to new scientific evidence and information. Factors influencing this change included the understanding that there was no mask shortage, the discovery of asymptomatic virus spread, and growing evidence supporting the effectiveness of masks in preventing virus acquisition and transmission. He acknowledged that there were disagreements regarding the effectiveness of masks at that time.  <a href="#">(318:16 - 318:23)</a></p>
- Masks Not Effective Perspective	<p>Dr. Anthony S. Fauci does not remember sending a study on March 31st, 2020, implying that masks are not effective. He also mentioned that he consistently has access to differing perspectives, which are crucial for shaping his opinions.  <a href="#">(318:24 - 319:16)</a></p>
- Science debate access.	<p>Dr. Anthony S. Fauci has access to both sides of the debate in science and agrees that this is important for people.  <a href="#">(319:17 - 319:21)</a></p>
- Mask Debate Consideration and Supply Management	<p>Dr. Anthony Fauci considered both sides of the debate when making decisions about the efficacy of masks in preventing the spread of COVID-19, basing his judgment on the preponderance of the correct data. He stressed the significance of proper statistical analysis and design when evaluating studies. He acknowledged that his recommendation against masking in February was partly to avoid a mask shortage for healthcare providers, a concern raised in the coronavirus task force meetings. Measures were taken to boost the mask supply, such as imports, increased production, and the use of cloth mask alternatives. The potential mask shortage influenced the decision not to encourage the public to purchase and wear masks.  <a href="#">(319:22 - 321:25)</a></p>
- Mask Efficacy Studies Reviewed	<p>Dr. Anthony Fauci does not recall whether placebo-based, randomized, double-blind studies on the efficacy of masking were conducted between February and April of 2020. He expressed the need to review the literature to confirm this.  <a href="#">(322:1 - 322:5)</a></p>
- Mask Effectiveness Studies.	<p>Dr. Anthony S. Fauci acknowledged early studies claiming masks were ineffective in preventing disease spread, but noted these studies were deemed inconclusive upon statistical scrutiny. He confirmed that later studies comparing mask wearing to non-mask wearing clearly demonstrated the effectiveness of masks.  <a href="#">(322:6 - 322:16)</a></p>
- Public access to accurate information.	<p>Dr. Anthony Fauci stressed the importance of public access to all available information, cautioning that inadequate or statistically unsound information can be harmful to those unable to discern its flaws. He underscored the self-correcting nature of science, with studies frequently conducted to examine and rectify statistically insignificant data. He also confirmed an email chain dated October 30th, 2020, involving Jen Routh, a member of his communications team, and individuals from Google.com.  <a href="#">(322:17 - 324:9)</a></p>
- Fauci confirms Billet, Sitar, Routh on vaccine misinformation.	<p>Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed Courtney Billet as the head of his communications team and acknowledged her inclusion in an email chain initiated by Sandra Sitar from NIAID. Despite not recognizing Sandra Sitar's name, he identified her as the director of communications, clinical trials program, VRC, based on her signature block, indicating her affiliation with the vaccine research center at NIAID. He also confirmed that Sandra Sitar had emailed Jennifer Routh about addressing vaccine misinformation.  <a href="#">(324:10 - 325:6)</a></p>
- Fauci's knowledge of VRC-Google vaccine communications	<p>Dr. Anthony Fauci acknowledged seeing an email in which Sandra, the director of communications for the clinical trials program at VRC at NIAID, indicated that Jennifer Routh from his communications team and the Google team were looking to discuss vaccine communications, particularly misinformation. Despite this, he claimed to have no knowledge of</p>

	his communications team liaising with the Google, YouTube team about vaccine misinformation. He also expressed uncertainty about whether his team had a discussion with Google about vaccine communications around October 30th, 2020. He further stated that it would be improbable for him to either authorize or not authorize someone to converse with Google about vaccine communications, including misinformation. <a href="#">(325:7 - 326:13)</a>
- Fauci's Communication Team Independence	Dr. Anthony Fauci did not specifically authorize his communication team, led by Courtney Billet, to liaise with Google regarding vaccine misinformation. He clarified that his communication team functions independently and does not need his approval for their communications, as it is part of their responsibilities. He confirmed Courtney Billet as the director of his entire communications team. <a href="#">(326:14 - 327:14)</a>

### Dr. Anthony Fauci Testified He Was Unaware of Plans to Remove a Fake Instagram Account Impersonating Him

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
- Vaccine Misinformation Discussions with Google	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci does not remember having specific discussions with Courtney Billet about communicating with Google concerning vaccine misinformation. <a href="#">(327:15 - 327:23)</a>
- Fauci Examination Discussion	Exhibit 57 was identified during Dr. Anthony Fauci's examination, followed by an off-the-record discussion. <a href="#">(327:24 - 328:3)</a>
- Email from Clarke Humphrey, July 2021	Dr. Anthony Fauci acknowledged seeing an email from Clarke Humphrey dated July 2021 in FAUCI Exhibit No. 57. <a href="#">(328:4 - 328:7)</a>
- Fake Fauci Instagram Removal Request	Dr. Anthony Fauci recognized Clarke Humphrey as a communications person at the White House and acknowledged an email Humphrey sent to Facebook in July 2021. The email requested the removal of a non-affiliated Instagram account named "Anthony Fauci official." Fauci also noted that the email's subject was "Deactivating the fake Fauci IG," which he assumed referred to Instagram. <a href="#">(328:8 - 328:19)</a>
- Awareness of Fake Accounts	Dr. Anthony Fauci acknowledged his awareness of fake accounts impersonating him on Facebook. He remembered that someone in his group had brought up the issue, but he could not recall who was specifically tasked with handling it. He confirmed that there were discussions about dealing with the impersonation issue, but he could not remember any specific details about these discussions. <a href="#">(328:20 - 329:7)</a>
- Fake Instagram Account Removal	Dr. Anthony Fauci acknowledged the removal of a fake Instagram account named "Anthony Fauci official" and agreed that the removal of such spurious accounts is beneficial. However, an objection was raised when he was asked if the removal was at the request of the White House, due to speculation. <a href="#">(329:8 - 329:19)</a>

### Dr. Fauci Testifies About a Fake Instagram Account Impersonating Him, Mentioned by the White House's Digital Director

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
- White House Digital Director Email Confirmation	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed his understanding of an email from Clarke Humphrey, the White House's digital director, regarding a deactivated fake Instagram account that had impersonated him. <a href="#">(329:20 - 330:4)</a>
- Examining Exhibit No. 58	Dr. Anthony Fauci examined FAUCI Exhibit No. 58. <a href="#">(330:5 - 330:9)</a>

**Dr. Fauci Confirmed in a Deposition That the CDC Informed Facebook About the Inaccuracy of Ivermectin's Effectiveness Against COVID-19**

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
- Email chain involving Google, CDC, and Carol Crawford.	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed the existence of an email chain involving individuals at Google and the CDC, including Carol Crawford. He also acknowledged an email from Catherine Jamal of the CDC on the first page of a particular document. <a href="#">(330:10 - 330:20)</a>
- CDC's stance on Ivermectin for COVID	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed that an email was sent by Catherine Jamal of the CDC to two individuals at Facebook, with Carol Crawford of the CDC copied in. The email was titled "Ivermectin questions for the CDC" and contained the CDC's stance on three claims. The first claim, stating that Ivermectin is effective in treating COVID, was refuted by the CDC. Dr. Fauci stated his belief that this response was typed in by the CDC. <a href="#">(330:21 - 331:14)</a>
- NIH-Guideline-Ivermectin-Effectiveness	Dr. Anthony Fauci acknowledged that individuals at Google and the CDC, namely Carol Crawford and Catherine Jamal, are using a guideline from the NIH to argue that the effectiveness of ivermectin is not accurate. He confirmed that he has seen a guideline titled "Practice guideline, COVID-19 guideline, treatment management" and another document titled "Ivermectin COVID-19 treatment guidelines" with NIH.gov mentioned. <a href="#">(331:15 - 332:5)</a>
- CDC and NIH collaboration on ivermectin efficacy.	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci stated he was not aware of the CDC providing information to Facebook to debunk claims about the efficacy of ivermectin, referencing something from the NIH. He expressed that it would not be surprising for organizations like the CDC to utilize the NIH's treatment guidelines, which are formulated by a group of up to 40 infectious disease experts nationwide. He also indicated that social media platforms possibly rely on public statements from health policy experts like him for their decision-making. <a href="#">(332:6 - 333:9)</a>
- Debunking Misinformation	Dr. Anthony Fauci stated that social media platforms or organizations, including the CDC, possibly relied on the published NIH guidelines to debunk information. <a href="#">(333:10 - 333:14)</a>
- Influential Expert Opinion	Dr. Fauci doesn't think his personal views on the effectiveness of ivermectin are as influential as the scholarly analysis of hundreds of articles by the treatment guideline panel. He believes that the opinion of 30 to 40 infectious diseases experts would likely be more influential than the statement of a single physician or scientist. <a href="#">(333:15 - 334:1)</a>
- Consensus of Infectious Disease Experts	Dr. Fauci's opinions are based on the consensus of a group of up to 40 infectious disease experts from across the country, usually the heads of infectious diseases at various medical centers. <a href="#">(334:2 - 334:5)</a>
- "Convolutd and Unclear Question"	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci found a question about his public statements and their interpretation by social media platforms as reflecting a consensus of government or public health authorities to be convoluted and unclear, and did not directly respond to it. He acknowledged the presentation of Exhibit 59. <a href="#">(334:6 - 334:18)</a>
- No information provided.	The narrative does not provide any information about what Dr. Anthony S. Fauci stated, agreed to, confirmed, or denied. <a href="#">(334:19 - 334:22)</a>
- Fauci's Awareness of Berenson's Banning Issue	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci acknowledged his awareness of Alex Berenson, though he was uncertain about the context. He remembered that Berenson had a problem related to being banned, potentially feeling silenced. Fauci clarified that he does not focus on social media issues involving individuals being banned or hindered, as it is not a matter of interest to him. <a href="#">(334:23 - 335:13)</a>
- Examining Exhibit 59	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed that he examined the second paragraph of a document known as Exhibit 59. <a href="#">(335:14 - 335:16)</a>

**Dr. Anthony Fauci Testified He Doesn't Recall Discussions About Vaccine Misinformation on Twitter and Finds Vaccine Rejection Alarming**

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
- White House Chief Medical Advisor	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed his role as the White House chief medical advisor in April of 2021. <a href="#">(335:17 - 335:25)</a>
- Fauci's Knowledge of Slavitt	Dr. Anthony Fauci stated that he does not remember any discussions or communications regarding Alex Berenson's presence or removal on Twitter. He acknowledged knowing Andy Slavitt, who was briefly part of the coronavirus team and spent considerable time at the White House. However, he could not recall Slavitt's whereabouts after his departure from the White House. <a href="#">(336:1 - 336:12)</a>
- Familiar with Andy Slavitt	Dr. Anthony Fauci does not know Rob Flaherty, but he is familiar with Andy Slavitt. <a href="#">(336:13 - 336:16)</a>
- Fauci's Uncertainty on Clarke's Reporting Structure and Lack of Awareness of April Meeting	Dr. Anthony Fauci identified Clarke as a potential digital director for the White House's coronavirus response team, but expressed uncertainty about whether Clarke reports to the director. He was questioned about a meeting involving Andy Slavitt, Rob Flaherty, and Twitter representatives in April 2021 to address vaccine misinformation, but he did not remember being aware of this meeting. <a href="#">(336:17 - 337:6)</a>
- Slack message thread on vaccine disinformation	Dr. Anthony Fauci acknowledged seeing a Slack message thread from a Twitter employee that mentioned Andy Slavitt, a temporary member of the White House coronavirus team, and Alex Berenson. The thread implied that Slavitt had access to data suggesting Berenson was a significant source of vaccine disinformation affecting the persuadable public. Despite this, Fauci was not aware of any conversations regarding a Twitter user being a primary source of vaccine disinformation. He noted that while there were frequent discussions about misinformation and disinformation, he could not remember any specific link to Berenson. He conceded that the information did not resonate with him. <a href="#">(337:7 - 338:9)</a>
- Vaccine Hesitancy & Disinformation	Dr. Anthony Fauci addressed the issue of misinformation, especially on social media, contributing to vaccine hesitancy. He cited a false claim that he and Bill Gates had implanted a chip in the vaccine for surveillance purposes as an example of this disinformation. He defined disinformation as the intentional spread of false information. He denied participating in any conversations with his White House colleagues about halting the spread of such disinformation, asserting that he had not been part of any discussions about stopping or blocking things. <a href="#">(338:10 - 340:6)</a>
- Fauci never halted false info.	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci was never part of any discussions aimed at halting the dissemination of information he knew to be false. <a href="#">(340:7 - 340:10)</a>
- Preventing Misinformation Spread Unremembered	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci does not remember participating in talks about halting the spread of disinformation, like rumors of a chip in the vaccine, on social media or any other platform. While he admits that the topic of stopping misinformation might have been brought up, he does not recall any specific involvement in preventing its spread. He did not view it as a main concern. <a href="#">(340:11 - 340:24)</a>
- Fauci's CNN State of the Union Comments	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed the identification of Exhibit 60 as a report from The Hill dated July 11th, 2021. He acknowledged his public comments reported in the document, which were from a CNN State of the Union talk show. Before providing further comments, he requested to read the entire document. He also acknowledged seeing the top of the second page of the document. <a href="#">(340:25 - 341:14)</a>
- Fauci Confirms Berenson Response	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci confirmed his response to a clip of conservative author Alex Berenson speaking at CPAC on a Saturday.

	<a href="#">(341:15 - 341:18)</a>
- Fauci's CPAC Response	Dr. Anthony Fauci identified Alex Berenson after viewing a clip of him speaking at CPAC, where Berenson claimed the government aimed to deceive 90% of the population into getting vaccinated. Fauci did not remember describing Berenson's statement as "horrifying" on CNN State of the Union, but did not dispute the quote attributed to him. He also recognized a quote attributed to him by The Hill, expressing that it was almost frightening for people to reject health officials' attempts to save their lives, and did not dispute this quote. <a href="#">(341:19 - 342:25)</a>
- Fauci's view on non-vaccination.	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci does not remember discussing with any government officials about criticizing Alex Berenson. His remarks on CNN State of the Union in July 2021 were informed by data indicating that hospitalizations and deaths were significantly higher among those who were not vaccinated. He holds the view that endorsing the idea that people should not get vaccinated goes against the principles of sound public health. <a href="#">(343:1 - 343:15)</a>

### Dr. Fauci Testified He Doesn't Remember Discussing Conservative Author Alex Berenson with Any Government Officials

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
- Fauci's lack of recall of Berenson discussions	Dr. Anthony Fauci does not recall having any discussions about Alex Berenson, a conservative author, with any government officials. Although he admits that such discussions might have taken place, he does not remember them. Upon being shown a clip of Berenson, he is able to recognize him. <a href="#">(343:16 - 343:23)</a>
- Marked for Identification	FAUCI Exhibit No. 61 was marked for identification by Mr. Sauer. <a href="#">(343:24 - 344:2)</a>

### Dr. Fauci Confirmed President Biden's Frustration with Social Media Spreading Vaccine Misinformation, Leading to Unnecessary Deaths

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
- Biden's Frustration with Social Media Disinformation	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed that he had seen a New York Times report from July 16th, 2021, updated on July 19th, 2021. He agreed with the statement that the report's first line was "President Biden unleashed his growing frustration with Social Media on Friday saying that platforms like Facebook were killing people by allowing disinformation about the coronavirus vaccine to spread online". <a href="#">(344:3 - 344:16)</a>
- President's statement on social media companies	Dr. Anthony Fauci does not recall the president stating that social media companies are "killing people". He acknowledges a New York Times report quoting the president saying this, but does not dispute the quote. He suggests that he might have been aware of the statement when it was made, but does not remember it now, except when presented with it during the deposition. <a href="#">(344:17 - 345:2)</a>
- Misinformation-Induced Deaths	Dr. Anthony Fauci expressed his concern about misinformation and disinformation, particularly when it discourages individuals from receiving lifesaving interventions, leading to unnecessary deaths. He equated the spread of such false information that causes people to avoid lifesaving measures to contributing to their death. <a href="#">(345:3 - 345:15)</a>
- Government misinformation/disinformation deaths	Dr. Anthony Fauci stated that he does not remember having conversations with any government officials or personnel about misinformation or disinformation on social media platforms causing people's deaths during an unspecified time period. <a href="#">(345:16 - 346:4)</a>
- Misinformation and Disinformation Detrimental to Public Health	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci considers misinformation and disinformation, particularly those that discourage people from lifesaving interventions, as detrimental to good public health principles. <a href="#">(346:5 - 346:7)</a>

**Dr. Fauci Testified That Disinformation Spread Via Social Media, Causing Avoidance of Lifesaving Measures, Harms Public Health**

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
- Social Media Disinformation Leads to Death	Dr. Anthony Fauci believes that the propagation of disinformation on social media, which encourages people to avoid lifesaving interventions, leads to people's death and is contrary to public health. <a href="#">(346:8 - 346:13)</a>

**During His Deposition, Dr. Anthony S. Fauci Was Requested to Review Exhibit 62**

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
- Examining Exhibit 62	Dr. Anthony Fauci examined Exhibit 62. <a href="#">(346:14 - 346:20)</a>

**Dr. Anthony Fauci Testified About His Knowledge of Scott Gottlieb, His Limited Twitter Connections, His Endorsement of a COVID-19 Drug, and Countering Misinformation**

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
- Fauci-Gottlieb acquaintance/communication	Dr. Anthony Fauci is acquainted with Scott Gottlieb from Gottlieb's time as the FDA commissioner, but they do not share a social relationship. Fauci is aware that Gottlieb often appears on CBS Sunday Morning shows to discuss COVID-19 and other health topics. Fauci might have communicated with Gottlieb in 2021, especially during the summer, but he cannot remember specific interactions due to the large number of people he communicates with. He would not be surprised if there was evidence of such communication. <a href="#">(346:21 - 347:14)</a>
- Email from Scott Gottlieb to Redacted Name re Alex Berenson Twitter Ban	Dr. Anthony Fauci identified a pasted email in Exhibit 62. The email was sent by Scott Gottlieb to an individual with a redacted name and was related to a post by Alex Berenson discussing his ban from Twitter. <a href="#">(347:15 - 348:6)</a>
- Fauci criticized for arrogance.	Alex Berenson criticized Dr. Anthony S. Fauci, labeling him as arrogant and commenting on the implications for the public. This criticism was subsequently forwarded to a Twitter user by Scott Gottlieb. Dr. Fauci confirmed that he is likely the 'Tony' mentioned in the email. <a href="#">(348:7 - 349:6)</a>
- Fauci security detail threats.	Dr. Anthony Fauci does not recall having a conversation with Scott Gottlieb about the necessity of a security detail due to online threats from individuals such as Alex Berenson. Despite this, he admits that such a discussion might have taken place, as he has a security detail because of numerous threats to his life. He also verifies that he is frequently referred to as "Tony". <a href="#">(349:7 - 349:23)</a>
- Fauci-Twitter Relationship	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed his first-name basis relationship with someone at Twitter. <a href="#">(349:24 - 350:2)</a>
- "Nickname for Dr. Fauci used by Twitter employee"	Dr. Anthony Fauci stated that a Twitter employee named Scott refers to him as Tony. He clarified that he does not observe anyone else on Twitter using this nickname for him. He also confirmed that Scott uses this nickname when speaking about him to another unidentified individual at Twitter. <a href="#">(350:3 - 350:15)</a>
- Fauci's Daughter at Twitter	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci is not currently on a first-name basis with anyone who works at Twitter. He was on a first-name basis with his daughter when she was employed at Twitter. <a href="#">(350:16 - 350:23)</a>
- Fauci's daughter's Twitter employment status.	Dr. Fauci does not recall whether his daughter was employed at Twitter on August 24, 2021, implying she might have departed from the company by then. <a href="#">(350:24 - 351:2)</a>
- Fauci-Gottlieb Vaccine Discussions	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci has not been on a first-name basis with anyone who worked at Twitter, except for his daughter. He believes Scott Gottlieb was on the board of Pfizer, but is unsure of the exact timing of Gottlieb's tenure. Fauci frequently discussed vaccine development, but does

	not remember if he specifically discussed it with Gottlieb. He also does not recall having specific conversations with Gottlieb about internet speech potentially leading to vaccine hesitancy. <a href="#">(351:3 - 352:11)</a>
- Fauci's lack of knowledge of Berenson	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci stated that he does not remember discussing Alex Berenson with Scott Gottlieb. He also mentioned that he does not recognize the name Alex Berenson, but suggested that Berenson might be connected to some of the items he was shown earlier. <a href="#">(352:12 - 352:18)</a>
- Fauci Exhibit 63	Exhibit 63 was identified during Dr. Anthony Fauci's testimony. <a href="#">(352:19 - 352:22)</a>
- Vice Provost Ezekiel J Emmanuel	Ezekiel J, also known as Zeke Emmanuel, is recognized as a vice provost at the University of Pennsylvania. He has held, and may continue to hold, the position of director of the division or program of medical ethics at the same institution. <a href="#">(352:23 - 353:4)</a>
- Fauci's endorsement of remdesivir for COVID-19 treatment	Dr. Anthony Fauci received an email from Ezekiel J. Emmanuel expressing confusion over Fauci's endorsement of remdesivir, an antiviral drug for COVID-19 treatment. Fauci was pleased with the clinical trial results of remdesivir, which showed a modest but clear effect, especially as there were no other good drugs for COVID-19 at the time. He did not strongly endorse the drug, but saw it as a step towards developing more effective treatments. The drug's importance lay in its ability to suppress the virus enough to see a clinical effect, however modest. Fauci also discussed various COVID-19 related topics, including hydroxychloroquine, mask effectiveness, the origins of COVID-19, vaccine efficacy, and herd immunity. He did not use strong language in media statements about these issues, but asserted that his language was mostly measured. <a href="#">(353:5 - 355:25)</a>
- Fauci acknowledges disagreement.	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci acknowledged that individuals, including Alex Berenson, have disagreed with him using strong language. <a href="#">(356:1 - 356:4)</a>
- Expert on Social Media Not	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci is not an expert on what should or should not be posted on social media and believes that people have the right to express their opinions. He repeatedly stated that he is not a social media person. <a href="#">(356:5 - 356:17)</a>
- Combatting Misinformation.	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci shared his views on the potential dangers of posting misleading opinions on social media. He clarified his lack of expertise in legal or First Amendment issues, but as a physician and scientist, he recognized the harm of disinformation, especially when it deters people from lifesaving measures. Despite this, he did not propose limiting individuals' freedom of expression. He instead recommended combating misinformation by saturating the system with accurate information, a position he has consistently maintained. <a href="#">(356:18 - 357:18)</a>
- Fauci's lack of expertise in social media responsibility.	Dr. Anthony Fauci expressed his lack of expertise in the legal aspects of social media platforms' responsibility to remove dangerous misinformation. He admitted to not being well-versed in the details of what should be on social media and stated that he has not deeply considered or analyzed the advantages and disadvantages of this issue. As a result, he refrained from commenting on the matter. <a href="#">(357:19 - 358:4)</a>

### Dr. Fauci Advocates for Honest COVID-19 Debates, Cautioning Against Misinformation Causing Harmful Actions

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
- Honest COVID-19 Debate	Dr. Anthony Fauci expressed his belief in the importance of honest debate on differing opinions related to COVID-19, including topics like the efficacy of hydroxychloroquine and the origins of the virus. He expressed concern about uninformed individuals taking harmful actions based on these debates. However, he stated that preventing such outcomes is not within his responsibility. <a href="#">(358:5 - 358:19)</a>

## Dr. Fauci Testified That He Combats Vaccine Misinformation by Spreading Accurate Information Via Multiple Media Outlets

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Summary</u>
- Promoting Vaccination Safety	Dr. Fauci mitigates against misinformation and disinformation by disseminating correct information. He uses various platforms such as media engagements, writing, interviews, and podcasts to promote vaccination. His latest message emphasized the importance of getting the updated booster for individual, community, and family safety. This approach is his strategy to counter misinformation and disinformation. The deposition concluded at 5:01 p.m. on November 23rd, 2022, with no further questions asked and the right to read and sign reserved. <a href="#">(358:20 - 359:22)</a>

### Transcript

Citation	Question / Answer
10:8 - 10:10	Q Good morning. Can you please state your name for the record? A My name is Anthony S. Fauci. <a href="#">Summary</a>
10:11 - 10:16	Q And, Dr. Fauci, what's your current position? A I'm the director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases at the National Institutes of Health and the Chief Medical Advisor to President Biden. <a href="#">Summary</a>
10:17 - 10:22	Q When did you become the Chief Medical Advisor to the President? A Very shortly after his inauguration. He asked me to be the advisor between the election and the inauguration, and I officially became his advisor following his inauguration. <a href="#">Summary</a>
10:23 - 11:1	Q And then how long have you been the director of NIAID, if I can call it that? A I've been the director of NIAID for 38 years a couple of weeks ago. <a href="#">Summary</a>
11:2 - 11:10	Q Congratulations. Have you ever given a deposition before? A I have. Q How many times? A Once. Q How long ago was that? A You know, I don't know exactly the time, but it was probably anywhere between 15 and 20-plus years ago. <a href="#">Summary</a>
11:11 - 11:12	Q Can I go over some ground rules with you? A Sure. <a href="#">Summary</a>
11:13 - 11:16	Q First of all, when I ask a question, can you and I be careful not to interrupt each other when we're talking for the clarity of the record? A Certainly. <a href="#">Summary</a>
11:17 - 11:22	Q And if I ask a question, if you don't understand the question, could you ask me to clarify to make sure you're answering the question that I'm asking as opposed to some other question you think I might be asking? Can you do that today? A Certainly. <a href="#">Summary</a>
11:23 - 12:2	Q Can you give verbal answers, like you're doing now, instead of merely nodding or saying "uh-huh," "huh-uh," can you say "yes" or "no" as the questions go forward? A Yes. <a href="#">Summary</a>
12:3 - 12:8	Q And maybe both of us can make an effort to speak slowly. You're probably going to be better at that

	<p>than I will, but to make an effort to speak slowly so that everything's getting transcribed. Is that okay?  A I will certainly do that.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
12:9 - 12:25	<p>Q I'd like to start off by handing you a document that I've asked the court reporter to mark as Exhibit 1, and I just want to take -- can you take a glance at this and see if you recognize it? (FAUCI Exhibit No. 1 was marked for identification.) MR. KIRSCHNER: Counsel, this is a standing objection for all of the documents you show. I would ask that you preference your questions, to the extent Dr. Fauci recognizes it, outside of the capacity of preparation for the deposition, otherwise I would object on work product grounds, but if you're asking if you recognize a document outside of anything that was shown in the context of deposition preparation, I will not prevent him from answering. MR. SAUER: You raise a good point.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
13:1 - 13:8	<p>Q Dr. Fauci, did you review any documents in preparation for your deposition today?  A We did a couple of documents -- a few documents, yeah.  Q What documents were those? MR. KIRSCHNER: I object on work product grounds, and I instruct the witness not to answer. BY MR. SAUER:  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
13:9 - 13:12	<p>Q Can you look at the document in front of you, Exhibit 1?  A Yeah. So let me take a -- be careful I read it, recognize it.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
13:13 - 14:16	<p>Q Well, let me ask you this: In 2011, did you coauthor an op-ed with Francis Collins in the Washington Post called "A Flu Virus Risk Worth Taking"?  A Well, I have it in front of me here, and it has my name on it. So, yes, it looks like I did coauthor an editorial in the Washington Post on December 30th of 2011.  Q Do you remember doing it or do you only remember because you see it in front of you?  A No. I vaguely remember. This was 11 years ago. I've written 1300 articles over my last several years.  Q You look at the final paragraph on the first page in the first -- or sort of the first sentence of the final paragraph of the first page, your op-ed states: "Given these uncertainties, important information and insights can come from generating a potentially dangerous virus in the laboratory." Do you remember writing that? MR. KIRSCHNER: Counsel, I would ask for Dr. Fauci to have an opportunity to familiarize himself with the document -- THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. KIRSCHNER: -- prior to answering questions about it. THE WITNESS: Yeah. Let me just read it and see. BY MR. SAUER:  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
14:17 - 15:21	<p>Q Let me ask you a question unrelated to that document just in general. Do you believe as you sit here today that important information, insights, can come from generating a potentially dangerous virus in a laboratory?  A Well, yeah, if you take it into the correct context because when you say "Generating a potentially dangerous virus in the laboratory," that is usually in the context of, for example, taking this H5N1 and studying it in different ways that could potentially make it more dangerous but only under very strict conditions laid out for the guardrails of conducting experiments that could potentially create such a dangerous virus. And if you look at the context of this particular paper, the point that Dr. Collins, Dr. Nabel and I were making that there is a risk as we were talking about with pandemic influenza to understand as best as possible. And, in fact, if you go to the next paragraph, we say "Understanding the biology of virus transmission has implications for outbreak prediction, prevention and treatment." And the point we were making in this article is that there is a risk benefit to research like this, and the point we were making it says "A risk worth taking if the benefit is the protection of the American and global public."  Q You refer to conditions under which such research should be done --  A Right.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
15:22 - 16:10	<p>Q -- when you're generating potentially dangerous viruses.  A Right.  Q First of all, is that kind of research generally referred to as gain-of-function research?</p>

	<p>A Gain of function is a very potentially misleading terminology, and that was one of the reasons why several years ago outside groups, not the NIH, made the determination that they would much more strictly define the guardrails of experiments that would require additional oversight and did away with the terminology "gain of function" because it can often be very confusing and misleading.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
16:11 - 16:20	<p>Q When was that terminology "gain of function" done away with?</p> <p>A At the time, I believe -- and I'm not a hundred percent sure -- but there was a period of time between, I think, 2011 and 2014 or '12 and '14, I'm not sure, when there was a pause that was put on research that was related to the manipulation of the influenza virus in order to get more concrete and more definitive guidelines about what the guardrails of this research should be.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
16:21 - 17:17	<p>Q Do those guardrails include things like the level of biosafety -- biosafety level at which such research should be done?</p> <p>A That, I believe, was part of it. I'm not sure if it was explicitly said, but it certainly could be. There were two elements to it. There was the pause, which any research that could potentially have any collaterally dangerous aspects to it were put on pause, and then a number of organizations outside of the NIH, including the Office of Science and Technology Policy, OSTP, the academies of science, engineering and medicine, and a number of working groups on the outside developed more clarity to the kinds of oversight that would be needed. That is referred to as P3CO or pandemic potential pathogens care and oversight, and the --</p> <p>Q Is that some type -- go ahead.</p> <p>A And the reason for that was the lack of clarity in the terminology "gain of function," which is often confusing. So it was felt by these outside groups to be very clear on the kinds of experiments that needed additional oversight.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
17:18 - 18:3	<p>Q Could I give you a second document, which I guess will be Exhibit 2? (FAUCI Exhibit No. 2 was marked for identification.) MR. KIRSCHNER: Just letting Dr. Fauci know that the court reporter will provide him the document that he's to look at. This -- these are copies for counsel. Do you want to mark this one also? Thank you. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
18:4 - 18:12	<p>Q This Exhibit 2 is a document printed off of the NIH website called "Understanding the Risk of Bat Coronavirus Emergence." Are you familiar with the project that's referred to in this document titled "Understanding the Risk of Bat Coronavirus Emergence"?</p> <p>A I'm vaguely familiar with the fact that EcoHealth Alliance has been doing research on trying to understand the bat coronavirus emergence.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
18:13 - 19:23	<p>Q And was this project initiated in 2014 on your understanding?</p> <p>A I do not know. That is not something that I would have followed very carefully.</p> <p>Q Would you have approved this in your capacity as head of NIAID?</p> <p>A I do -- MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Assuming evidence not in the record. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q You may answer.</p> <p>A I do not individually approve grants. They go through multiple levels of peer review, so I would not have, by standard way things work, have seen this, read it, or individually approved it. That's not the way things work in the Institute.</p> <p>Q Do you have any recollection of this at the time?</p> <p>A I have no recollection -- I have no recollection of the initiation of this grant.</p> <p>Q If you flip to the second page, under "Details," it mentions EcoHealth Alliance. You referred to that a second ago, as the recipient of the project.</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q Is that right?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q And that's your understanding, they did receive funding under this project; is that right? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Assuming evidence not in the record. MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q You may answer.</p>

	<p>A I'm sorry. Would you repeat the question. I'm not understanding what the question is.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
19:24 - 20:14	<p>Q Is it your understanding that EcoHealth Alliance received funding from NIAID under this project?</p> <p>A Well, looking at this, I can't make that connection. I do know, with all of the activity that's been going on with EcoHealth Alliance and the NIAID funding, that indeed, NIAID has funded EcoHealth Alliance. I don't know if I can specifically link it to this particular grant because this is the first time that I have seen this piece of paper.</p> <p>Q Got you. Above that, it lists a man called Peter Daszak. How do you say his name, if you know?</p> <p>A I'm not sure. I think it's Daszak. I think so.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
20:15 - 22:23	<p>Q Do you know Mr. Daszak?</p> <p>A I have met him once or twice. I would not exactly characterize him as an acquaintance.</p> <p>Q In what connection have you met -- sorry, go ahead. MR. KIRSCHNER: Can you please let the witness answer the questions. MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Go ahead.</p> <p>A So what's the question again.</p> <p>Q In what connection have you met him?</p> <p>A You know, I don't even remember meeting him, but I do know that someone showed me a picture at a meeting where somebody said, here, take a picture with him. And so I clearly must have met him because there's a photograph, I believe, of he and I. But that is not unusual, when you go to a scientific meeting, you run into hundreds of people. And I believe that this Dr. Daszak is one of the people that I almost -- well, I did run into him because I believe I've seen a photograph of he and I together at a meeting. But he's not somebody that I would have had a major amount -- I think someone in one of the thousands of e-mails of mine that have been foyered, someone showed me, I think, or pointed out, that there was an e-mail from Peter Daszak to me. And I don't remember the content, but I think it was some casual type of response to something, but it's not someone that I deal with on a regular basis. That is rather clear.</p> <p>Q On that the same page, below Daszak and EcoHealth Alliance, there's a reference to NIAID funding this grant from 1st June of 2014 to 31st May 2019. Do you see that?</p> <p>A It says "Budget Start, 1st of June. Budget End." Is that what you're talking about?</p> <p>Q Yeah. Over there on the right.</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p>Q Did you later become aware that not -- at any time, that NIAID was funding this project? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Vague. Assuming evidence not in the record. THE WITNESS: So I'm sorry. What is the question? MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Did you, at any time later, become aware that NIAID was funding this project understanding the risk of bat Coronavirus emergence?</p> <p>A I became aware of this after all of the attention was put on it, following the early part of January, February, mid-March of 2020, but I certainly was not aware -- well, I wouldn't say certainly because who knows what came across my desk. Thousands of pieces of paper come across my desk. But I do not recall at all being aware of the existence of this grant at the time that it was initially funded of the dates shown on page 2.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
22:24 - 23:2	<p>Q If you go to the first page, in the abstract text, see that big paragraph that covers most of the first page?</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
23:3 - 25:1	<p>Q Very bottom, last couple sentences. Do you see where it begins number 3, and it says, "Test predictions of COV interspecies transmission"?</p> <p>A Hold on. What line up from the bottom are you talking about?</p> <p>Q Fourth line up from the bottom.</p> <p>A Fourth line up from the bottom. "Test predictions" --</p> <p>Q "Test predictions of CoV" --</p> <p>A "Test predictions of -- predictive models of post strains will be tested experimentally using reverse</p>

	<p>genetics" -- yeah.</p> <p>Q What does reverse genetics refer to in that line? Do you know? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. THE WITNESS: I'm not really quite sure what they're referring to. Reverse genetics can mean many things. Manipulation of a virus, recombination, things like that. I'm not exactly sure what they were referring to here. MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Can it refer to what we were talking about a minute ago that you talked about in your 2011 op-ed about generating a more dangerous virus in a laboratory. Can reverse genetics refer to that? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Calls for speculation. THE WITNESS: Yeah. You know, reverse genetics is a very, very broad term that could have multiple applications. The influenza virus vaccine that I hope you were vaccinated with this year was likely produced by reverse genetics. So reverse genetics is a very broad categorization. MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Can it refer to genetic manipulation of a virus in a way that renders it either more transmissible or more virulent? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Calls for speculation. MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Can it refer to that, on your understanding?</p> <p>A Like I said, reverse genetics is a very broad terminology, and it mean manipulation of a virus. We do that when we create an attenuated influenza virus, and I believe it can be done also to amplify the function of the virus.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
25:2 - 27:1	<p>Q I'm going to hand you a document that we've marked Exhibit 3. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 3 was marked for identification.) MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Do you recognize this document? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. To the extent the question is asking for what Dr. Fauci was shown during preparation, I would instruct the witness not to answer on work product grounds. It's a standing objection for all documents. Not saying whether we did or did not show him such documents, but to the extent you're asking if he recognizes this document outside of the preparation, you can ask. THE WITNESS: I don't recognize it as a document that I've seen before, but I'm put before me, I would say, tens of thousands of documents in my capacity. I am aware of the concept of the gain-of-function pause involving influenza, MERS and SARS viruses. MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Let me ask you this: Can you flip to the second page of the document? At the top, it says: "U.S. government gain-of-function deliberative process and research funding pause." You referred earlier in your testimony, I believe, to a period starting in 2014 where there was a pause on gain-of-function research. Do you recall that? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Mischaracterizes testimony. MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Do you recall?</p> <p>A I'm sorry. I'm getting confused on your questions.</p> <p>Q Well, let me ask you. MR. KIRSCHNER: I would ask counsel to allow Dr. Fauci to familiarize himself with the document prior to asking more questions. THE WITNESS: So if the footnote says 1, I have to find out what 1 is referring to. So if you just give me a second. MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q If you see there, it's the bottom line of the second paragraph.</p> <p>A Okay. THE COURT REPORTER: And if I could just ask counsel to slow down a little bit, please. THE WITNESS: Okay. What's the question?</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
27:2 - 28:21	<p>Q The question is: Are you familiar with the U.S. Government policy adopted in 2014 pausing gain-of-function research on certain viruses?</p> <p>A Yes, I am familiar with it.</p> <p>Q And was there an exception in that policy? Yes or no?</p> <p>A To my -- to my -- it says right here an exception; so obviously there was.</p> <p>Q Were you aware of that exception at the time --</p> <p>A Because --</p> <p>Q -- it was adopted?</p> <p>A Either at the time it was adopted or sometime thereafter. And to my recollection and, again, this was 2014; so we're talking eight years ago, but my recollection is that the pause was for all research such as this until a new U.S. Government research policy could be developed.</p> <p>Q And was there an exception to that pause that's set forth in the footnote on your understanding?</p> <p>A Yeah. The deliberations at the time based on the need to continue certain critical research that an exception clause was put in saying that under special circumstances -- and I'll read it so that you get an</p>

	<p>understanding -- an exception from the pause may be obtained if the head of a U.S. Government funding agency determines that the research is urgently needed to protect the public health or national security. So at the time that the pause on all of this research was implemented, it was felt strongly by just about everybody in the research community and the public health community that if you paused everything, there might be a situation where you would want to do an experiment that would be urgently necessary to protect the public health and national security and, therefore, that would allow an exception to be considered.</p> <p>Q Did you ever invoke that exception when -- or you're the head of a U.S. Government funding agency --</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p>Q -- aren't you?</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
28:22 - 30:19	<p>Q Did you ever invoke that exception during the years the pause was in place?</p> <p>A As I recall, exceptions were given to a couple of experiments. To my recollection, that does not usually rise up to the office of the director but is handled at the level of staff and deputy. So I don't recall. It is possible, though I doubt it, but it is possible that a piece of paper that was an ultimate signoff on an exception came to my desk, but I doubt it because I do not recall specifically ever being someone that put a piece of paper in front of me and said "we're going to have an exception. Would you sign off on it?" So it is likely, though, again, I'm not certain. It was eight years ago. It was likely that it was done at the staff level or at the level of my deputy or someone like that.</p> <p>Q It -- is it your understanding that anyone at NIAID authorized any research under this pause during the years that the gain -- the -- the moratorium was in effect?</p> <p>A Again -- MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Calls for speculation. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q If you know?</p> <p>A My memory is vague about this because it was eight years ago, but I understand in subsequent discussions that there may have been a couple of exceptions to that in the context of research that was considered necessary for the protection of the public health or national security.</p> <p>Q Did any of those projects relate to research on viruses conducted by EcoHealth Alliance? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Assumes evidence not in the record. THE WITNESS: Yeah. I'm not certain. I don't -- I don't really recall. I know -- I believe that after the fact, I was brought -- it was brought to my attention that there were exceptions. I am not quite sure what the exceptions were for, but there were a couple of exceptions. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Who in your agency would have authorized those, if not you?</p> <p>A Well, it could have been any of a number of people. It could have been people at the program level. It could have been my deputy. It could have been program managers and division directors.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
30:20 - 30:23	<p>Q Who's your deputy?</p> <p>A Dr. Hugh Auchincloss.</p> <p>Q How do you say his last name, Auchincloss?</p> <p>A Auchincloss, A-U-C-H-I-N-C-L-O-S-S.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
30:24 - 30:25	<p>Q What's his title?</p> <p>A Principal deputy director.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
31:1 - 31:5	<p>Q I'm giving you a document we've marked as Exhibit 4. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 4 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
31:6 - 32:14	<p>Q And do you see this Nature Medicine article entitled "A SARS-like cluster of circulating bat coronaviruses shows potential for human emergence"?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p>Q Were you familiar with this -- this article when it was published in 2015?</p> <p>A I was not familiar with it when it was published in 2015.</p> <p>Q When did you first become aware of it?</p>

	<p>A I believe -- again, I read a lot of articles -- I believe it was brought to my attention in the context of questions that were raised by members of Congress about experiments that were funded by the NIAID.</p> <p>Q So would that have been in and around 2021 time frame, do you know, when you first became aware of it?</p> <p>A It certainly was after the beginning of the COVID-19 outbreak.</p> <p>Q How long after the beginning would you estimate?</p> <p>A I don't recall.</p> <p>Q Would it have been right at the beginning of the outbreak or months into it or years into it?</p> <p>A You know, years is where we are right now. So it wouldn't have been years. So it likely would have been several months, though I'm not a hundred percent certain.</p> <p>Q And so who are the last two authors listed on the top there?</p> <p>A Well, one is Ralph Baric, who I believe is a scientist at North Carolina, who is a long-term grantee of NIAID.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
32:15 - 33:12	<p>Q Do you know Ralph Baric?</p> <p>A Not really. I know who he is. I doubt if I've ever met him. I may have met him at one of the meetings where there are thousands of scientists saying hi to each other, but I know who he is. He is a scientist at University of North Carolina.</p> <p>Q And he's funded by NIAID?</p> <p>A He is.</p> <p>Q But you don't remember ever meeting him in person?</p> <p>A Again, I don't recall. I could have met him. Again, I run into several thousands of scientists that we refer to, but I don't recall certainly having a relationship with him.</p> <p>Q How about the person that's listed immediately before him listed here as Zhengli Shi? Do you know who that is?</p> <p>A I believe, if I'm correct, that this is a scientist who is at the Wuhan Institute of Virology, I believe. I'm not a hundred percent certain. I get sometimes confused with Asian names, but I believe this is the person who is a scientist at the Wuhan Institute.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
33:13 - 34:2	<p>Q And are you aware generally that there's someone called Shi Zhengli who's described in the media as the bat woman who does research on bat coronaviruses at the Wuhan lab --</p> <p>A Yeah, is that her? I don't know if that's the same person. Like I said, when you're dealing with Asian names, sometimes the first name is last and the last name is first. So I -- I -- I believe this is the person from Wuhan.</p> <p>Q Have you ever met that person before?</p> <p>A To my knowledge, I haven't. I don't -- I'm fairly certain I have not. I could possibly, again, have run into her at one of the many scientific meetings that occur, but I don't specifically recall ever personally running into her.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
34:3 - 34:11	<p>Q Can I direct your attention to the beginning of the pandemic or at least the beginning of the outbreak? Do you remember when you first became aware that there was an outbreak of a new coronavirus in China?</p> <p>A It was either December 31st or the first couple of days of the new year of 2020. So it was either December the 31st of 19 -- 2019 or the first couple of days of 2020.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
34:12 - 35:4	<p>Q Do you recall at some point somebody, anybody, raising concerns to you in January of 2020 at the beginning of the outbreak or near the beginning of the outbreak that the virus might have been genetically engineered or originated in a laboratory?</p> <p>A There was a phone call in late January of 2020, I believe, from Jeremy Farrar. There was one other person on the phone. I believe it was Christian Anderson, who piped me in on a three-way call, saying that they looked at the virus and there was some concern about the molecular configuration or makeup of the virus that made them think there was a possibility that there could have been a manipulation of the virus.</p> <p>Q Before that, had anyone raised a concern like that to you?</p>

	<p>A To my recollection, no.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
35:5 - 35:15	<p>Q How about Robert Redfield? Who's he?  A Robert Redfield at the time was the director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.  Q Did he call you in mid January 2020 and raise that kind of concern about whether or not the virus originated from nature or in a laboratory?  A To my recollection, no. I know that Bob today talks about that. I don't recall back in January of 2020 whether Bob was involved or not in any discussion about the manipulation of the virus.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
35:16 - 35:24	<p>Q Are you aware if there -- if there's any relationship between Peter Daszak and Shi Zhengli, the two coauthors of that study I showed you in Exhibit 4? Do they work together or what's your understanding of that? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Calls for speculation. Vague. Ambiguous. THE WITNESS: Can you repeat the question? BY MR. SAUER:  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
35:25 - 36:6	<p>Q Are you -- do you know whether there's a working relationship between Shi Zhengli and Peter Daszak?  A Well, I do know now. I didn't know it at the time, but I do know now that EcoHealth has a subaward from their original grant that goes to Shi Zhengli at the Wuhan Institute of Virology.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
36:7 - 36:13	<p>Q So they work together on research that's funded directly by NIAID --  A The -- yeah, the funding goes to EcoHealth which awards a subaward. To my knowledge and recollection, it is a five-year grant of somewhere between 500,000 and \$600,000. I believe it averages about 120 to \$130,000 a year for a five-year period.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
36:14 - 36:25	<p>Q Do you know whether Peter Daszak has access to, for example, the genomes of viruses that Shi Zhengli has generated at the Wuhan Institute of Virology? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Mischaracterizes the evidence. MR. SAUER: I'm just asking him if he knows. MR. SAUER:  Q Do you know? I'm just asking if you know.  A Again, repeat the question. I want to make sure I give you an accurate answer.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
37:1 - 37:18	<p>Q Do you know whether Peter Daszak had access, or is in possession of data generated by Shi Zhengli pursuant to their research together, including the genomes of Coronaviruses?  A I don't know absolutely for sure, but I would imagine that if Peter Daszak is collaborating scientifically with Shi Zhengli, that it is likely, given the norms of scientific collaboration, that he would have access to data if they were indeed collaborating, which it looks like, from what I have learned subsequently, that they are collaborators, since he has a subaward to the Wuhan Institute that I believe goes to Dr. Shi.  Q Would it be ordinary practice for someone in his position to have access to her data when he's funding her, essentially through subawards?  A That would be not be unusual and probably likely.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
37:19 - 37:23	<p>Q Can I give you Exhibit 5? We're premarking them. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 5 was marked for identification.) MR. SAUER:  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
37:24 - 38:4	<p>Q If you look at the top there, there's someone sending an e-mail to you and Jen Routh called Greg Folkers. Who's Greg Folkers?  A Greg Folkers is a member of my inner office. He's my immediate chief of staff in my office group.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
38:5 - 38:7	<p>Q And then who's Jennifer Routh?  A She's a member of our communications staff.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
38:8 - 38:21	<p>Q And then directly below her, who's Courtney Billet?  A She is the director of the Office of Communication, Legislative Affairs, and Government Outreach.  Q And if you look at all these people on the CC line, are they all within your kind of -- I think you</p>

	<p>described it as your inner office?</p> <p>A Yes. They are in the immediate office of the director.</p> <p>Q And it looks like the attachment was indicated with talking points for NIAID director, Dr. Fauci?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
38:22 - 40:18	<p>Q Would that be a common thing for your chief of staff to do, to prepare talking points for when you're going to a press appearance or something like that?</p> <p>A That would be a not unusual thing if I was going to whatever, a meeting or a congressional briefing or what-have-you, and a subject was brought up that I was not particularly familiar with, that my staff would put together talking points to at least update or inform me about what the meeting was about and things that I should know about it.</p> <p>Q If you look in the body of the e-mail, that kind of second paragraph that begins: "Also, hyphen, hyphen, hyphen." Do you see that?</p> <p>A Wait a second. Where are we now?</p> <p>Q Well, kind of very close to the top, second kind of text cluster that begins, "Also, when talking about CoV, not necessarily in this venue..." Do you see that?</p> <p>A No, I'm really sorry. As a placeholder, looks good, that's the first paragraph. "Also," okay, we're talking -- I got it.</p> <p>Q And Greg -- Mr. Folkers says to you, "We have on our team," and then in parentheses, Vincent and folks we fund, Peter Daszak, Ralph Baric, Ian Lipkin, et cetera, "probably the world's experts on nonhuman coronaviruses." Do you see that?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p>Q Do know what he means when he said that those people are on your team? Does he mean that you fund them?</p> <p>A I think he means -- I'm speculating -- I don't recall this e-mail of January 27th, 2020. But my speculation is that what Mr. Folkers was referring to were people that were in our group or that we know and are colleagues of ours because -- I mean, Peter Daszak, we've already mentioned, is a grantee. Ralph Baric is a grantee. Ian Lipkin is a scientist at the Columbia School of Public Health. I believe Vincent, though I don't know, could possibly be Vincent Munster, who is a scientist who's employed by NIAID, and I believe that's what Mr. Folkers was referring to when he was saying -- when talking about COVID, these are people who are well versed in that area.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
40:19 - 43:6	<p>Q Who's -- do you know Ian Lipkin?</p> <p>A I do.</p> <p>Q Is he a grantee of --</p> <p>A I believe he is. I mean, he is a well-established scientist in New York City at the Columbia School -- I believe it's the Mailman School of Public Health.</p> <p>Q Two paragraphs down, it says, "NIAID has funded Peter's group," referring to Mr. Daszak, "for coronavirus in China for the past five years through understanding the risk of bat coronavirus emergence"; correct? And then the grant number.</p> <p>A Yes, I see that.</p> <p>Q And that, I take it, would be the grant that we referred to earlier in Exhibit 2, with the same title, "Understanding the risk of bat coronavirus emergence"? MR. SAUER: Objection. Calls for speculation. THE WITNESS: I'm looking at Exhibit Number 2 and the title is, "Understanding the risk of bat coronavirus emergence," and that is the quote that is here, and the grant number is 1R01 -- BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Let me ask you this -- I don't need to the hear the grant number? Can I just ask you --</p> <p>A Well, I'm trying to make sure that I'm referring -- to give you a correct answer -- which is the question you asked me: Is this referring to this? And it looks like the grant numbers match and the titles match, so my answer to your question is yes -- they're referring to. MR. KIRSCHNER: Counsel, I just would ask to let the witness fully respond before cutting him off. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Do you recall that grant being placed on your radar screen on January 27th of 2020?</p> <p>A Based on this e-mail, it looks like Mr. Folkers has at least mentioned it, but I wouldn't characterize that as being, quote, put on my radar screen to the point of garnering my precise attention to it. Let me</p>

	<p>finish reading the e-mail. It says, "That's now been renewed with a specific focus to identify cohorts of people exposed to bats in China and work out if they're getting sick from COVID. Erik Stemmy is the program officer and the collaborators include the Wuhan Institute and Ralph. The results of the work." Yeah, I mean, I think this was likely the situation where, when the idea of an outbreak in China was brought up, or the coronavirus, that my staff thought it would be important for me to understand just the kind of things we were doing. And I think the important sentence in here, which is relevant, is that the grant wanted to identify cohorts of people exposed to bats in China, and the reason for that is wanting to see if there was the possibility of spillover from bat viruses to humans that might or might not be related to SARS-CoV-2. I believe that was the intent of this briefing talking points, if I'm not mistaken.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
43:7 - 43:16	<p>Q You're being given an exhibit that's labeled Exhibit 6. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 6 was marked for identification.) MR. KIRSCHNER: Counsel, I would ask that Dr. Fauci be given the opportunity to familiarize himself with this document prior to being asked questions related to it. THE WITNESS: Okay. February 1st. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
43:17 - 45:1	<p>Q I think you testified earlier that you recalled the first time the concern about the origin of the virus being posted on your radar screen was from a call from Christian Anderson and Jeremy Farrar; is that right?</p> <p>A Yeah. I believe that my recollection from a few years ago, that that's the first I became aware of this concept of the possibility of there being a manipulation of the virus.</p> <p>Q Do you remember what was said in that call?</p> <p>A To my recollection, on that call, Jeremy and Christian said they had looked at -- or at least Christian did, possibly Jeremy -- and maybe one other scientist -- and said that it is possible that there may have been a manipulation because it was an unusual virus. And on that call, I and others said, "Well, that being the case, we should bring together a group of highly qualified international evolutionary virologists to discuss the issue, and to see what the way forward would be to try to clarify that." And that was the phone call that we arranged, I believe for the following day, on February 1st, if I'm not mistaken. I think those are the dates. I'm fairly sure, but --</p> <p>Q You say I and others on the call suggested arranging a group of scientists to discuss this. Who are the others?</p> <p>A Again, I believe -- I'm fairly certain, although I'm not 100 percent -- that was a few years ago -- that Jeremy Farrar was one and Christian Anderson was another. Eddie Holmes could possibly have been in on that. I know he got involved in this later on.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
45:2 - 45:8	<p>Q Who's Eddie Holmes?</p> <p>A Eddie Holmes is a very well-recognized evolutionary virologist who works in Australia.</p> <p>Q Does he receive funding from your agency?</p> <p>A I don't know. I'm not certain whether he does or not.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
45:9 - 45:12	<p>Q Do you know Eddie Holmes?</p> <p>A I don't know him personally, but I know of him. He's a very highly -- what's the right word for it? Highly respected evolutionary virologist.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
45:13 - 51:2	<p>Q Do you know Christian Anderson?</p> <p>A I know Christian. Not well. I've spoken to him a few times. I believe the first time -- and again, when you say "Do you know," remember, we all go to international meetings where there are hundreds, if not thousands, of people that you interact with over the years. To my recollection, I've heard of Christian Anderson for a while. Christian is an internationally renowned scientist. I believe maybe the first time that I've actually spoken to Christian was on that phone call, but it is possible that without recalling, I ran into him and spoke to him on other occasions.</p> <p>Q Do you know why he brought that concern to you in particular? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Calls for speculation. THE WITNESS: I would imagine since I am, with all due modesty, recognized as one of the top infectious disease people in the country and the director of the major research</p>

institution for infectious diseases in the world that Christian and Jeremy I know -- I've known Jeremy for a long time -- that they thought it would be a good idea to give me a call since I'm looked upon, rightly or not, as the top government infectious diseases person, and they felt, I believe -- you'll have to ask them -- but I felt they believed, since I'm generally considered the top government infectious disease person, that it would be appropriate to let me know at the same time as we brought in -- I don't have the list in front of me of the scientists we brought together on the phone call the following day, which was a Saturday -- let me finish because I think it's important -- because the people we brought in, we tried to get a large international group of people together so we could have well representation. As to my recollection, there were people like Sir Patrick Vallance, who was the chief scientist in England on the phone, among other people. BY MR. SAUER:

Q Could I pause for a second?

A Sure.

Q This is a deposition. I'm going to ask you questions, and I'm going to ask you to listen to the question --

A Right.

Q -- and answer the question that I'm asking --

A Okay.

Q -- and not go off on, like, a tangent.

A Fine.

Q Can you agree to do that, please?

A I would be happy to do that. MR. KIRSCHNER: And, counsel, I would also ask you to let the witness provide proper context where he feels is necessary in response to your questions. MR. SAUER: Yeah. BY MR. SAUER:

Q Let me direct your attention to the first page of Exhibit 6 in front of you. At the bottom of that page, you see it indicates that on Friday, January 31st, 2020, at 18:47, you wrote an e-mail to Jeremy and Christian saying "this came out today. You may have seen it. If not, it is of interest to the current discussion"; correct? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection, Your Honor -- not Your Honor. THE WITNESS: Well, you're very honorable but go ahead. MR. KIRSCHNER: I just would like the witness to have an opportunity to familiarize himself with the document. MR. SAUER: I'm just directing his attention to that spot on the page. BY MR. SAUER:

Q Do you see the spot I referred to? MR. KIRSCHNER: Well, I would like to make sure that the witness is familiar with the document -- BY MR. SAUER:

Q Right here. MR. KIRSCHNER: -- prior to answering questions about the document. BY MR. SAUER:

Q So I just asked if you see that spot on the page?

A Where it says "this just came out today"?

Q Yeah.

A Yes.

Q And is that a reference to the article by Jon Cohen in Science Magazine?

A You know, I don't recall.

Q You don't recall sending that message?

A No, no. I -- MR. KIRSCHNER: Object -- THE WITNESS: No, no. Let me finish. MR.

KIRSCHNER: Go ahead. THE WITNESS: You're asking me a question. When you say "this just came out today," and on the next page of Exhibit 6, there's an article by Jon Cohen on mining coronavirus genomes for clues in the outbreak, since they are juxtaposed together, I imagine that that's what I sent, but I don't recall specifically that article. BY MR. SAUER:

Q Do you know -- do you know why you would have said that article is of interest to the current discussion? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Assuming evidence not in the record. Mischaracterizes the testimony. THE WITNESS: Looking at the title of the article, which is "Mining Genomes for Clues in the Outbreak," you know, I'm not sure exactly why I would have sent it. Imagine is that if they're referring to the genomic makeup of the virus and we were talking about the genomic makeup of SARS-CoV-2 that raised some suspicion on the part of Christian and Jeremy, that's an article in science by Jon Cohen that talks about genomes of virus would be, as it said, might be of interest to the current discussion. I imagine that's what I was referring to. BY MR. SAUER:

	<p>Q If you look -- staying on Page 1, if you look immediately above your e-mail, do you see the kind of response e-mail from Dr. Anderson?</p> <p>A Let me read it. Yeah.</p> <p>Q Okay. And you see in the second paragraph that e-mail --</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p>Q -- where he mentions I should mention that after discussions earlier today, says Dr. Anderson, Eddie, Bob, Mike and myself all find the genome inconsistent with expectations from evolutionary theory?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
51:3 - 51:4	<p>Q Do you know who Eddie is?</p> <p>A Eddie Holmes probably.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
51:5 - 51:6	<p>Q Do you know who Bob is?</p> <p>A Could be Bob Garry. I'm not sure.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
51:7 - 52:19	<p>Q And do you know Mike is?</p> <p>A I don't, but it could be Mike Laribee. I'm not sure.</p> <p>Q Okay. And then immediately above that at -- Dr. Anderson said, "the unusual features of the virus make up a really small part of the genome so one has to look really closely at all of the sequences to see that some of the features potentially look engineered --</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q -- correct?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p>Q Does that -- is that the sort of concern that he had raised in the call you had earlier that day on Friday, January 31st?</p> <p>A The answer is, yes, he was referring to some unusual features, but if I might just take an extra five seconds, it says the unusual features of the virus make up a really small part of the genome and one has to look really closely, and that was the tone of the discussion. And just quickly referring to the last sentence in the second paragraph when he was talking about inconsistent with expectations from evolutionary theory, the next sentence says, "but we have to look at this much more closely and there are still further analyses to be done, so those opinions could still change."</p> <p>Q Did you think this was an alarming concern that he was raising?</p> <p>A I think it was an interesting and important concern, and that was the reason why we all agreed it would be a very good idea to get a larger group of qualified evolutionary virologists to look closely, more than just a quick look, but a look over a period of a couple of days at the virus to see if, in fact, this concern and suspicion was justified or there could be another explanation for it.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
52:20 - 53:4	<p>Q Can you stay in that same document, Exhibit 6, and flip ahead to the eighth page of the document that's got a Bates Number 2432 at the bottom? MR. KIRSCHNER: Counsel, I, again, ask you to allow Dr. Fauci sufficient time to -- actually, counsel, this seems to be several documents together. I'm a little confused what's going on with -- with -- with this exhibit. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
53:5 - 53:13	<p>Q Can you turn to the eighth page of the exhibit, please? MR. KIRSCHNER: Well, I would like for Dr. Fauci to have an opportunity to familiarize himself with this exhibit prior to answering questions. MR. SAUER: I just want him to look at the eighth page. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
53:14 - 54:14	<p>Q Do you see the eighth page?</p> <p>A Is that 2421?</p> <p>Q 2432.</p> <p>A Oh, excuse me, 2432. I'm sorry. This -- the numbers are kind of -- oh, it's going the opposite direction. Sorry. The -- I got 2430 and then it's followed by 2431, and then it's 2421. MR. KIRSCHNER: I have the same. THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I'm confused. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Can you go to -- starting at the first page, count eight pages. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven,</p>

	<p>look at the eighth page. MR. KIRSCHNER: Well, counsel, this seems to be out of order with the Bates stamping, and so I would object to this as being misleading. 2432 is inserted in this document between 2402 and 2426. MR. SAUER: Off the record, please. Can we go off the record? THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Time is 9:04 a.m., and we are going off the record. (Discussion off the record.) (Recess.) THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 9:05 a.m., and we're back on the record. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
54:15 - 54:23	<p>Q Dr. Fauci, do you see the eighth page of this document?  A Yeah. If it's the one that says, "Hugh, it's essential that we speak," yeah.  Q Correct, yeah. And at the top of this page, you sent this e-mail to Hugh Auchincloss?  A Correct.  Q Is that how you say his name?  A That's correct.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
54:24 - 55:11	<p>Q You sent this e-mail to Hugh Auchincloss, your principal deputy --  A Yes.  Q Did you send it at 12:29 a.m. on Saturday, February 1st?  A Yes.  Q In the "To" e-mail, there's a cc there that's redacted out. Do you know who you CC'd on this e-mail?  A No. I don't recall.  Q Would you have CC'd one of your personal e-mail addresses on this?  A No, I very rarely do that.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
55:12 - 56:19	<p>Q Have you ever done that? Have you ever CC'd your personal e-mail on a work-related matter?  A You know, I don't recall. I doubt that. I doubt that.  Q Do you see there's an attachment listed on this e-mail? Attachments? Do you see where it says, Shi, et al., Nature Medicine --  A Yeah.  Q -- SARS Gain of Function?  A Right.  Q Do you know what that attachment was? It's not included on the e-mail.  A You know, it says, "SARS Baric, Shi, et al., Nature Medicine." It could possibly have been -- it could possibly -- again, I don't know for sure, but it's certainly consistent with it being Exhibit No. 4.  Q And that is the 2015 article?  A Right.  Q Coauthored?  A Right.  Q In part by Ralph Baric and Shi Zhengli that we talked about earlier?  A Right.  Q Do you recall attaching that particular exhibit to this e-mail to Hugh?  A I can't say that I recall that particular, but it is certainly consistent with that because the attachment title is Baric, Shi, Nature Medicine. So it certainly is consistent with, and maybe likely that that's what I was referring to. All those things look consistent.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
56:20 - 57:7	<p>Q In other words, that Exhibit 4 is a Nature Medicine article; correct?  A Exhibit 4 is a Nature Medicine article.  Q And two of the coauthors are Baric and Shi that we talked about earlier?  A Correct. Yes.  Q And then did you describe it as a SARS gain-of-function article? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Mischaracterizes the evidence. BY MR. SAUER:  Q Did you describe it as that?  A It looks like it was described as that.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
57:8 - 57:16	<p>Q Do you know if you were the one who wrote that title describing that article?</p>

	<p>A I don't recall. I'm not sure exactly why those words got in there. It was maybe something that was mentioned by Baric. I don't really recall. That was some time ago.</p> <p>Q Do you think that that article, it refers to the gain of function or do you not recall?</p> <p>A I don't recall.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
57:17 - 59:9	<p>Q Do you know why you attached that article to this e-mail to Hugh, your principal deputy?</p> <p>A I don't recall, but I believe -- and again, I would say I don't precisely recall, but there was some recollection or someone told you that, you know, we do fund research in China, particularly surveillance research -- I think you referred to it when you gave me one of the exhibits about the surveillance of what might be out in the community among bats. And at my recollection, I brought to Hugh's attention, saying, "We have to speak in the morning, because I want to find out what the scope of what it is that we are funding so I'll know what we're talking about." And that's what I was referring to when I said you will have tasks today to give me some information because this was the first that I had heard about specifics of what EcoHealth and what other people were doing, and I wanted my staff to say get me up to date. So that's what I meant by you have work to do.</p> <p>Q And you said that it was essential that we speak this morning, this a.m.; correct?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q And so you wanted him -- and you said keep your cell phone on; correct?</p> <p>A Right. Yeah. And the reason is that I know that we were going to have a phone call with the larger group of evolutionary virologists, and this is the first that I had heard of what we may or may not be funding through EcoHealth and others, and I wanted to get a better scope of just what the terrain of what we were doing in collaboration with different scientists, and that's why I asked him that question.</p> <p>Q Did you call Hugh's cell phone that day?</p> <p>A I don't recall if I did.</p> <p>Q Do you remember talking to him at all that day?</p> <p>A I might have, but I don't recall.</p> <p>Q Later in the e-mail, you say, "Read this paper, as well as the e-mail that I will forward to you now."</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
59:10 - 60:11	<p>Q What are the tasks that must be done today?</p> <p>A I wanted to be briefed on the scope of what our collaborations were and the kind of work that we were funding in China. I wanted to know what the nature of that work was.</p> <p>Q Were you concerned at that time that the work that you had funded in China might have led to the creation of the coronavirus?</p> <p>A I wasn't concerned that it might have, but I didn't like the fact that I was completely in the dark about the totality of the work that were being done, and I was going into a phone call with a larger group of established scientists and I wanted to have at my fingertips just what we were and were not doing.</p> <p>Q In the call earlier that evening, had Christian Anderson or Jeremy Farrar raised this 2015 Nature Medicine paper in any way?</p> <p>A I don't recall.</p> <p>Q How did you think of it? How did this -- why were you, at midnight, a little after midnight, thinking of this particular 2015 article?</p> <p>A I don't recall.</p> <p>Q Do you remember how this article kind of got on your radar screen at all?</p> <p>A I don't recall.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
60:12 - 60:25	<p>Q And I think I showed you earlier, the e-mail, I think is Exhibit 5, where it refers to the grant pursuant to that coronavirus from about three days earlier? Do you remember that?</p> <p>A I'm sorry. You're going pretty quickly --</p> <p>Q Sorry. THE COURT REPORTER: Also, Counsel, I need you to slow down. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Let's move on actually. Your testimony is you do not remember how you became aware at this time of the Shi, Baric Nature Medicine paper; correct?</p> <p>A Say that again? At this time, I'm sorry, I'm not getting your question clearly.</p>

	<u>Summary</u>
61:1 - 65:5	<p>Q Do you recall how you became aware of this attachment that you've called Baric, Shi, et al., Nature Medicine SARS gain-of-function?</p> <p>A I don't recall -- I mean, I became aware of it, but right now, I really don't recall what specific day I became aware of it.</p> <p>Q In your e-mail, you tell Hugh, "Read this paper as well as the paper I will forward to you later on." Can you turn to the next page?</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p>Q And here it's an e-mail just a couple minutes later -- it's literally the same minute that you sent to Hugh at 12:29 a.m. on Saturday, February 1st, 2020; correct?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q And here you're forwarding him that same Jon Cohen article that you had sent to Christian Anderson and Farrar?</p> <p>A Did I send it to Christian and Farrar? Yeah.</p> <p>Q Remember sending it to him and saying to him: This is of interest in the current discussion? This same Jon Cohen e-mail or article?</p> <p>A I'm sorry. I'm getting confused with your question. So what is the question?</p> <p>Q Well, let me ask you this: Looking at this second e-mail to Hugh Auchincloss?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q Why did you forward him this particular article? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Calls for speculation. THE WITNESS: Yeah, I actually don't recall why I forwarded it to him. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Did you -- you forwarded him two articles, right? The Baric, Shi Nature Medicine article at 12:29 a.m., and then the Jon Cohen Science article as well?</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p>Q Do you know why you did that?</p> <p>A I don't recall why I did that. I think I wanted him to be aware because the question that I was really getting at with him is that I want to find out what the scope of what we were doing in China because they obviously called me up and said they had a concern about a virus. I wanted to make sure I knew everything that we were doing there.</p> <p>Q Do you remember --</p> <p>A That was the purpose of my e-mail.</p> <p>Q Do you remember talking to him about that? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Asked and answered. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q If you know? Do you remember talking to Hugh about that concern?</p> <p>A I don't remember, but I think somewhere it says -- I think I said I was going to call you somewhere. I'm not -- I don't recall speaking to him. I -- I recognize the e-mails because, as I said and I'll repeat, I was going to be on a phone call with a large group of people who are very versed in the field, and I didn't want to go into the phone call not knowing the scope of what our relationship was regarding funding of grants in China. I was not familiar with these grants.</p> <p>Q Did you ever raise those grants in China in the phone call you had later that day with all the scientists?</p> <p>A I don't believe I did. I might have, but I don't believe I did. The discussion -- I was relatively silent in the discussion with the group of about a dozen people. They were all evolutionary virologists, and the nature of the discussion was back and forth about the likelihood or not of there being a manipulation. No, I don't recall bringing this up. In fact, what I did have -- heard in statements from people who were on the call that I was, you know, quite open and let people talk and decide what they wanted to do, but that's not my field, evolutionary virology.</p> <p>Q Do you remember saying anything at all on that call?</p> <p>A I may have said a few things, but I was relatively silent on that call.</p> <p>Q Do you know what they were?</p> <p>A What "what" were?</p> <p>Q The things that you may have said.</p> <p>A No, I don't recall, but I certainly was not one of the people actively engaged in the discussion. I was relatively quiet because I wanted to hear what they had to say.</p>

	<p>Q Can you flip ahead in that document to -- five more pages from that ninth page that we were on -- or six more pages from that ninth page that we were on. There's a document that's Bates Number 2421.</p> <p>A 2421?</p> <p>Q Yeah. It's an e-mail from you to --</p> <p>A Yes, got it.</p> <p>Q -- Lawrence Tabak. Do you have that?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
65:6 - 68:4	<p>Q Who -- who -- who's Lawrence Tabak or Tabak?</p> <p>A Lawrence Tabak is the -- at the time was the deputy director of the National Institutes of Health. He is currently the acting director of the National Institutes of Health.</p> <p>Q Do you see -- did you forward him the same article at 1:13 in the morning? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Mischaracterizes the time. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Or was that done at a different time? MR. KIRSCHNER: Just for the clarity of the record, counsel, it says 13:19. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Sorry. At 1:19 in the morning? MR. KIRSCHNER: In the morning or afternoon? BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Was it in the morning or the afternoon? Do you remember?</p> <p>A Thirteen is, I believe, the afternoon.</p> <p>Q Let me ask you this: Later that day, then --</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p>Q -- on Friday, February 1st, did you forward Lawrence Tabak the same --</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p>Q -- Nature Medicine article that you sent to Hugh?</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p>Q Why?</p> <p>A I don't recall why, but likely I wanted to make sure everyone was aware of what the discussions were. Francis Collins, the director at the time of the NIH, was on that phone call in the morning of February 1st.</p> <p>Q But that phone call happened in the morning to your recollection?</p> <p>A I believe it was in the morning.</p> <p>Q Are you sure it wasn't at 2:00 p.m.?</p> <p>A I don't recall.</p> <p>Q If your official calendar reflects a call with Jeremy Farrar at 2:00 p.m. that day, that Saturday, would you dispute that?</p> <p>A You know, I don't recall when it was. If my calendar says it was at 2:00 p.m., then likely it was at 2:00 p.m. I don't recall.</p> <p>Q Was Mr. Tabak on that call?</p> <p>A I don't believe so. I know that Francis Collins was. I don't believe that Larry was, but he could have been.</p> <p>Q Were you sending it to him so that he could give it to Francis Collins?</p> <p>A I don't recall. That is a possibility that I would have done that.</p> <p>Q Had you discussed with Francis Collins that day this concern about -- concern -- had you discussed with Francis Collins that day the possibility that NIAID had funded research in China?</p> <p>A I don't believe so. I -- I mean, that we funded research in China? Well, everybody knows we fund research in China.</p> <p>Q More specifically, had you discussed with Francis Collins that day an issue that you may have -- that NIAID may have funded coronavirus-related research in China?</p> <p>A You know, I'm not sure exactly the point you're making.</p> <p>Q I'm just asking if you discussed that issue with Francis Collins?</p> <p>A I don't recall --</p> <p>Q Okay.</p> <p>A -- to be honest with you.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
68:5 - 72:19	<p>Q That's all I'm -- can you turn to the next page? Do you see this e-mail exchange between you and</p>

Hugh Auchincloss?

A Yeah.

Q Okay. What's the time of this e-mail? 17:51, is that 5:51 in the afternoon where you sent --

A Yeah.

Q And then you respond in the e-mail that he sent you at 11:47 a.m. that morning; is that correct? MR. KIRSCHNER: Counsel, I would ask if you'd give Dr. Fauci a moment to familiarize himself with this document prior to asking questions. THE WITNESS: Okay. The paper you sent me says the experiments were provided -- ^ (Witness reading to himself.) THE WITNESS: I'm not sure what that means since -- (Witness reading to himself.) THE REPORTER: And, Dr. Fauci, I need you to speak up. THE WITNESS: Okay. I'm reading from an e-mail from Hugh Auchincloss to me at 11:47 a.m. on February 1st, 2020. And -- BY MR. SAUER:

Q I'm not asking you to read the e-mail. I'm just asking you to --

A Okay. But she asked me to.

Q I'm asking you to identify what time that e-mail from Hugh was sent to you. MR. KIRSCHNER: And, Counsel, I'm asking you to give the witness an opportunity to familiarize himself with this document. THE WITNESS: And what's what I was reading when you're telling me to read it out loud. So let's get together here. THE REPORTER: And if you read on the record, I need you to speak up so that I can get it on the record -- THE WITNESS: Okay. I'll keep my mouth shut and read it silently so it's not on the record. Okay. What's the question, sir? BY MR. SAUER:

Q Hugh e-mailed you saying, "The paper you sent me says the experience would perform before the gain-of-function pause that have since been reviewed and approved by the NIH." Do you know what he was referring to when he said that?

A I don't know exactly, but I'm assuming and I think correctly, apropos of what I've been telling you for the last several minutes, is that I wanted to get a feel of the scope of what we were doing, and I had mentioned to Hugh, I'm sure, "Hugh, I want to know everything that's going on because I want to make sure that I understand all of what our involvement is in funding research in China." And Hugh's response was he looked at it and he said everything's been reviewed and approved by NIH, and Emily, who is Emily Erbeling, is the director of the Division of Microbiology and Infectious Diseases, and she would have been the one who was closest to the ground in understanding what we were doing in funding China. And it says, "Emily is sure that no coronavirus work had gone through the P3 framework, which means it did not rise to the level of concern to get the extra approval of P3CO. She will try to determine if we have any distant ties to this work and above -- all of these sentences and statements are compatible with what I mentioned to you a couple of times now is that this being the first time I had heard of this, I wanted to be briefed as to the extent of our involvement with funding in China.

Q Did you raise a specific concern with Hugh about the possibility that the 2015 research paper had been inconsistent with the gain-of-function moratorium that was in place -- put in place in 2014? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous. THE WITNESS: Again, I'm sorry. Did -- did I -- BY MR. SAUER:

Q Did you raise a specific concern with Hugh that the research reflected in the Baric, Shi Nature Medicine paper may have been inconsistent with the pause on --

A Right.

Q -- gain-of-function funding research?

A That is possible. As I've said, again, very consistent with what I've been saying, I wanted to make sure I had a good feel for the scope of what we were doing regarding research that we fund in China. Since that was not something that was on my radar screen, and I will say so that you understand, this is a \$120,000 a year grant in a \$6.3 billion portfolio. So --

Q Above that on the e-mail you respond to Hugh, "Okay, stay tuned." Do you see that?

A Yes.

Q Stay tuned. Did you have any follow-up communications with him about this?

A I don't recall.

Q Do you remember talking to Emily Erbeling about it at all?

A I don't recall. I don't -- I might have. I don't -- I believe certainly that Hugh did. He said he did on the e-mail. He said, Emily is sure that no coronavirus work has gone through the P3 framework.

	<p>Whether I specifically spoke to Emily, I don't recall but Hugh certainly did.</p> <p>Q And Emily works for NIAID?</p> <p>A Emily is the director of the Division of Microbiology and Infectious Diseases at NIAID.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
72:20 - 74:11	<p>Q Can you turn the page one page in this document?</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p>Q Do you see in the bottom part of this page, there's an e-mail from Jeremy Farrar dated February 1st, 2020, at 1524?</p> <p>A Yeah. MR. KIRSCHNER: Again, Counsel, I would ask you to give Dr. Fauci an opportunity to familiarize himself with this document. MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q You see immediately below that --</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p>Q -- where he says, "1st February, 2nd Feb for Eddie"? Is Eddie Eddie Holmes?</p> <p>A I believe it is. He is in Australia.</p> <p>Q So he would be a different date than everyone else?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q And then he says, "Information and discussion is shared in total confidence and not to be shared until agreement on next steps." Do you see that?</p> <p>A I do.</p> <p>Q Do you remember any discussions with Jeremy Farrar about this call being kept in total confidence?</p> <p>A I don't recall a discussion about confidentiality or not, but I would imagine that Jeremy -- and again, this is speculation -- I would imagine that Jeremy wanted to make sure, when you have something that obviously has a degree of sensitivity to it, that he didn't want people just blathering about it without proper discussion first, and I think that's what he meant, but that's speculation on my part.</p> <p>Q Do you remember Jeremy saying anything about that, keeping it in confidence at any time?</p> <p>A I don't recall, but it is certainly possible that he said that. It's understandable that he would say that.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
74:12 - 75:17	<p>Q Did you ever say anything about keeping in confidence to your recollection?</p> <p>A I may have. I don't recall. THE COURT REPORTER: And Counsel, I would remind you to slow down, please. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Can you just turn one page further? Do you see there, the last text on that page, he's got a list of participants on a call?</p> <p>A Yes. I see that.</p> <p>Q Do you know how these participants were selected?</p> <p>A It was predominantly -- to my recollection, it was predominantly Christian and Jeremy who made the selection of these people.</p> <p>Q Do you have any role in picking who would participate in the call?</p> <p>A I don't believe I did. I felt that Francis Collins should be on the call since he's the director of NIH.</p> <p>Q And did you loop him in later?</p> <p>A I believe I did. I believe I sent him an e-mail or somehow connected him with the pending phone call.</p> <p>Q Who's Patrick Vallance at the bottom of the list or valence?</p> <p>A Patrick Vallance is Sir Patrick Vallance, who is the chief scientific -- or medical -- I believe it's either one or the other -- I believe it's the chief scientific officer who reports to the prime minister of the United Kingdom.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
75:18 - 75:25	<p>Q Is there anyone on this list who's affiliated with government as opposed to being an independent researcher?</p> <p>A You know, I don't know because many scientists internationally have an affiliation with a government. But looking at these names, I don't see anybody there on this list that is known to me to be affiliated with any government.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
76:1 - 76:5	<p>Q What is Jeremy Farrar's role?</p> <p>A Jeremy, at the time -- and I believe he still is -- is the director or CEO or head -- I'm not sure what</p>

	<p>the title is -- but he is the chief person at the Wellcome Trust in the United Kingdom.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
76:6 - 78:24	<p>Q Does the Wellcome Trust award grants for funding scientific research?</p> <p>A Yes, they do.</p> <p>Q About how much do they award per year, do you know?</p> <p>A I do not know.</p> <p>Q Is it a significant amount?</p> <p>A I guess so. I don't know for sure. I would imagine it is -- it's a predominant organization in the UK.</p> <p>MR. KIRSCHNER: Counsel, we've been going for close to an hour and a half. How much longer on this line of questioning? MR. SAUER: Well, why don't we finish this document. Are you okay? MR. KIRSCHNER: Well, do you know how much longer with this document? MR. SAUER: Not long. MR. KIRSCHNER: Okay.</p> <p>Q You testified earlier that on this call -- I take it that this call actually occurred, didn't it?</p> <p>A The call on Saturday -- I believe it was February 1st -- did occur.</p> <p>Q And you testified earlier there was scientific back and forth --</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q -- among some of the participants?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q And they were discussing and debating, you know, whether the virus had originated from a laboratory as opposed to in nature; correct? Do you remember anything that anybody said on the call?</p> <p>A No. The only thing I do remember is that there was what appeared to me to be good faith discussion back and forth between people who knew each other, people who had interacted with each other, so they had mutual respect for each other's opinion. I got that impression in listening and I was in a total listening mode because, as I mentioned, these were evolutionary virologists who were talking about the specifics of what detail made them suspicious that it could have been a manipulation and the other side would counter and show that this is compatible with a natural evolution and they were going back and forth. The tenure of it ended that we need more time and I believe that in one of the e-mails that you asked me about a little bit ago that they said we need some time to more carefully look at this to see if we can come to a sound conclusion based on further examination of the sequences.</p> <p>Q Was there concern expressed in the call that people might, you know, express in the media or social media conspiracy theories or anything like that? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q If you recall?</p> <p>A You know, I don't -- I don't recall whether that was discussed. I believe there was some concern after that. Just the mention of something being manipulated could create a lot of buzz-buzz and discussion, but I don't really recall anything specifically that was said during the call about this.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
78:25 - 79:19	<p>Q Do you remember any discussion of people having concerns that expressions on social media that the virus was originated in a lab might discredit scientific funding projects?</p> <p>A I don't recall anything from that phone call that said that.</p> <p>Q How about in this -- in this time period. Is that something you ever discussed with Jeremy Farrar?</p> <p>MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous. THE WITNESS: I'm not sure if I discussed it with Jeremy Farrar. I have a vague recollection that there was concern about -- I don't think it had anything to do with social media, but it was a concern of diverting attention from the real task of pursuing what needs to be pursued with this outbreak, for the better good of the public health, a distraction of some sort. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
79:20 - 83:22	<p>Q So are -- specifically, would the theory that the virus escaped from a lab might be a distraction from the response to the virus's spread?</p> <p>A No. I think the general feeling among the participants on the call is that they wanted to get down to the truth and not wild speculation about things. They are scientists, highly regarded qualified evolutionary virologists, and they make as their mantra always sticking with evidence and sticking with data, and I believe there's always a concern that when you throw speculations in that are not based on data and evidence, that that's a diversion from more proper things that should be done. I don't think</p>

	<p>there was any other concern than sticking with the truth and sticking with data, and part of the data would be to carefully look at the virus in a careful measured way and to determine whether or not the initial concern about the molecular makeup upon further examination either validated that concern or made it clear that that concern was somewhat unwarranted, if not completely unwarranted. That was the nature of the discussion.</p> <p>Q Was the consensus on the call, I think you said earlier, that they needed more time to investigate this possibility?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q And was the plan at the end of the call to take more time to investigate that possibility?</p> <p>A The plan was to go and spend more time carefully looking at it. That was the -- the sort of end conclusion that let's take a closer look at this, and on taking a closer look, perhaps we can, you know, come to a more evidence-and-fact-based conclusion.</p> <p>Q Did they -- did they, in fact, do that? Did they take more time and come to an evidence-and-fact-based conclusion to your knowledge?</p> <p>A Oh, I believe that a few of -- Christian and a few of the others carefully got together and looked at it and examined the pros and the cons and the ups and downs, and came to the conclusion that their initial concern about the molecular basis of the concern was unwarranted and that what they saw was quite compatible and, in fact, suggestive of a natural evolution.</p> <p>Q Did you have any further involvement after the -- in this after the phone call? Like, were you talking -- did you talk to people on this call later or were you included in e-mails about it after that?</p> <p>A Well, after that, I believe, at some time later, a group of them -- I don't remember all of them, but Christian was certainly one of them -- put out a preprint, I believe, with that statement that was subsequently followed by a manuscript in which they laid out the molecular basis of why they felt this was more likely to be compatible with a natural evolution.</p> <p>Q During that time period, did you have any other involvement in this issue? Did you have any other communications related to it with any of these people? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous. THE WITNESS: When you say "involvement," could you be more specific? BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Well, did you have any -- let me ask you this: Did you have any communications after the Saturday, February 1st, phone call that you just described, from that time period until a preprint was published of their study, did you have any other discussions or communications with any of the people on the call about this issue of the virus?</p> <p>A You know, I had not recalled that until, I believe, in questions that were asked in letters that came in from Congress and others that they may have -- and I believe they did -- send Francis Collins and I a preprint of the article that came to the conclusion that the molecular configuration of the virus was clearly compatible with a natural occurrence.</p> <p>Q Do you recall any communications with Jeremy Farrar after that phone call?</p> <p>A You know, I don't. It is certainly possible, but I don't specifically remember any communications with Jeremy about that. But, you know, Jeremy and I know each other reasonably well. I would not be surprised if we did, but I don't specifically recall a communication related to the subject at question.</p> <p>MR. SAUER: That's my last question on this exhibit. Do you want to take a pause now? MR. KIRSCHNER: Yeah. If -- if -- it's 9:37, if that works for Dr. Fauci? THE WITNESS: Yeah, a short -- short break. I'm good. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 9:38 a.m., and we're going off the record. (Recess.) THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 9:50 a.m., and we're back on the record. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
83:23 - 92:5	<p>Q Dr. Fauci, you're being handed Exhibit 7 -- (FAUCI Exhibit No. 7 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q -- which is a collection of e-mails that were produced pursuant to FOIA. On the front page here just at the very top, there's an e-mail from you to Jeremy and Christian Anderson; correct?</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p>Q And it says, "Jeremy, Collins," and there's a huge redaction of everything you said. "Best regards, Tony." Do you see that?</p> <p>A I do.</p>

Q Do you have any recollection of what you're talking about in this e-mail?

A No, I don't. I don't recall.

Q Okay. Flip ahead four page -- to the fourth page. There's an e-mail from Jeremy Farrar to you on January 30th saying, "Tony, perfect timing. Thank you. Great to catch up"; correct?

A Yeah, the January 30th at 7:13 a.m.?

Q Right.

A Yeah. "Tony, perfect timing. Thank you. Great to catch up."

Q And you responded, "Thanks, Jeremy. Great chatting with you and Patrick. Will stay in close touch"

--

A Right.

Q -- correct?

A Correct.

Q Do you recall -- and I guess this would be two days before that Saturday conference call we talked about?

A Yeah.

Q Did you have a phone call with Patrick Vallance and a Jeremy Farrar on -- on that day?

A Well, I don't recall it, but it says here in an e-mail from me to Jeremy on January 30th, "Great chatting with you and Patrick." So I assume I did, but I don't recall that -- that --

Q Do you know why you said, "We'll stay in close touch"?

A No, I don't recall.

Q Do you remember what you-all -- you, Jeremy, and Patrick may have said to each other on that phone call?

A No, I really don't recall that. I mean, obviously it happened because I -- I refer to it in the e-mail, but I don't recall that, no.

Q Can you -- can you flip ahead? So we're going to go one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine more pages to a page that has an e-mail from Jeremy to you on February 1st saying "could you join" at the top?

A Yes.

Q Correct?

A I see that.

Q And is this Jeremy inviting you to the conference call that would happen later that day? MR.

KIRSCHNER: Objection. Speculative. BY MR. SAUER:

Q If you recall?

A Yeah. It looks that way. I mean, I know we had a conference call on February the 1st, and Jeremy in this e-mail is saying "can you join," and the names on the list are the names that were on the call. So I would imagine it's quite reasonable to assume that this is the invitation to join the call.

Q Lower -- yeah. Lower down in Jeremy's e-mail close to -- close to the bottom, about four lines up from the bottom, he says, "My preference is to keep this a really tight group." Do you see that?

A Yes.

Q Do you know why that was his preference? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Speculative. THE WITNESS: You know, I don't really know why. I think -- I mean, I -- I could speculate as to why that -- when you have too large a group -- BY MR. SAUER:

Q To be clear, I'm not asking you to speculate. I'm just asking if you know. For example, did he tell you why he wanted it to be a really tight group --

A No, he didn't tell me why, but I can -- I can gather why if you're not interested in hearing it --

Q What do you gather? What do you gather? THE REPORTER: And please slow down, you guys.

THE WITNESS: Okay. I'll slow down. I said -- BY MR. SAUER:

Q What do you gather?

A My knowledge of meetings of this sort is that when you want to get something done and you have a task to do, that if you have a really large group of people -- like, I've been on conference calls where there's 50 people on the call and nothing gets done -- I believe, and I think it's a reasonable assumption, that if you want to have a working group to have a serious discussion, you don't want to have a hundred people on the call. You want to make it -- and I think that's -- I think that's what Jeremy was referring to was he said, "I want to make it a tight group."

Q And then four lines lower he says, "obviously" -- "obviously ask everyone to treat in total confidence"; correct?

A Yes.

Q Do you know why it was obvious that it should be treated in total confidence? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Asked and answered. Also speculative. BY MR. SAUER:

Q If you know. Why is that obvious?

A Well, my speculation is that what Jeremy meant is that when you're dealing with something in which there is a suspicion of something that would have great consequences but there's no real evidence that it is, that you want to make sure that you don't all of a sudden have a lot of people talking about something based on no evidence. So I think that's what he meant is until we can get together and seriously discuss it, let's not just make it widely disseminated.

Q So he didn't like --

A I believe that's what he said, but I -- I don't know.

Q Do you know if he wanted Dr. Anderson to not share his concerns about the origins of the virus potentially being from a lab with anyone else? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Speculative. Vague. THE WITNESS: No. I believe based on what the purpose of the call was to rather than be at the level of speculation about something that may or may not have been engineered, that we first get a group of highly qualified international evolutionary virologists to discuss it first before people on the outside who have no knowledge of evolutionary virology start wildly speculating about things. BY MR. SAUER:

Q Can you flip ahead a few pages so the page you're on -- we're going to go ahead -- one, two, three, four, five and then the sixth page, an e-mail from you -- from Jeremy Farrar to you and Francis Collins. Do you see that?

A Are you on the page, the top line says, "From Jeremy Farrar, sent Saturday, 1st of February at 13:27"? MR. KIRSCHNER: I apologize. I'm not on the right page then. THE WITNESS: You got it. MR. KIRSCHNER: Yep. BY MR. SAUER:

Q Farrar has responded "Excellent" to an e-mail from you where you said "Jeremy, Francis will be on the call. He is trying to phone you." MR. KIRSCHNER: Counsel, I think we're on two different pages. Dr. Fauci referred to a page with a sub line re: Conference details. And you're referring -- BY MR. SAUER:

Q Can you turn more pages?

A Two more forward? Two more forward?

Q Yeah.

A Teleconference, re teleconference.

Q Yeah. And Jeremy responded "Excellent" to your e-mail saying, "Francis, Jeremy will be on the call. He is trying to phone you"?

A Right.

Q Correct?

A Correct.

Q Do you recall discussing -- talking to Francis Collins about getting involved in the conference call?

A I don't specifically recall, but certainly, it was my intention of making sure that the director of the NIH was on the call. And given what I said in the e-mail at 15:48 to Jeremy, I said, "Francis will be on the call. He's trying to call -- he's trying to phone you." I mean, obviously that is totally consistent with my having spoken to Francis and saying, "Francis, you should be on a call. Why don't you check with Jeremy to get some feel about what the call is going to be about."

Q Do you know if they talked to each other?

A I don't know for sure whether they did.

Q Can you start with that page you're on and flip ahead a few pages? So one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine. And then you're on the tenth page?

A And what's the top line?

Q At the top, it should say From Dr. Fauci, Anthony, sent Saturday, February 1, 2020, at 20:30?

A Yeah. And the subject is teleconference.

Q Okay?

A All right.

	<p>Q And immediately below your e-mail saying, "Yes," there's an e-mail from Jeremy Farrar sent to you, Francis Collins, Patrick Vallance, and Mike Ferguson; correct?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
92:6 - 93:17	<p>Q Who's Mike Ferguson?</p> <p>A You know, I should know. I don't know. I've heard that name before, but I don't know who he is. He was one of the -- I believe he was one of the people on the call. Name is familiar, but, you know, I probably should know who he is, but I don't.</p> <p>Q Okay. So Jeremy e-mailed to that smaller group of people, "Can I suggest we shut down the call and then redial just for five to ten minutes"; correct?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p>Q And you responded "yes"; correct?</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p>Q Did that happen -- did Jeremy shut down the call?</p> <p>A You know, I don't recall.</p> <p>Q Do you know why Jeremy was wanting to have the call paused for a minute and floated it only to a small group of participants in the call? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Speculative. THE WITNESS: No, I -- I don't remember -- I don't remember shutting down a call, actually. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Do you remember Jeremy talking to you and Dr. Collins during the course of the call?</p> <p>A No, I can't recall that.</p> <p>Q Can you flip ahead one, two, three, four, five pages?</p> <p>A The top is Jeremy Farrar, 2020, 19:09?</p> <p>Q Yes. And you see it's the same list of participants, Francis Collins, you, and Patrick Vallance and Mike Ferguson; correct? MR. KIRSCHNER: I apologize. I'm lost myself on this. What's the top e-mail? THE WITNESS: The top e-mail is Jeremy Farrar, Saturday, 1st of February, 2020, 19:09. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
93:18 - 94:12	<p>Q I'm not on that one. Mine is 2013. Can you turn two more pages?</p> <p>A Two more forward?</p> <p>Q Yeah. MR. KIRSCHNER: I'd just ask counsel to identify the time when the -- THE WITNESS: Okay. The one that says Jeremy Farrar, teleconference 2013; right?</p> <p>Q Do you remember if Francis Collins responded to that e-mail about shutting down the conference call?</p> <p>A No. I do not recall. I just don't recall anything about shutting down a conference call.</p> <p>Q Okay. Can you turn three more pages to an e-mail at 22-06-26?</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p>Q And this is an e-mail chain between you, Jeremy, and Francis Collins; correct?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
94:13 - 95:4	<p>Q Counsel, I would please ask if you can let Dr. Fauci familiarize himself with the document as you're asking questions? MR. SAUER: If he knows, he can answer the questions. If he wants to familiarize, he can ask for it. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q If you go down halfway through the page, there's an e-mail from Francis Collins to you and Jeremy; correct?</p> <p>A Let me look at it.</p> <p>Q Labeled at 2050?</p> <p>A Right. Yes, I see that.</p> <p>Q It says, "Hi, Jeremy. I can make myself available at any time, 24/7, for the call with Tedros"; correct?</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
95:5 - 96:7	<p>Q Do you know who Tedros is?</p> <p>A Tedros is the director general of the World Health Organization.</p> <p>Q So there was a plan to have a call with the director general of the World Health Organization at this</p>

	<p>time?</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p>Q Do you remember that plan?</p> <p>A What I do recall from the discussion on the call was that we needed to notify various relevant people as to the fact that this was being looked into. One of the obvious relevant people would be the director of the World Health Organization.</p> <p>Q Do you specifically remember a plan between you, Francis, and Jeremy to contact Dr. Tedros? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Mischaracterizes evidence and speculative. THE WITNESS: I know that there was a discussion about contacting Tedros. That responsibility was not put on me. I believe it was predominantly -- I'm not 100 percent certain, but I think with some degree -- I wouldn't say certainty, but I tend to believe it was Jeremy's responsibility to be the one to contact and reach out to Tedros and explain to him what these deliberations were. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
96:8 - 96:14	<p>Q I'm going to give you a another document marked Exhibit 8. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 8 was marked for identification.) MR. KIRSCHNER: Counsel, do you have copies for us? BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
96:15 - 96:21	<p>Q Do you recall communicating -- before you look at the document, do you recall having any communication with Dr. Tedros about the concerns that were raised in --</p> <p>A No. I don't recall having any communications directly, or even indirectly, with Tedros.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
96:22 - 97:6	<p>Q Did you have any input on, you know, having the World Health Organization get involved in this issue of any kind?</p> <p>A I don't specifically recall. But one of the theme and the spirit of the discussion on the phone call on February 9th, either before or after or during the phone call, was that it would be important to alert, or let in at least to the discussions, important individuals, including the director general of WHO.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
97:7 - 97:18	<p>Q Can you look at this Exhibit 8 that's in front of you, and with this one, can we start at the back starting at the last page can you turn one page forward to the second-to-last page? MR. KIRSCHNER: Again, as I've objected beforehand, I would please let the witness have an opportunity to familiarize himself with this document prior to asking questions. THE WITNESS: So I'm looking at something that says "von an" -- this is, I guess, a German "to" and "from." BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
97:19 - 98:9	<p>Q I think so. Are you on the second-to-last page of the document?</p> <p>A I think so. The one that has "von," Jeremy Farrar. And "an," Fauci, Vallance, CC: Dorsten, Coopman --</p> <p>Q Those are the participants in the call there in the cc line.</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q Down there, second-to-last paragraph, there's a one-sentence paragraph there that begins there in Jeremy Farrar's e-mail, "I do know there are papers being prepared." Do you see that?</p> <p>A "I know there are papers being prepared. There will be media interest and there already is chat on Twitter and WeChat."</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
98:10 - 98:16	<p>Q And Twitter and WeChat are social media platforms; correct?</p> <p>A Yes, I guess so. I don't know about WeChat, but I know what Twitter is. I don't know.</p> <p>Q You don't know what WeChat is?</p> <p>A I don't do social media so I'm not familiar with them.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
98:17 - 98:19	<p>Q Is that a Chinese-based social media platform?</p> <p>A I don't know.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
98:20 - 99:10	<p>Q Okay. Do you remember Jeremy raising concerns about the chat on Twitter and WeChat or other social media platforms about the virus's origins?</p> <p>A No. I'm not -- this is not ringing a bell with me.</p> <p>Q Well, let me ask you this: Did you ever have concerns about what people might be saying on social</p>

	media about the virus's origin? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Ambiguous. THE WITNESS: You know, I'm so dissociated from social media. I don't have a Twitter account. I don't do Facebook. I don't do any of that, so I'm not familiar with that. I've never gotten involved in any of that. BY MR. SAUER: <a href="#">Summary</a>
99:11 - 99:19	Q Do you know anyone who works for a social media platform? A Do I know somebody who works for a social media platform. Q Or at this time? A Well, I've had communications with Mark Zuckerberg in the past who was -- I've done, I believe, three outward FaceTime discussions encouraging people to get vaccinated. <a href="#">Summary</a>
99:20 - 99:22	Q Do you know anyone else who works for a social media platform other than Mark Zuckerberg? A When you say do I know somebody who works? <a href="#">Summary</a>
99:23 - 100:1	Q Like, do you have acquaintances, people that you know, who work at social media platforms? A Well, a person who used to work as a software engineer for Twitter was my daughter. <a href="#">Summary</a>
100:2 - 100:3	Q Oh, your daughter worked for Twitter? A She used to, yes. <a href="#">Summary</a>
100:4 - 100:11	Q Did you ever -- when she was working at Twitter, did you ever discuss with her the content of stuff posted on social media platforms? A No. Q Did you ever discuss with her the origins of the virus or concerns about the origins of the virus? A No, she has no interest in that. <a href="#">Summary</a>
100:12 - 100:17	Q Was she -- what was her role in Twitter? A I believe she was a software engineer. Q Does she still work at Twitter? A No. Q When did she stop? A Over a year ago. <a href="#">Summary</a>
100:18 - 100:20	Q Do you know anyone else who works at a social media platform -- A No. <a href="#">Summary</a>
100:21 - 102:1	Q -- other than Mark Zuckerberg and your daughter? THE REPORTER: Please slow down. THE WITNESS: Do I know anyone else who works at a social media platform? To my knowledge, no, I think -- I mean, I have done a number of podcasts and interviews on Instagram, but I don't think those people work for a social media platform. I mean, I've done Instagrams with Steph Curry -- Steph Curry. I don't think he works for a media. He's a basketball player. But he uses his -- his Instagram account to get me to talk with him about encouraging people to get vaccinated. Q Can you go back to that exhibit in front of you, Exhibit 8? We're on the second-to-last page. Can you flip forward two pages, and on the top there, there's another e-mail from Jeremy Farrar beginning "My view is completely neutral on this." Do you see that? MR. KIRSCHNER: Dr. Fauci, I think it's the page before. THE WITNESS: This one? MR. KIRSCHNER: No, I think you jumped too much. THE WITNESS: I jumped too much? MR. KIRSCHNER: No, it's this page, I think. Oh, nope. I was wrong. Sorry. THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Just hold on for a second. "My view is completely" -- yeah, I got it. I'm on the right page. <a href="#">Summary</a>
102:2 - 102:12	Q And that next line below that, do you see where Jeremy says, "I do know these questions are being asked by politicians citing ^ starting the scientific literature and certainly on social and mainstream media." Do you see that? A Yeah. (Reading to himself.) Q Do you see that?

	<p>A Let me finish reading it. One second. But who's the e-mail to? I'm sorry. Is this --</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
102:13 - 103:14	<p>Q I'm just curious if you remember Jeremy raising concerns about expressions on social media about the origins of the virus in this time frame?</p> <p>A I don't -- I don't recall anything about social media. I think Jeremy -- and I believe he says it really very well here -- that what he was afraid of that people would be speculating and blaming people, blaming the Chinese, and -- and that only will increase tensions and reduce cooperation which is necessary to really continue to pursue what actually happened in order to prepare for and prevent similar things from happening in the future. And I think if you look at the e-mail, he says, "A respected body convening a group now to consider the evolutionary origins with an open mind, neutral, and in a transparent way could prevent wild claims being made." I think it was Jeremy trying to be the honest broker and saying let's do this properly.</p> <p>Q And he's prepare -- he was concerned about wild claims being made on traditional and social media. Is that how you read it?</p> <p>A Well, I guess so. I mean, I -- let me see if he says "social media" here. Like I said, I'm kind of dissociated from social media. I don't -- I don't even know how to access a tweet.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
103:15 - 103:22	<p>Q Were you ever concerned about what people would be saying on social media about the origins of the virus?</p> <p>A I'm concerned about, you know, there being misinformation or disinformation that would interfere with our trying to save the lives of people throughout the world, which happens when people spread false claims.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
103:23 - 104:2	<p>Q Including about the origins of the virus specifically?</p> <p>A I mean, I think that there's a lot of discussions about the origins of the virus, and we've got to keep an open mind about that.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
104:3 - 104:17	<p>Q You mention that you're concerned about misinformation and disinformation about the virus spreading?</p> <p>A No, I didn't say that.</p> <p>Q Okay.</p> <p>A That's not what I said.</p> <p>Q What'd you say?</p> <p>A I said misinformation and disinformation, and misinformation can be that Bill Gates and I put a chip in the vaccine which prevents people from getting vaccinated and perhaps leads to their losing their lives. That's what I get concerned about as a physician and a scientist, that misinformation and/or disinformation can lead to loss of life, and I'm a physician and that troubles me.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
104:18 - 105:24	<p>Q And it troubles you that those kinds of claims are being made on social media in particular?</p> <p>A I didn't mention social media.</p> <p>Q Does it?</p> <p>A I mean, that's part of the way information is disseminated.</p> <p>Q Can you take the page that's in front of you, and we're going to turn forward five more pages. So we're really on the second page of the document now.</p> <p>A Second page. Okay. Moving forward.</p> <p>Q On the middle of that page, do you see an e-mail from you on Sunday, 2nd February 2020, at 15:30?</p> <p>A "Jeremy, sorry I took so long." Is that it?</p> <p>Q That's the one, yeah. You say here in that second sentence --</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q -- "Like all of us, I do not know how this evolved"?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q Do you see that?</p> <p>A Where I say, "And so many people and the threat of further distortions on social media," yeah.</p> <p>Q Yeah. Were you concerned about the further distortions on social media --</p>

	<p>A Well --</p> <p>Q -- the day after the conference call?</p> <p>A I guess I was. I said it here in the e-mail that I was concerned about the further distortions.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
105:25 - 107:25	<p>Q What -- what distortions on social media were you concerned about? Was that the people expressing --</p> <p>A Wild -- wild speculations and accusations, you know, blaming the Chinese and talking about their deliberately or accidentally -- which certainly is a possibility. There was no evidence of that at the time, and that's what I was concerned about. And I think we were all concerned about that because if you put this e-mail juxtaposed against the statement of Jeremy about wanting to have a situation where we get down to the truth and people in good faith trying to figure out what was going on, certainly there are distortions on social media. Social media says I put a chip into the vaccine so that I can monitor people. That's a distortion.</p> <p>Q In that same -- in that same e-mail, if you look down there, you go on to say -- immediately after the reference to further distortions on social media, and you say, "It's essential that we move quickly." Do you see that?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q And then "Hopefully we can get the WHO to convene"; correct?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q Do you know what you were talking about there? What were you --</p> <p>A I'm talking about getting down to the facts because when the facts come out, that counters distortions wherever that distortion is, speaking here or on social media or in any way, and what I was referring to is that we've got to get WHO to convene an unbiased body of people to try and thoroughly examine the information so we can get to the truth, and when you get to the truth quickly -- and I said, "It is essential that we move quickly."</p> <p>Q Did that happen --</p> <p>A And when the truth comes quickly, then you can avert and avoid distortions when you don't have the information out.</p> <p>Q Did that happen? Was there actually a group convened by the WHO?</p> <p>A You know, I'm not sure where that went quite frankly.</p> <p>Q Did you have any further involvement in that suggestion?</p> <p>A I think we all felt we should get the WHO involved since that's the natural organization when you have something that has international implications.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
108:1 - 108:5	<p>Q If you look in the e-mail above Jeremy's response to you and Francis Collins, it says, "Tedros and Bernard have apparently gone into conclave." Who is Tedros?</p> <p>A Tedros is the director general of the WHO.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
108:6 - 110:8	<p>Q And who is Bernard?</p> <p>A I don't know his last name. I do know, but I keep forgetting. Bernard, it's a German last name. Bernard is one of the high ranking officials at WHO, I believe, if it's the same Bernard that I'm thinking of. There is a Bernard, and I'm embarrassed that I forgot his last name, but if this is the Bernard who I think it is, it is a close senior associate of Tedros.</p> <p>Q What does it mean when they say they have gone into conclave? Does that mean they are unavailable? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Calls for speculative -- speculation. THE WITNESS: Yeah. I have no idea where they'd go. ^ I -- I would never use a terminology "I'm going into conclave." I wouldn't know what that means. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q He goes -- Jeremy goes on to say, "They need to decide today, in my view." Do you know what he's -- what he -- what are they supposed to decide that day?</p> <p>A I do not know what they were supposed to decide.</p> <p>Q Can you -- and then he goes on to say, "If they do prevaricate, I would appreciate a call with you later tonight or tomorrow to think how we might take forward"; correct?</p> <p>A Boy, Jeremy must have been having a bad day. He's using words like conclave and prevaricate. I don't even know what he's talking about.</p>

	<p>Q Well, let me ask you this: Was there a discussion of having a follow-up call with you and Jeremy and Francis Collins about what steps you would take if the WHO didn't convene a group to study the virus's origins? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Mischaracterizes the evidence. Assumes evidence not in the record. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Was there any follow-up call between you, Jeremy Farrar, and Francis Collins?</p> <p>A I don't think so. I know that my feeling at the time was that Jeremy was going to take the bull and run with it regarding getting the WHO involved. And my involvement or input into the WHO I think diminished if not stopped at that time. So I really would doubt that there was any further communication between me and the WHO about this. This was fundamentally Jeremy's lane, if you want to call it that. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
110:9 - 110:23	<p>Q Can you turn to the first page of this document? Another e-mail from Jeremy. This one copies you, Dr. Tedros, Francis Collins, and Bernard Shortlander?</p> <p>A That's him. Shortlander. We got it.</p> <p>Q Down in -- you see a list of bullet points in this e-mail from Jeremy?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p>Q Are -- okay. And about halfway down, there's a bullet point that says, "Gathering interest evidence in the science literature and in mainstream and social media to questions of the origins of the virus." Do you see that?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
110:24 - 111:8	<p>Q Are you aware of Jeremy discussing with the WHO the concern that there be social media discussion of the origins of the virus?</p> <p>A I have no recollection or information about Jeremy's discussions with the WHO involving anything including social media. And I see this here in an e-mail, but I -- I really have no additional further information about Jeremy's gathering interest evidence in the science literature regarding the origin, no.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
111:9 - 111:13	<p>Q You're being handed another document marked Exhibit 9. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 9 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
111:14 - 112:11	<p>Q Do you see the second page of this document?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p>Q You've got an e-mail there at the top to Francis Collins and Jeremy Farrar where you say, "Agree. Very thoughtful summary and analysis. We really need to get WHO moving on getting the convening started." Correct?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q Why did you say that to Jeremy and Francis Collins? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Again, I would ask that Dr. Fauci have an opportunity to familiarize himself with this document. THE WITNESS: Well, I'm looking at this e-mail and it says, "Agree, very thoughtful summary and analysis." And I don't recall what that summary and analysis was. I get hundreds, if not thousands, of documents thrown in front of me. I don't recall. So I said, "I agree, very thoughtful summary and analysis." But I don't recall today what that summary and analysis was. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
112:12 - 112:14	<p>Q Can you look at the page before the first page of the document?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
112:15 - 112:17	<p>Q Here's an e-mail from Eddie Holmes to Jeremy Farrar; correct?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
112:18 - 114:15	<p>Q "And here's our summary so far. It will be edited further." Correct?</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p>Q Was this a summary of the paper they were drafting as a result of the conference call? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Calls for speculation.</p> <p>Q If you know?</p>

	<p>A I do not know what the summary was for, whether it was a summary of the discussion at the meeting, or whether it was the summary of what the deliberations were following the meeting. I really don't know.</p> <p>Q He goes on to say in the next line, "It's fundamental science and completely neutral as written"; correct?</p> <p>A That's what he says.</p> <p>Q And then he says, "Did not mention other anomalies as this will make us look like loons." Do you see that?</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p>Q Do you know what he's referring to? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Calls for speculation. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Do you know?</p> <p>A I do not know what he is referring to.</p> <p>Q Were anomalies in the virus discussed on that call that you participated in on February 1st?</p> <p>A You know, I'm not really sure what you mean by the word "anomalies." It could mean a number of things. Unusual observations about the virus. I'm not really sure. I really don't understand very well what Eddie was referring to when he wrote this e-mail to Jeremy, so --</p> <p>Q Were you e-mailed drafts of a paper that Eddie prepared as a result of that meeting?</p> <p>A I was -- Francis and I got -- I believe -- I'm trying to recall accurately, but it's -- I think this is the case. I'm not 100 percent sure -- that we were given copies of a draft of a manuscript at some point that was very fundamentally evolutionary virology, which is not my lane. So I remember getting a paper looking at it. I don't believe I had any substantive comments on it, just by reading it. Because that's not my lane, evolutionary virology.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
114:16 - 115:3	<p>Q Can you look at this next document which we've marked Exhibit 10? (FAUCI Exhibit No. 10 was marked for identification.) MR. KIRSCHNER: I wanted to make a standing objection that these documents that are being marked as exhibits are merging a lot of documents together and we have -- I object to the extent that this is mischaracterizing the record by putting documents together that may or may not be together, and I just want to say there's been several exhibits along these lines, including Exhibit 10. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
115:4 - 116:3	<p>Q Can you look at the second page of Exhibit 10, Dr. Fauci?</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p>Q And this is an e-mail chain on Tuesday, February 4th, between you, Francis Collins, and Jeremy Farrar; correct?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p>Q At the bottom of the e-mail of this page, the e-mail from you says, "Question mark, question mark, serial passage in ACE2 transgenic mice." Do you see that? MR. KIRSCHNER: Again, I ask that you give Dr. Fauci an opportunity to familiarize himself with this document. THE WITNESS: Well, I'm not sure -- there's so many different things going on here, I'm not sure what anybody is referring to here. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Do you know what you're referring to? Do you remember referring to serial passage in ACE2 transgenic mice in connection with that call?</p> <p>A No.</p> <p>Q Do you know what that phrase means?</p> <p>A Serial passage means you sequentially passage a virus in mice; right?</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
116:4 - 117:6	<p>Q In other words, is that another way of having the virus gain function?</p> <p>A It's possible. You could decrease function, you could gain function. You could do any of a number of things. And I don't recall or remember why or even to what I was even referring when I said, "Question mark, question mark, serial passage in ACE2 transgenic mice." I don't recall that at all.</p> <p>Q Jeremy responded, "Exactly" and then further up, Francis Collins says, "Surely that wouldn't be done in a BSL-2 lab," question mark. Do you see that?</p> <p>A Right.</p>

	<p>Q Do you know why Francis Collins raised that issue? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Calls for speculation. THE WITNESS: I don't know why he did it because I don't know the context in which he's talking. I would imagine if Francis is saying if you're going to do in vivo studies with a virus that might have some danger to it, that you would want to do it in a higher level of containment, but I don't -- I have to say I don't know what they're talking about on these e-mails, and it doesn't ring a bell with me at all. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
117:7 - 117:12	<p>Q Do you know whether that the -- whether the research that was done by Peter Daszak and Shi Zhengli in the Wuhan Institute of Virology was done at a BSL-2 safety level?</p> <p>A When you're dealing with pseudo viruses and in vitro things, it is generally done in a BSL-2.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
117:13 - 119:2	<p>Q So is serial passage in ACE2 transgenic mice generally done at BSL-2?</p> <p>A Well, it depends. Each different country, I believe, has their own level of restrictions about where -- at what level of restriction a particular experiment is done, in general. And again, I'm hesitant to go there because that's not my area of expertise. But in general, when you're dealing with the situation where you need to take extra precautions in an in vivo experiment, that you would do it in a BSL-3. But again, having said that, I am not sure of what the connection between these different e-mails are referring to.</p> <p>Q Above that, it says, "Wild West" and that's from the e-mail from Jeremy in response to Francis; correct?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q Did Jeremy have an understanding that -- to do the kind of research being referred to --</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q -- at BSL-2 --</p> <p>A Right. Yeah.</p> <p>Q -- safety conditions would be the Wild West? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Calls for speculation. THE WITNESS: I actually don't know what Jeremy is referring to when he says, "Wild West." BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Did you have concerns about performing gain-of-function research on viruses in BSL-2 conditions? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Ambiguous. THE WITNESS: No. You're a using the term gain-of-function which as I mentioned earlier in the discussion has such a broad range of interpretation that you would have to specifically tell me what experiment you're referring to. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
119:3 - 119:7	<p>Q How about the experiment set forth in, I think it was Exhibit 2, the 2015 Shi and Baric paper, would those experiments be the sort to -- would be --</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
119:8 - 119:17	<p>Q -- appropriate to perform at BSL-2 functions -- sorry -- BSL-2 conditions?</p> <p>A I have not familiarized myself with that paper. I don't know if I ever even read it carefully. It would take me probably an hour to read through the paper to make a determination of what particular level of function -- not function, level of restriction it would be. So I don't think I could answer that question right now.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
119:18 - 120:1	<p>Q I'm handing you an Exhibit 11. Do you see that?</p> <p>A I don't have anything in front of me yet. MR. KIRSCHNER: Counsel, could I have a copy? MR. SAUER: Yeah. (Dr. Fauci Exhibit No. 11 was marked for identification.)</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
120:2 - 120:9	<p>Q Can you turn to the second page of this document? And is this an e-mail on February 7th of 2020 from Jeremy to you and Francis Collins with the subject line "revised draft"?</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p>Q And it says, "Attachment: Summary, Feb 7 PDF"; right?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
120:10 - 120:20	<p>Q Is this -- did Jeremy send you a draft of -- a paper that Eddie Holmes was working on that arose</p>

	<p>from the February 1st conference call?</p> <p>A You know, I don't recall. I believe -- and, again, this is vague -- that a draft of a summary of something was sent to me. My recollection is I really didn't have any meaningful comments on it because it is, again, if I -- if it is a draft of what it might have been, it would be involved in a lot of complicated evolutionary virology that is not my lane.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
120:21 - 122:23	<p>Q Turn to the next page, the actual attachment. Do you see where it says "overview" at the very top?</p> <p>A Yes. MR. KIRSCHNER: Counsel, you say this is the actual attachment. I wanted to point out that is your characterization of it. There's nothing indicating that it is necessarily the -- MR. SAUER: This is produced by NIH in response to FOIA requests -- MR. KIRSCHNER: I -- I understand, but -- but there's -- I'm not saying -- I'm just saying for the record, it's not clear. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Under overview, do you see the third sentence that's bolded beginning "Analysis of the virus"?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p>Q That bolded sentence says, "Analysis of the virus genome sequences clearly demonstrates that the virus is not a laboratory construct or experimentally manipulated virus"; correct?</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p>Q Was that a conclusion that you and Jeremy and Francis Collins discussed in this time frame?</p> <p>A As I mentioned before, I don't find -- I am not qualified since I am not an evolutionary virologist to make any kind of definitive determination about whether a genome could or could not be a laboratory construct or experimentally manipulative. I have relied, as anyone would, with highly qualified, respected evolutionary virologists to come to that conclusion or not.</p> <p>Q Were you involved in the response to the various FOIA requests for your e-mails from NIAID and NIH?</p> <p>A I'm -- I don't understand what you mean was I involved in them. I don't -- a FOIA request does not come to me, and I look through my e-mails and give the e-mails that they ask for. We have a system at the NIH where FOIA requests come in and a different component of the institutes tap into the e-mails and provide the e-mails that are requested. I don't decide which e-mails go and don't go.</p> <p>Q Do you approve redactions to them?</p> <p>A I never redact -- I don't redact things.</p> <p>Q So you don't have any involvement in deciding what gets redacted and what doesn't?</p> <p>A I have no involvement in what gets redacted. It gets redacted at multiple levels beyond my -- beyond me.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
122:24 - 123:2	<p>Q I'm handing you Exhibit 12. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 12 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
123:3 - 124:20	<p>Q If you look at the first page of this document?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p>Q And that's an e-mail, again, chain on February 4th between Jeremy Farrar, you, and Francis Collins; right?</p> <p>A Yes, I see that.</p> <p>Q And the attachment is called "Summary.DOCX"; right?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q And he says, "Please treat in confidence.</p> <p>A very rough first draft from Eddie and team. They will send on an edited, cleaner version later today"; correct? A Correct.</p> <p>Q So you testified earlier that the consensus of the call on September 1st was that they needed to take more time to consider the arguments back and forth; correct?</p> <p>A It wasn't September.</p> <p>Q I'm sorry. January.</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p>Q Okay. And then by February 4th, the following Tuesday after that Saturday call, you had received a rough first draft of a -- a paper to be published as a result -- or to be authored --</p> <p>A Right.</p>

	<p>Q -- as a result of that; correct?</p> <p>A It says, "Please treat confidence. A very rough draft." So it looks like they did send it to me. Right.</p> <p>Q And do you remember getting that draft?</p> <p>A I don't recall specifically getting it, but as I mentioned, if I did, I wouldn't have much input into it since it's a draft, I'm sure, that involves very complicated evolutionary virology of which I'm not an expert.</p> <p>Q And in the -- Jeremy had forwarded to you lower down on that page the same e-mail we looked at a moment ago where Eddie Holmes says, "Did not mention other anomalies as this will make us look like the^ "?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
124:21 - 126:18	<p>Q Do you recall reviewing this draft?</p> <p>A I might have looked at it, but I certainly didn't make any meaningful comments since this is outside of my lane of expertise.</p> <p>Q If you can turn to the next page -- or actually stay on that page for a minute. Jeremy says, "Pushing WHO again today" there in the top -- near the top of the page. Do you see where that is?</p> <p>A I'm sorry. Top of the first page?</p> <p>Q Yeah.</p> <p>A And what are you referring to?</p> <p>Q Second paragraph of Jeremy's e-mail at the top of the page to you and Francis Collins. It says, "Pushing WHO again today"; correct?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p>Q Were you involved in any communications with the WHO at that time to try to get them to act on this project? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Asked and answered. THE WITNESS: To my recollection, I didn't have direct involvement with the WHO, not to my recollection. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Next page, second page of this document is another e-mail from you we've seen before, right, where you say we really need to get --</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q -- WHO moving?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q Does this jog your memory at all? Do you remember being involved in trying to get the WHO to act?</p> <p>A The context of this exchange and the theme of the discussion, although I, myself, did not directly get involved in interactions with WHO on this, was that we all felt that given the convening power and the status of WHO, that we wanted to get them involved because we wanted to make sure that this was an open and transparent discussion that involved international global health authority. So it is perfectly consistent and compatible that I would say we really need to get WHO moving on getting the convening involved because we wanted an open convening so that evidence and data could be openly discussed. That was the theme of everything that was going on at the time.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
126:19 - 128:8	<p>Q Can you turn ahead to the second-to-last page of this document?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p>Q And this is an e-mail on Tuesday, February 4th, from Jeremy to you and Francis Collins with an attachment called "Summary.PDF"; right?</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p>Q And this says -- it just says "tidied up"; correct?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p>Q Did he send you a second draft that same day the 4th that was, quote, tidied up?</p> <p>A I don't recall.</p> <p>Q You don't know if he sent you a second draft? Does this e-mail jog your recollection?</p> <p>A The e-mail does very little to jog my recollection. Again, I had very little input or even interpretation of the -- the -- the information because it was in an area that is not my area of expertise. I don't know what he means by tidied up. Usually --</p> <p>Q Can you turn to the next -- I'm not asking you about that. Can you turn to the next page -- MR.</p>

	<p>KIRSCHNER: Counsel, please don't interrupt -- please don't interrupt the witness. Just he's -- BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q I'm going to ask you to listen to questions that I'm asking --</p> <p>A I'm listening.</p> <p>Q -- and answer the question that I'm asking without going on long tangents. Can you do that, please?</p> <p>MR. KIRSCHNER: I -- THE WITNESS: I'd be happy to. I don't think I'm going on long tangents, but I'm trying to put things -- BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Well, can you turn --</p> <p>A -- into appropriate context.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
128:9 - 129:18	<p>Q Can you turn to the next page of the document?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p>Q This is the last page. This is a February 5th e-mail from Jeremy to you and Francis; correct?</p> <p>A It says, "Tony and Francis, the revised draft from Eddie copied here."</p> <p>Q And so he sent you a third draft on February 5th?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q Two drafts on the 4th and a third draft on the 5th; correct?</p> <p>A I'm not keeping up with the different ones. So I can't say "correct" because you're going really fast.</p> <p>Q And you recall from the prior exhibit that there was another draft that was sent to you on February 7th; correct?</p> <p>A It appears that there were a couple of drafts that were sent back and forth.</p> <p>Q And those were -- when you say "a couple," it's about four so far; correct?</p> <p>A I can't say. At least a couple. I don't know exactly how many.</p> <p>Q Were you aware during the same time frame that Peter Daszak was organizing a statement for The Lancet -- MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q -- about the origins of the virus? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Speculative, also vague. THE WITNESS: I don't recall. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
129:19 - 130:5	<p>Q Are you aware that a -- a letter was published in The Lancet in February of 2020 organized by Peter Daszak?</p> <p>A You know, I really don't recall this. Again, getting to my statement about context, you're talking about a period of time when thousands of things come across my desk. So I don't -- I don't recall anything specific about something that Peter Daszak may or may not have written for Lancet. If I saw it, perhaps, not guaranteed, it might jog my memory, but I don't recall that right now.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
130:6 - 130:12	<p>Q I'm handing you Exhibit 13. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 13 was marked for identification.) MR. KIRSCHNER: May I ask the witness if he needs a break or if he's okay. THE WITNESS: I'm okay. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
130:13 - 132:25	<p>Q Can you turn to the third page of this document?</p> <p>A Third page.</p> <p>Q And the top half of this page there's a e-mail from Jeremy to -- that begins "Francis and Tony"; correct? Do you see that e-mail?</p> <p>A I'm reading it. Yeah.</p> <p>Q In that third bullet point in his e-mail, his e-mail is talking about contact with WHO again; correct?</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p>Q There's been a number of e-mails. We talked about that already; correct?</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p>Q Third bullet point in his e-mail, he says, "We can have a call this week with the core group of that to frame the work of the group including if you could join."</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q And I take it he's inviting you and Francis Collins to join a call to discuss framing the work of the WHO convened group?</p> <p>A Right.</p>

	<p>Q Is that right?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q Did you have that call?</p> <p>A I don't recall. Like I said before, this was mostly a Jeremy-led thing, and I don't recall having a call with WHO. It's possible that we did, but I don't recall.</p> <p>Q Two bullet points down, it says, "With names to be put forward into the group from us, and pressure on this group from your and our teams next week." Correct?</p> <p>A That's what it says.</p> <p>Q First half of that line, it talks about, "Names put forward into the group from us." Did you put forward names for this group for the WHO, or do you recall doing that?</p> <p>A I think, if you go back -- and when you say "recall," I recall because the first page of the cluster of e-mails that you just sent me is an e-mail from Jeremy to me and Francis saying, "Thank you. Pardis is great, respected by everyone." He's referring to Pardis Sabeti. And as the e-mail jogs my memory, I believe I made the suggestion that if you want to have another expert on coronavirus evolution for the working group that I assume is the group in the second bullet of the e-mail from Jeremy to Francis and I, where it says, "They have asked for names to sit on that group. Please do send any names," and I believe that in response -- not I believe. It looks clearly obvious that in response to that e-mail request from Jeremy, I said, "I left out an important name for the group, Pardis Sabeti at the Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard." And Jeremy writes back, "Thank you. Pardis is great. Respected by everyone."</p> <p>Q And you had provided -- top half of the second page of the document, you had provided the list to Jeremy --</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
133:1 - 133:9	<p>Q -- of people to include in the WHO's work?</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p>Q How did you come up with these names? Did you talk to anyone before proposing them to Jeremy?</p> <p>A I don't believe I did. I just -- I may have. I just -- I don't recall. It's likely because these are people, some of whom I know well and I probably asked around my institute for other people who are fluent in molecular virology.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
133:10 - 134:22	<p>Q How about Joseph DeRisi, third name on the list, at the Chan Zuckerberg Biohub. What's the Chan Zuckerberg Biohub?</p> <p>A I haven't referred it as Biohub, but the Chan Zuckerberg has supported research institutions at the University of California at San Francisco. That might be what he's referring to, because --</p> <p>Q This is he -- this is you; right? This is your e-mail?</p> <p>A Yeah. But again -- these are names that were given, I believed, even though the e-mail is from me to Jeremy, several of these names, I almost certainly got by asking members of my institute, such as people in the division of microbiology and infectious diseases for some names of people who might actually be able to be contributory to the working group. Let me give you some examples so you can be clarified. Harold Varmus I know very well. Former Nobel Prize winner and former director of the NIH.</p> <p>Q I'm really not asking you to go through the whole list. I just want to focus on --</p> <p>A Well, I want to put it into a context.</p> <p>Q I'm going to ask you to listen to the question that I'm asking and answer that question. This is an extremely long answer that is absolutely nonresponsive. I just asked you about Joseph DeRisi. Did you originate that name? MR. KIRSCHNER: I will say before Dr. Fauci responds, if he has to provide proper context, he provides proper context. You can ask your question, and then Dr. Fauci will provide his response. THE WITNESS: Yeah, it's very important to me to provide the context because there are certain names on this list that I don't even recognize. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
134:23 - 135:14	<p>Q How about Joseph DeRisi?</p> <p>A I don't recognize that name. It was almost certainly given to me by someone in my institute. And the reason --</p> <p>Q How about the name -- the name below?</p> <p>A I'm sorry. I got to finish.</p>

	<p>Q Go ahead.</p> <p>A This is context, sir. I don't recognize Joseph DeRisi. I may have heard of him. I know Harold Varmus well. I know Dan Gannon well. I don't know Eugene Koonin well. So the point that I'm putting into context is that it is highly likely that these names were given to me in part by others. So you're asking about Joseph DeRisi, and Joseph DeRisi's name does not ring a bell.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
135:15 - 135:18	<p>Q How about Pardis Sabeti on the page before?</p> <p>A Pardis Sabeti does. She's a well-known virologist.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
135:19 - 136:25	<p>Q Did you talk to her before you sent her e-mail to Jeremy for inclusion in the WHO group?</p> <p>A Unlikely that I pulled Pardis. I likely just know her well enough that I would have put her name in. But perhaps I did call her. But unlikely that I did. She's such a well-known figure in molecular virology that it is not unusual for me to say, "Of course include Pardis Sabeti."</p> <p>Q How about Don Gannon?</p> <p>A Don Gannon is well-known person.</p> <p>Q Did you talk to him before you put his name on this list to Jeremy?</p> <p>A I don't believe I did. I don't believe I spoke to anyone on this list. I just pulled the names out. Some of which I knew, like Varmus and Nabel, and some of which were very likely given to me by my staff.</p> <p>Q Turn back to the third page of the document, Jeremy's e-mail to you and Francis. In the third bullet point we talked about earlier, it talks about having a call to, quote, frame the work of the group. Do you know what he was referring to when he was asking you -- or he wanted to frame the work of the group?</p> <p>A I can't say exactly that I know what he means by frame the work of the group, but in experience in dealing with a number of working groups, when you frame the work of the group, you usually start off by saying, "What is the theme and what is the question we're asking? Let's frame the discussion. What's the issue at hand?"</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
137:1 - 137:4	<p>Q Do you recall any discussions about wanting to the frame the work of the WHO group?</p> <p>A I don't recall anything about framing it, but --</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
137:5 - 137:16	<p>Q Two bullet points lower down, you see there's a bullet point about the WHO, Jeremy says he -- refers to pressure on this group from your and our teams next week. Do you know what pressure he's referring to?</p> <p>A I don't. MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Mischaracterizes the record. THE WITNESS: I don't know what Jeremy is referring to when he says pressure on this group. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
137:17 - 138:6	<p>Q Do you recall any discussion of having anybody pressure the WHO in its work related to this origins of the virus investigation?</p> <p>A I don't have any inkling at all of pressuring them. The one thing that's clear from the e-mails and my recollection is that everyone wanted the WHO to get involved because of their convening power and their credibility. We all wanted to make this an open discussion, and the WHO was the most appropriate forum for an open discussion. So I don't think a belief had anything to do with pressuring the WHO to do anything, merely to get them to meet. You're sniffing. You sure you don't have a cold.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
138:7 - 139:11	<p>Q Exhibit 14? (FAUCI Exhibit No. 14 was marked for identification.) MR. KIRSCHNER: Counsel, can I have copies? BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Can you -- during this same time frame we've been talking about, was there also a discussion of having the WHO sponsor a trip to China to investigate the virus? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Calls for speculation. THE WITNESS: You know, I don't recall. You're asking, Mr. Sauer, about during this discussion, was there discussion about WHO going to China. Well, I know now, memory-wise, that WHO did send a group to China.</p> <p>Q Did that group include Cliff Lane of your staff?</p> <p>A Let me answer the question. The question: Did I know about it then? And I'm saying right now, I don't recall, at this particular time, whether they were talking about a group going to China. I do know that they wanted to put together a WHO group and they may have and they likely did ask HHS, who</p>

	<p>asked NIH, who would be a good person to go to China to see -- you know, to get some information about what exactly evolved in China.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
139:12 - 140:13	<p>Q Did you make a recommendation about who would be a good person to go to China around February 2020?</p> <p>A I believe I recommended Dr. Clifford Lane. I recommended or it was obvious because he's a very well-known, competent person. So it is highly likely that I recommended him. Though I don't specifically remember, it would be very compatible with the process that I would recommend him.</p> <p>Q Do you remember why you were sent an e-mail that says, "WHO advance team on way to China, Tedros tweet"?</p> <p>A No idea.</p> <p>Q You believe you may have recommended Cliff Lane for that -- for that trip, but you don't know for sure?</p> <p>A It's highly likely I would recommend him if anyone asked me who would go on an international trip. Dr. Lane has extensive experience in dealing at the international level with a number of countries, including the work he did in Africa with Ebola and in Southeast Asia. So he's a very experienced person at the international level. It's entirely likely, if not very likely, that I would have recommended him.</p> <p>Q Did he actually attend that trip?</p> <p>A Yes, he did.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
140:14 - 140:18	<p>Q During February of 2020 in the kind of month we've been talking about, did you make any public statements about the origins of the virus?</p> <p>A That's a very broad question. I don't recall if I did.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
140:19 - 141:1	<p>Q Okay. Well, did you have any -- did you have any contact with Peter Daszak or conversations with him about the origins of the virus?</p> <p>A I don't recall. I may have, but I don't recall.</p> <p>Q You testified earlier that you don't really know Peter Daszak; is that right?</p> <p>A I don't know him very well at all.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
141:2 - 141:14	<p>Q Have you ever done a joint podcast with him?</p> <p>A You know, that was brought -- it was interesting. I think someone recently -- I don't know when whether it was our discussion or not. I don't remember -- brought up that I did do some sort of an interview with him, but if it had not been brought to my attention, I would not have remembered it. I've done several hundred podcasts, maybe -- several hundred podcasts. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 15 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
141:15 - 142:17	<p>Q I'm handing you Exhibit 15. Does this document jog your memory of doing a podcast with Newt Gingrich and Peter Daszak on February 9th, 2020?</p> <p>A Well, there's an advertisement that said that I'm Newt Gingrich's guest. If you had not put this in front of me, I likely would not have remembered it. Like I said, I've done at least several hundred podcasts over the last couple of years.</p> <p>Q Do you remember this one in particular now that you see this? Do you remember doing this podcast?</p> <p>A I don't -- I don't remember it specifically, but since the e-mail indicates that the podcast occurred, I don't even say I vaguely remember that podcast. Like I said, I've done many podcasts.</p> <p>Q At the top you say, "Definitely for the director's page." What are you referring to? What's the director's page?</p> <p>A Whenever we do a media thing or a podcast or a paper that comes out that the people who are interested in the goings on of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, we sometimes put it on the director's page, which is the link when you go to NIH.gov and then NIAID.gov, you get the director's page, and on that are various links for people to access things that we may have done.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>

142:18 - 144:19	<p>Q I'm handing you a document that's marked Exhibit 16. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 16 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q And this is an informal transcription of some of your remarks in that podcast. Do you see at the top there it says -- there's a timestamp, 18:48, Newt. Do you see that?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p>Q And it quotes Newt Gingrich as saying, "I don't know if you had access to enough information from the Chinese, but as you know, there is sort of an urban legend that there is a biological warfare center in Wuhan and that the coronavirus escaped from that. Do you have any sense where it probably came from"; correct? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Is that what it says?</p> <p>A You just read it correctly, yes.</p> <p>Q And then the transcript reports you as responding at 19:06: "Well, I think ultimately we know that these things come from an animal reservoir. I heard these conspiracy theories and like all conspiracy theories, Newt, they're just conspiracy theories." Do you see that?</p> <p>A Yes, I do.</p> <p>Q Do you recall making that comment on Newt Gingrich's podcast? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: I don't recall making it, but if this is a correct transcript, then it's clear that I made that statement, but I don't recall making that statement. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Do you recall thinking on February 9th, 2020, that it was, quote -- or that we know these things come from an animal reservoir?</p> <p>A The background of saying that we know things come from an animal reservoir because the history of the evolution of new microbes from an animal reservoir to a human is very clear. I could give you a number of examples, but one in particular to save time is that SARS-CoV-1, very similar circumstances to SARS-CoV-2, was for a while not knowing what it evolved, but it became clear that it went from a bat to a civet cat to a human. So very, very similar --</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
144:20 - 146:25	<p>Q Can I direct your attention to another ^ page, if I may?</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p>Q At 34:30 Newt says -- you see halfway down, second bullet point? MR. KIRSCHNER: Counsel, I would ask for you not to interrupt the witness. MR. SAUER: He was giving a completely nonresponsive answer. I'm just asking -- THE WITNESS: No, actually I was -- I was responding to the issue of what you mean by coming from an animal reservoir, and what I was saying is that my statement that things -- and I'll quote the exact words -- "these things come from an animal reservoir," and the context of that is, is ample historical experience that these things overwhelmingly come from an animal reservoir. I was putting it into context. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Thank you for that. Can I direct your attention now to the second bullet point beginning 34:30? Do you see that?</p> <p>A Yes. Yeah.</p> <p>Q Where Newt says, the coronavirus probably came from one of the flea markets, although there was a secondary rumor that there is a biological weapons laboratory in Wuhan -- THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, Counsel. Can you slow down?</p> <p>Q There is a secondary rumor that there is a biological weapons laboratory in Wuhan and it may have come from there. Is it your sense that it's almost certain that it came from an animal to human transition -- transmission. Do you see that?</p> <p>A I do.</p> <p>Q And then the transcript quotes Daszak saying, "All the evidence says that is what happened"; is that right? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. Speculative. THE WITNESS: That's what it says. It says, Daszak, quote, "All the evidence say that is what happened." BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Do you recall Daszak saying that? MR. KIRSCHNER: Again, objection. Lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: I don't recall hardly anything about this interview since, as I mentioned, I give hundreds of podcasts. So I cannot say that I recall Daszak making that statement, though, if this transcript is correct, it appears that he has made the statement.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
147:1 - 148:3	<p>Q Does this jog your recollection of having any communications with Daszak about the origins of the</p>

	<p>virus in February of 2020? Do you remember any such communication?</p> <p>A I told you before that I did not remember any direct conversations with him about the origin, and I said I very well might have had conversations, but I don't specifically remember conversations. If you are implying, understandably, that being on a podcast with Dr. Daszak in which the origins were discussed, if that constitutes a discussion with him about it, I guess I had a discussion, but at the time you asked the question, I did not recall having a discussion with him about the origins.</p> <p>Q How about Dr. Ralph Baric? We talked about him earlier. Did you say you knew him or not?</p> <p>A I know of him. I wouldn't say I know him. I'm not sure. I may have met him at a meeting or not. I certainly know who he is. He's a well-established scientist. I cannot say for certain if I've ever met him.</p> <p>Q Okay. Did you ever -- so you don't recall ever having a one-on-one meeting with him of any kind?</p> <p>A I don't recall. It's possible. I have meetings with hundreds, if not thousands, of scientists over the years that I've been at this position.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
148:4 - 148:17	<p>Q I'm handing you Exhibit 17. MR. KIRSCHNER: Counsel, I would like to take a break soon. Are we kind of finishing up a line of questioning or -- MR. SAUER: Yeah, we can do that after the exhibit, if that's what you want. MR. KIRSCHNER: Okay. Can I have the exhibit myself? (FAUCI Exhibit No. 17 was marked for identification.) THE WITNESS: So is this 17? MR. SAUER: Yeah. THE WITNESS: Thank you. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
148:18 - 149:18	<p>Q Do you see this exhibit is a page from your official Outlook calendar dated February 11th, 2020?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q And then if you look at 2:30 p.m. in the afternoon that day, there's a meeting marked that says, "Hold meeting with Dr. Ralph Baric." Do you see that?</p> <p>A I do.</p> <p>Q And indicated on it is that the invitation came from Emily -- sorry -- Emily Erbeling; correct?</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p>Q Was that -- did that meeting occur? Did you and Emily have a meeting with Dr. Ralph Baric on February 11th, 2020? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Speculative. THE WITNESS: You know, I don't recall the meeting, but it's on my calendar. And as I mentioned a moment ago, I might have had a meeting with him. I don't recall. Getting into context, it says 7A-18, which is our conference room. If one goes back and looks, I have literally hundreds of meetings in 7A-18 with scientists who we fund, who we don't fund, who come in and visit the NIH. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
149:19 - 150:7	<p>Q What did you discuss in this meeting, if you remember?</p> <p>A I don't recall the discussion that we had at 2:30 on February the 11th, 2020. I just don't recall it. MR. SAUER: We can take a break there, if you want? THE WITNESS: Sure. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. Stand by. The time is 11:09 a.m., and we're going off the record. (Recess.) THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 11:21 a.m., and we're back on the record. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
150:8 - 150:17	<p>Q Dr. Fauci, I want to circle back to something you said a little while ago before I forget. You said that misinformation and disinformation can lead to loss of life; correct?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q And I think that was in the context of talking about the misinformation and disinformation on social media, among other things; is that correct?</p> <p>A However it's disseminated, it can lead to loss of life.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
150:18 - 151:1	<p>Q Is it your view that misinformation and disinformation on social media can lead to loss of life? THE WITNESS: What's the matter? THE COURT REPORTER: Nothing. THE WITNESS: You're shaking your head. THE COURT REPORTER: I need counsel to slow down.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
151:2 - 151:11	<p>Q Is it your view that misinformation and disinformation on social media can lead to loss of life?</p> <p>A I think in any situation where egregious misinformation such as some of the ones I referred to before, such as information that would discourage people from getting vaccinated, that in my mind, would be a way that life that could otherwise have been saved would be lost, if people were persuaded</p>

	<p>not to pursue a life-saving intervention.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
151:12 - 151:20	<p>Q Do you think that there should be steps taken to curb the spread of misinformation and disinformation?</p> <p>A You know, that's not my area. I'm very well aware of the concept of freedom of speech. The area of the curtailment of that is something that is not in my area of the expertise. Those are legal and other things. And I really don't have any opinion on that.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
151:21 - 152:16	<p>Q Have you ever contacted a social media company and asked them to remove misinformation from one of their platforms?</p> <p>A No, I have not.</p> <p>Q Is that something you ever discussed with Mark Zuckerberg?</p> <p>A To my knowledge, we have not -- my discussions with Mark Zuckerberg were very clearly directed at getting me on some Facebook podcast to encourage people to get vaccinated. That was the extent of our conversations.</p> <p>Q Has anyone on your staff, you know, at NIAID, ever reached out to a social media platform to ask them to take content down or to block content in any way? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Speculative. THE WITNESS: To my knowledge, no. But again, I don't know everything that goes on, but certainly nothing that I was made aware of that they were doing. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
152:17 - 153:7	<p>Q Let me give you Exhibit 18. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 18 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Do you see this short e-mail from Ian Lipkin dated February 11th, 2020? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: To whom was the e-mail written to? BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Do you know if you were copied on this e-mail?</p> <p>A Well, let me read it first, and then I'll see. Is this an e-mail from Ian to me?</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
153:8 - 153:20	<p>Q That's my question. Do you know if this is an e-mail from Ian to you?</p> <p>A You know, I can't say for sure. I mean, again, just in the spirit of the context that I've been trying to establish here, I average a couple of thousand e-mails a day. So this could have been --</p> <p>Q Do you have any recollection of this one?</p> <p>A I don't have a recollection of it. It's entirely possible that Ian wrote this to me. Ian communicates with me -- I wouldn't say a lot, but enough to recognize an e-mail when -- and I will send it, I'll read it, but I don't recognize this particular e-mail.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
153:21 - 155:14	<p>Q Can I direct your attention to the last sentence where Ian says, "Given the scale of the bat CO research pursued there -- that is to say at the institute in Wuhan -- and the site of the emergence of the first human cases, we have a nightmare of circumstantial evidence to assess." Do you see that?</p> <p>A I do.</p> <p>Q Do you know what he is talking about? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Speculative. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q If you know.</p> <p>A I am not certain of what he's referring to. I could surmise what he is referring to is that -- and I think it has to do with circumstantial evidence, is that whenever you have a situation when research is being done and you might have an outbreak, then there will be always people who immediately jump on and say, "Well, this could have had to do with the research."</p> <p>Q Did you think it was a nightmare of circumstantial evidence, these factors he's referring to, given that there's a lot of bat coronavirus research pursued at the Institute in Wuhan, and that the first human cases emerged in Wuhan, you view that as a nightmare of circumstantial evidence? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous. Compound. THE WITNESS: I don't -- at least that's not my style to think in terms of circumstantial evidence. I think anyone who is involved in the field knows that when there's an outbreak, there's always a concern of how did it happen? What happened? And when you have an element that there is a research institution involved, there is always speculation that it has</p>

	<p>something to do with research institution. I mean, we have been in situations where people questioned what's going on up in Frederick, Maryland, even though there's nothing going on in Frederick, Maryland, to my knowledge, that is of any concern that people always refer to as "Oh, there's that kind of research going on." BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
155:15 - 155:21	<p>Q Would it be a nightmare if it turned out that, in fact, that the virus had escaped -- accidentally escaped from a lab in Wuhan?</p> <p>A You know, again, you're use the word "nightmare," you know, kind of a -- a sort of a vague thing that means different things to different people.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
155:22 - 157:22	<p>Q How would you describe it?</p> <p>A I mean if -- and I have to emphasize "if," and I believe the evidence weighs much more toward a natural occurrence, even though you always keep an open mind as to what the origin and etiology is, certainly if that happened, then the purpose of knowing that is try and make sure, looking forward, that those things don't happen again. The purpose of trying to determine the origin of an outbreak is to see what you can do, looking forward, to prevent it from happening again and it goes both ways. If it's a factual occurrence, then you want to make sure that you get good animal human surveillance.</p> <p>Q How about it was not a natural occurrence on the hypothetical, and it, in fact, escaped from the lab and in fact that the research that had created the virus was partly funded by NIAID, would that be a nightmare scenario? Can you pick a word that would describe the scenario to your knowledge?</p> <p>A Well, I'm going to go to context because you're asking a question that I think needs to be explained. If you look at the molecular makeup of SARS-CoV-2 and you look at the viruses that were studied under the auspices and funding of the subaward to the Wuhan Institute, those bat viruses evaluated by anyone with even a reasonable acquaintance with evolutionary virology would tell you that given those viruses that they worked on, reported on, and published on was so far removed from SARS-CoV-2, that it would be molecularly impossible, even if people tried to manipulate them to become SARS-CoV-2 they wouldn't become SARS-CoV-2. So the idea of conflating research that's funded by NIH to look at in a surveillance way the bat viruses that were circulating in that area, you can talk to any unbiased molecular virologist and you can say that the evolutionary difference between those viruses and SARS-CoV-2 would make it essentially impossible to have this turn into this. And what happens, is when you talked about laboratory leaks and the things you're referring to here, people inappropriately conflate that with research funded by the NIH. And it's apples and oranges. Could something have, quote, leaked out of a Chinese lab? I have always kept an open mind that that is possible. Could it have happened by the experiments that were done and reported that were funded by the NIH? Getting back to what I said a moment ago, molecularly, that could not have happened.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
157:23 - 158:8	<p>Q What about experiments that were done but weren't reported. For example, are you aware that a whole large number of genomic sequences were pulled down in September of 2019 from the Wuhan Institute of Virology's website? Are you aware of that? It's a yes or no question. MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: Tell me what you're referring to. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
158:9 - 158:17	<p>Q Well, are you aware that genomic sequences of viruses were removed from publicly available databases in September of 2019 at the Wuhan Institute of Virology?</p> <p>A I am aware of that context. Those sequences were also, even though they were removed from a bank that has nothing do with my institute, those sequences were published in the literature. So it isn't as if they were unknown.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
158:18 - 159:1	<p>Q Let me ask you this. Actually, let me give you another exhibit. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 19 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q I'm handing you Exhibit 20. MR. KIRSCHNER: Twenty or 19? MR. SAUER: You're right. It's 19.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
159:2 - 160:12	<p>Q Do you recognize this as the preprint version of the proximal origin of SARS-CoV-2 dated February 17th of 2020?</p> <p>A Yeah, this looks like the preprint that antedated the full papers that were published in the peer-</p>

	<p>reviewed literature. This is a preprint.</p> <p>Q Did you review the preprint when it came out? Did anyone send it to you? Do you know? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Asked and answered. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Do you know?</p> <p>A Again, I -- a lot of things get sent to me. I -- it likely is that they probably sent a copy of this to Dr. Collins and I, though I don't specifically recall it.</p> <p>Q Do you know if you reviewed it when the preprint came out? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Asked and answered. THE WITNESS: It -- it depends. I think I answered that question before, did I not? BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q I'm just asking you again. I don't remember what you said.</p> <p>A Well, let me try and remember and make sure that it's both true and consistent, that it is likely that this was sent to me. When you say review a paper, review means different things to different people. Did I look through it? Yes. Did I fully understand the molecular virology of it? Unlikely, because I'm not an evolutionary virologist. Did I make any substantive comments on it? Unlikely, because that would not be my position since I'm not an evolutionary virologist.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
160:13 - 161:22	<p>Q Now, you have been copied on four drafts of this paper prior to this on February 4th, 5th, and 7th; correct?</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p>Q Those drafts were sent to you by Jeremy Farrar as written up by Eddie Holmes? Do you recall that?</p> <p>A I'm not sure it was written up by Eddie Holmes, but it was sent from me, I believe. You showed me an -- you showed me a lot of e-mails and papers before. I don't have an exact recollection of the name of the person who sent it versus the one who was referred to, but the names of Eddie Holmes and Jeremy Farrar are certainly associated with the paper.</p> <p>Q And, in fact, if you look at the author line, there's five authors associated with it; correct?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p>Q And all of those people are on that February 1st call at 2:00 p.m. organized by Jeremy Farrar; correct?</p> <p>A I believe so. I -- yeah, I believe so, but I'm not a hundred percent sure. Was he and Lipkin on the call? He might have been. I know that the others very likely were on the call.</p> <p>Q Is that Ian Lipkin who one week -- or six days earlier had sent an e-mail saying that we have a nightmare of circumstantial evidence to address? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Is that the same human?</p> <p>A Well, Ian Lipkin is Ian Lipkin. There aren't a lot of Ian Lipkins that I know.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
161:23 - 162:24	<p>Q Can you turn to the second page of the document? Second paragraph, last sentence, it says, "Importantly, this analysis provides evidence that SARS-CoV-2 is not a laboratory ^ construct nor a purposely manipulated virus"; correct?</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p>Q Did you have any discussions with any of these authors about that conclusion? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Asked and answered. THE WITNESS: I don't recall whether I had a discussion with the authors about that last statement. When I looked at the paper for things that you understand are clear sentences like that and not necessarily things like Figure 1, which go into the mutations and contact residues, et cetera. So I am certain that having looked at it, I was aware of what their conclusion was. I don't recall discussing specifically that conclusion with them. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q How about with Francis Collins? Did you discuss it with him?</p> <p>A It's possible. I mean, Francis and I know each other very well. He's the director of NIH. I would not be surprised if I had in the discussion a mention of and perhaps discussion of the conclusion of that paper.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
162:25 - 163:6	<p>Q How about with Jeremy Farrar? Did you have any discussions with him about the conclusion?</p> <p>A I don't recall. I would not be surprised if I did, but I don't specifically recall. It would be much more likely that I had a conversation of that type with Dr. Collins, possibly with Dr. Farrar, but I don't know</p>

	<p>for sure.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
163:7 - 163:10	<p>Q I'm handing you Exhibit 20. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 20 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
163:11 - 163:21	<p>Q Do you see this article from the NIH record entitled "NIAID's Lane Discusses WHO COVID-19 Mission to China"?  A And what's the question, sir? I'm sorry.  Q I'm just saying do you see this?  A Yes, I do see it.  Q Okay. And then if you look at the first paragraph, it's talking about Dr. Cliff Lane, which is the patient in that WHO mission we talked about earlier; correct?  A Correct.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
163:22 - 164:6	<p>Q Could you turn to the fifth page of the document, bottom paragraph? There's a quote from Mr. Lane. Do you see that? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. I would ask that Dr. Fauci have an -- an opportunity to familiarize himself with this document. MR. SAUER: I'm just asking if he sees that -- that quote on the bottom of Page 5. THE WITNESS: Is it the last paragraph? BY MR. SAUER:  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
164:7 - 164:19	<p>Q Yeah, beginning "The Chinese were managing"?  A Yes.  Q And Mr. Lane, after returning from the trip, said the Chinese were managing this in a very structured, organized way; correct? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. BY MR. SAUER:  Q Is that what it says?  A That's what the sentence says on this report on Page 5. That's what the NIH record -- report says, yes.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
164:20 - 165:1	<p>Q And the quote goes on to quote Mr. Lane as saying, "When we got there, the outbreak was already coming under control in China. The measures they put in place appear to be working. I think that they felt there were lessons learned they wanted to share with the rest of the world"; correct?  A Correct.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
165:2 - 167:13	<p>Q Did you discuss Mr. Lane's experience on the trip with him when he got back from the WHO trip?  A The answer is I did, and it relates really a lot to what -- the sentence -- what he said. Dr. Lane was very impressed about how from a clinical public health standpoint, the Chinese were handling the isolation, the contact tracing, the building of facilities to take care of people, and that's what I believed he meant when he said were managing this in a very structured, organized way.  Q And he goes on in that last sentence on that page to say, "From what I saw in China, we may have to go to as extreme a degree of social distancing to help bring our outbreak under control"; correct?  A Correct.  Q So he drew the conclusion that there might have to be extreme, in his word, measures to mandate social distancing to bring the outbreak under control; correct?  A That's what this is implying, yes.  Q Did he discuss that with you when he came back from the trip?  A He might have. I don't recall the exact sentence, but he did discuss with me that the Chinese had a very organized way of trying to contain the spread in Wuhan and elsewhere. He didn't get a chance to go to Wuhan, but he was in Beijing, and I believe other cities -- at least Beijing -- and he mentioned that they had a very organized, well-regimented way of handling the outbreak.  Q And so he had a kind of positive reaction to that. There might be lessons to be learned for the United States in its response to the outbreak; correct? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous. BY MR. SAUER:  Q Correct?  A I believe Dr. Lane came to the conclusion that when you have a widespread respiratory disease that</p>

	<p>a very common and effective way to curtail the rapid spread of the disease is by implementing social distancing measures.</p> <p>Q Did you agree with that conclusion when you discussed it with him when he came back?</p> <p>A I wasn't there and I didn't see it, but Dr. Lane is a very astute clinician, and I have every reason to believe that his evaluation of the situation was accurate and correct.</p> <p>Q Do you know if he communicated with Chinese officials when he was on that trip?</p> <p>A I don't know for sure whether he communicated with Chinese officials on the trip.</p> <p>Q So you -- would you know the identities of any Chinese officials he may have communicated with?</p> <p>MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Speculative. THE WITNESS: I don't recall discussions about -- he may have. Again, this was a few years ago. He may have had discussions with them. I -- I don't know if he did or not. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
167:14 - 167:21	<p>Q I'm going to give you another exhibit, 21. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 21 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Just real briefly, you see this is an e-mail from Cliff Lane dated 22nd February 2020; correct?</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
167:22 - 168:9	<p>Q And in the first line of the e-mail he said, "China has demonstrated this infection can be controlled, albeit at great cost"; correct?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q In your discussions with him, did he discuss controlling the infection at great cost?</p> <p>A Again, I don't recall the precise nature of the conversation that I had with Dr. Lane, but I believe what he was referring to is that you have to -- that you can control it, and by great cost, I believe he was referring to extreme methods. And the Chinese, indeed, went to extreme methods to do that.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
168:10 - 170:8	<p>Q And those extreme methods include very aggressive lockdowns, for example --</p> <p>A Yeah, but the lockdowns were the types of lockdowns that were really quite extreme. They would essentially lock people in their homes, which was extreme to do that.</p> <p>Q Did you come to believe that extreme measures would be required to control the spread of the virus?</p> <p>MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous. THE WITNESS: When you're talking about the virus here in the United States? BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Correct.</p> <p>A It was my opinion that social distancing would be very important when you have a respiratory virus that is spreading widely through a community causing an extraordinary amount of suffering and death. Getting to context, I refer specifically that early on in the epidemic when New York got hit very badly, there were freezer and cooler trucks that were loaded with dead bodies from the hospital. That is an unprecedented extreme issue that we all felt strongly, those of us involved in the discussions and the public health recommendations, that social distancing was imperative so that our hospitals would not be overrun, and that we would be in a situation where we would have to almost triage the decision of who would live and who would die. When you get to that extreme, social distancing, even by somewhat difficult means, is warranted to save lives.</p> <p>Q Did you think that social distancing -- I'm talking about this time frame of around February of 2020 -- did you think that social distancing would have to include only high-risk individuals or would it apply to society as a whole? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Vague. THE WITNESS: When you're -- when you're dealing with a respiratory illness that has the potential to kill a lot of people -- we've lost over one million people in this country -- in order to have an effective interruption, which would almost certainly be on a temporary basis, but to interrupt this enormous explosion of infections that we were seeing, you would have to involve essentially the entire community. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
170:9 - 170:16	<p>Q Let me hand you Exhibit 22. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 22 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q And this is an e-mail chain involving you, Christian Anderson, Jeremy Farrar, and Francis Collins; right?</p> <p>A Yeah.</p>

	<p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
170:17 - 171:4	<p>Q And then it also includes the other authors of that "Proximal Origins of COVID-19" paper that we looked at earlier in the preprint version?</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p>Q If you look at that, just a little way down the March 6th, 2020 4:23 p.m. e-mail from Anderson. Do you see that?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q He says, "Dear Jeremy, Tony and Francis, Thank you again for your advice and leadership as we've been working through the SARS-CoV-2 origin paper; correct?"</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
171:5 - 171:6	<p>Q And Jeremy is Jeremy Farrar; correct?</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
171:7 - 171:10	<p>Q Tony is you?</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p>Q And Francis is Francis Collins, right?</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
171:11 - 171:25	<p>Q And what advice and leadership did you provide, if any, on the preparation of that paper?</p> <p>A Very little.</p> <p>Q So you don't know what he's talking about when he says thank you?</p> <p>A No. I think that Jeremy is being courteous, as he is wont to be. I mean "advice" could be -- and "leadership" could be we really got to get information out. Thank you for the effort you've put into it. Advice and leadership, to my recollection, had very little to do with substantive input into the paper.</p> <p>Q And that second --</p> <p>A And we did not have substantive input into the paper.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
172:1 - 173:1	<p>Q And below that, it says, "Please let me know if you have any comments, suggestions or questions about the paper or the press release"; correct?</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p>Q So he invited you to have comments on the paper because we're still waiting for proofs?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q So there was still time to make changes to it; correct?</p> <p>A Yeah. And there were no -- to my recollection, any substantive input into the paper.</p> <p>Q Do you recall making comments on it at any time -- MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Asked and answered. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Do you?</p> <p>A I don't recall making any substantive comments on the paper. I may have made a comment that "nice job," which is very courteous, but doesn't mean that I had a substantive input into the paper. I did not. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 23 was marked for identification.)</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
173:2 - 174:5	<p>Q Exhibit 23. The first stage -- page of this document is an e-mail from you to Mark Zuckerberg; correct?</p> <p>A Yeah. The reason I'm smiling, you're jumping around here, but that's okay. We're good. Fake left. All right. Let's go.</p> <p>Q Is an e-mail to you from Mark Zuckerberg; correct?</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p>Q The top one is dated February 27, 2020.</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q And he writes to you, "Tony, I was glad to hear your statement about the COVID-19 vaccine," and so forth.</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q Were you already on a first-name basis with Mark Zuckerberg on February 27?</p>

	<p>A You know, a lot of people call me Tony who have never even met me before.</p> <p>Q Had you met him before this e-mail was sent?</p> <p>A I don't recall what the first time I met Mark Zuckerberg. I actually don't think -- maybe not. Again, context, I meet thousands of people. I'm not sure I've ever met him in person. I've been on Zooms and Facebook things with him, but it could not be at all unusual -- it happens every day -- that people who have never met me refer to me as Tony. I'm a rather informal person.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
174:6 - 175:9	<p>Q Do you have relationships with researchers at the Chan Zuckerberg Institute?</p> <p>A If the Chan Zuckerberg Institute that you're referring to is the San Francisco General Hospital.</p> <p>Q The one you described earlier.</p> <p>A Yeah because remember -- yeah, that's the thing, Mr. Sauer. I'm not really clear on -- I'm not really quite sure what Bio Club is. I do know that Chan Zuckerberg supports the San Francisco General Hospital. And I know Chan Zuckerberg in the context of the University of California, San Francisco General Hospital.</p> <p>Q And do you have relationships with researchers at that hospital? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Vague and ambiguous. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q If I could finish the question.</p> <p>A Again, I'm not sure what you mean by relationship. I know, to varying degrees of familiarity ranging from knowing who they are to being able to recognize them at a meeting and say hello, to knowing them over the years in our interactions in the medical and scientific community, but the answer to your question is: I can't pull out people. I mean, I know researchers who are at the San Francisco General Hospital, for sure. I've dealt -- our institute deals with them regularly.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
175:10 - 175:18	<p>Q Do you remember the first time you met Mark Zuckerberg?</p> <p>A I don't remember specifically, but I believe it was on a Zoom call. I don't believe I've ever physically -- I may have. Could be. I don't know for sure, but I don't think I've physically interacted with him. I believe I have seen him on multiple times that we've interacted on Facebook Zoom-type podcasts.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
175:19 - 176:10	<p>Q Did any of those Zooms predate the outbreak of COVID-19?</p> <p>A I don't think so. I mean, I don't -- I've heard of Mark Zuckerberg -- obviously, he's a famous person, but I don't recall -- again, I could have run into him prior to the outbreak, but I don't specifically recall running into Mark Zuckerberg before. It's possible.</p> <p>Q Can you turn to the third page of this document? There's another e-mail from Mark Zuckerberg dated March 15th of 2020. Do you see that? MR. KIRSCHNER: The page before. THE WITNESS: The one in the middle of the page? MR. KIRSCHNER: No, I think it's -- BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
176:11 - 177:16	<p>Q Third page of the document?</p> <p>A Third page of the document, yes. MR. KIRSCHNER: Again, I would ask for Dr. Fauci to have an opportunity to familiarize himself with this e-mail prior to asking any questions. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q I just want to ask a quick question about the paragraph that begins, "I'm also doing a series of live-streamed Q and As." Do you see that?</p> <p>A Yeah. I see it. Just let me read it. Yeah.</p> <p>Q Did you, in fact, do a live stream Q and</p> <p>A with Mark Zuckerberg as he invited you to do in this one -- in this paragraph? A I believe I did. I did a three -- I think three is correct. Three live stream Facebook-type Q and As where he would ask me important questions -- you know, why is it important to be careful with, you know, public health measures. Tell us the truth. Now, what is the virus? What do you mean? How does it spread? Things like that.</p> <p>Q Next paragraph down, "Finally, we have allocated technical resources and millions of dollars of free ad credits for the U.S. Government to use for PSAs to get its message out over the platform"?</p> <p>A That's what he says, right.</p> <p>Q And the platform refers to Facebook, I guess?</p> <p>A I guess so.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>

177:17 - 178:4	<p>Q Did you accept that offer that Facebook would donate millions of dollars of free ad credit?</p> <p>A No, I don't have the authority to accept outside money like that. It would have to go through a different channel. And I don't believe -- though I'm not 100 percent certain -- I don't believe that there was any money that was given from the Zuckerberg to the United States government to do PSAs. It's possible, but it certainly didn't happen to my knowledge. I don't recall money being given for PSAs. I recall the offer to help get information out, but I don't recall -- again, could have happened, possible. But I don't recall.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
178:5 - 178:16	<p>Q Exhibit 24 -- MR. KIRSCHNER: Counsel, before we go to Exhibit 24, I've noticed on this exhibit it looks like a phone number that I want to make sure is redacted before it becomes a public record. It looks like a personal cell phone for Mark Zuckerberg. MR. SAUER: This is a document as we received it from the government. MR. KIRSCHNER: And it's marked confidential. MR. SAUER: We have no objection to that. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
178:17 - 178:20	<p>Q And Exhibit 24? (FAUCI Exhibit No. 24 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
178:21 - 180:3	<p>Q Is this the actual published version of the "Proximal Origin of SARS-CoV-2"?</p> <p>A I don't have anything in front of me.</p> <p>Q Oh, sorry. Is this the published version of the "Proximal Origin of SARS-CoV-2" that was published online on March 17th of 2020. MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Mischaracterizes the evidence. Just to make the record clear, you're saying March 17th. MR. SAUER: If you look at the last page in the far right column, at the very top, it says, "Published online 17 March, 2020." Do you see that? MR. KIRSCHNER: Okay. I see that. Thank you. THE WITNESS: This appears to be the Nature Medicine -- it says Nature Medicine, Volume 27, April 2020, on the bottom of the paper so I would imagine this is the original, published, peer-reviewed article that appeared in Nature Medicine. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q So this is the published version of the one that Dr. Anderson had sent you the preprint version of a few days earlier; correct?</p> <p>A Well, I can't say exactly that it is. I do know that it would be standard to have a preprint usually in Med Archive. And it had the same title, the "Proximate Origin of SARS-CoV-2," and the authors appear to be the same, so I would make a reasonable assumption that Exhibit 24 is the peer-reviewed version of the preprint that you showed me before.</p> <p>Q And the first page, second paragraph?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
180:4 - 180:7	<p>Q Last sentence. "Our analyses clearly show that SARS-CoV-2 is not a laboratory construct or a purposely manipulated virus;" correct?</p> <p>A That's what it says.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
180:8 - 182:18	<p>Q Did you have any input in formulating that conclusion between the time you got the preprint version from Dr. Anderson on March 8 and then the publication online on March 17?</p> <p>A Mm-hmm.^ this is a conclusion of the authors. I'm not really sure of what you're saying did I have any input. I don't recall conversation that we had -- and as I mentioned before, my input into the formulation of this was minimal, if at all. I remember reading through it. And I'm not quite sure what you mean that I have substantial input into the conclusion. That conclusion was based on the analysis by the authors of this paper.</p> <p>Q Did you have any communications at all about that -- about -- any communications at all about that conclusion in that time frame from March 8th to March 17th?</p> <p>A Conversations with whom?</p> <p>Q With anybody.</p> <p>A You know, I don't recall specific conversations, but we read the preprint and, therefore, we knew what the conclusion was, and I'm sure that that conclusion was discussed. So I would not be surprised at all following the initial preprint that I discussed the conclusion of these authors that this is not a laboratory construct or a purposely manipulated virus. I wouldn't be surprised if I did discuss this with people since it already was out in public knowledge in the preprint. So the question, did I discuss this</p>

	<p>between the preprint and now? I would not be surprised if I did.</p> <p>Q Do you know anyone you discussed it with? Do you remember?</p> <p>A I can't specifically remember anyone I discussed it with, but, as I said, given the fact that it was out in the preprint literature, it is likely, and I'm not surprised if I did, discuss it. It was being discussed widely.</p> <p>Q I'm handing you Exhibit 26. MR. KIRSCHNER: I think we're on 25. MR. SAUER: Oh, sorry. That was it. Twenty-five. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 25 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Is this a copy of a blog that Francis Collins, the NIH director, published on March 26th, 2020? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Speculative. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Is that what appears to be on the cover?</p> <p>A The cover states it was a NIH director's blog posted on March 26th, 2020, by Dr. Francis Collins. So I have no reason to believe that that's not what actually occurred. That this blog was put up on his director's page.</p> <p>Q Can you look at the second page of the document, the beginning of the blog?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
182:19 - 185:1	<p>Q You see where Director Collins says, "Some folks are even making outrageous claims that the new coronavirus causing the pandemic was engineered in a lab"?</p> <p>A I'm sorry. Where -- we are -- where are we?</p> <p>Q Second page.</p> <p>A This here?</p> <p>Q First full paragraph. MR. KIRSCHNER: Again, I would ask for Dr. Fauci to have an opportunity to familiarize himself with this document. THE WITNESS: Yeah. Let me read that paragraph, please. Yes. I've read the paragraph. What's the question? BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q You see where it says, "Some folks are even making outrageous claims that the new coronavirus causing the pandemic was engineered in a lab"?</p> <p>A Yes, I see that.</p> <p>Q And he goes on to say, "A new study debunks such claims by providing scientific evidence that this novel coronavirus arose naturally"; correct?</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p>Q In the immediate following paragraph, he describes that as reassuring findings and refers to the Nature Medicine article we just looked at; right?</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p>Q Were you aware that Francis Collins was publishing a blog addressing the Nature Medicine article "Proximal Origins of COVID-19"? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Were you aware?</p> <p>A Was I aware that he was preparing it? I don't think so. I might have been, but I doubt it. Someone likely would have brought this to my attention. I don't recall reading this. I don't read every NIH director's blog. It is conceivable, maybe likely, that I did read it, but I was not -- to my knowledge -- maybe he mentioned something to me that I forgot that he was going to write a blog, but it doesn't ring a bell in my mind that he was planning to write a blog. But, you know, Francis writes a lot. I wouldn't be surprised if he mentioned he was going to do a blog, but this does not ring a bell. It's clear that he did it and if he did it, I likely saw it.</p> <p>Q You don't recall discussing it with him beforehand in any way before he published it?</p> <p>A You know, again, I might have discussed it with him, but I don't recall specifically discussing it with him.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
185:2 - 185:19	<p>Q I'm handing you Exhibit 26. Was there -- were you aware of media coverage of the article when it came out? MR. KIRSCHNER: Can you please wait until Dr. Fauci has the exhibit in front of him? Also I only have one person -- okay. What exhibit number is this? MR. SAUER: Twenty-six. MR. KIRSCHNER: I apologize, Mr. Sauer, but can you -- once Dr. Fauci has the exhibit, can you restate the question? THE WITNESS: So this is -- I have two things here. MR. KIRSCHNER: Oh, I have one copy. THE WITNESS: So this is -- (FAUCI Exhibit No. 26 was marked for identification.) BY MR.</p>

	SAUER: <a href="#">Summary</a>
185:20 - 186:4	Q Do you see this ABC News article designated at the top of the page entitled "Sorry, conspiracy theorists. Study concludes COVID-19 is not a laboratory construct." Do you see that? A I see it, yes. Q And then it -- it's dated March 27th, 2020, the day after the NIH director's blog that we just looked at; correct? A Correct. <a href="#">Summary</a>
186:5 - 186:10	Q Did you communicate with the media about the Nature Medicine article when it came out at all? A You know, I don't recall communicating with the media about that. I might have, but I don't specifically recall communicating with the media about it. <a href="#">Summary</a>
186:11 - 186:13	Q Do you know if Dr. Collins communicated with the media about it? A I don't know if he did. <a href="#">Summary</a>
186:14 - 186:18	Q Do you know if anyone in the NIAID staff, the staff that you oversee, communicated with the media about it? A I don't recall if they did or did not. They might have, but I don't recall. <a href="#">Summary</a>
186:19 - 187:7	Q Did Dr. Collins ever contact you about the Nature Medicine article after this -- his March 26th blog? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous. Lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: You're asking if he contacted me about the Nature Medicine article. I don't remember a specific contact, but since it's a published article, I wouldn't be surprised if somehow or other Dr. Collins commented to me about it or I commented to him about it. But I don't specifically recall any significant discussion. Again, we might have. That would not be surprising to me. BY MR. SAUER: <a href="#">Summary</a>
187:8 - 188:1	Q I'm handing -- we're handing you Exhibit 26. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 27 was marked for identification.) THE WITNESS: I have Exhibit 26. You're talking about 27. BY MR. SAUER: Q Sorry. Twenty-seven. You're right. A Francis Collins to me, CC. Q Do you recognize this e-mail? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection -- THE WITNESS: I have to read it. MR. KIRSCHNER: -- I would ask for Dr. Fauci to have an opportunity -- THE WITNESS: I have to read it. MR. KIRSCHNER: -- to familiarize himself with the document. THE WITNESS: Yes, I've read it. <a href="#">Summary</a>
188:2 - 188:18	Q Do you recall getting this e-mail from Dr. Collins on April 14th, 2020 at 5:02 p.m.? A Again, I'm very sorry, but you're talking about e-mails several years ago. I don't recall specifically this e-mail. You're putting an e-mail in front of me that's from Francis to me, and I'm reading what it says. I don't recall seeing this, but I know that Francis clearly was concerned that there'd be misinformation out and he wanted -- and that's why he asked: "Any more we can do as the national academy to weigh in?" Q In particular in the first paragraph there he says to you, "Wondering if there is something NIH can do to help us put down this very destructive conspiracy with what seems to be growing momentum"; correct? A Right. <a href="#">Summary</a>
188:19 - 191:18	Q Have you ever described the lab leak theory of the origins of COVID as a very destructive conspiracy to you? A Specifically, to me -- I mean, it's here in this e-mail, but I just think that my little bit of a hyperbole on his part about, you know, using words like destructive conspiracy, I think Francis felt -- and you'll have to ask Francis about that -- but I believe he felt that the data -- and you go to the third paragraph in that e-mail -- he said, "I hoped that the Nature Medicine article on the genomic sequence would settle this." So what I believe Francis was saying that the scientific data strongly point to a natural

	<p>occurrence, and there's a lot of, you know, discussion by some that this is clearly a deliberate development of a virus that could harm people, and Francis in the e-mail appears to be disturbed saying, the scientific data shown in Nature Medicine we hoped would settle this, and that's why he's concerned. The words that he used, I don't recall him using those words in public -- in person to person to me, but he clearly used those words in this e-mail.</p> <p>Q You said a few things there. To understand what Dr. Collins meant when he sent this e-mail and the various other e-mails, you said you really have to ask Dr. Collins about that?</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p>Q Is that fair to say? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Mischaracterizes the evidence and also -- THE WITNESS: No, I mean, you're asking me about something he said, and I think the natural thing is why don't you ask the guy who said it? BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Fair enough. And then if you look there to the link, he's got a link there to a Bret Baier report that's entitled "Sources increasingly confident coronavirus outbreak started in a Wuhan lab"; correct?</p> <p>A I'm sorry. What -- is this the --</p> <p>Q First page?</p> <p>A I can't read it.</p> <p>Q Yeah, directly.</p> <p>A I can't see Bret Baier. I can't read the rest of it.</p> <p>Q Well, let me ask you this: Dr. Collins, at the end of it says, "Anything more we can do? Ask the National Academy to weigh in?" Correct?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q So he's asking you if there is anything more that you and he and Cliff Lane and the others copied can do to try to put this destructive conspiracy, in his words, to rest; correct?</p> <p>A I think if you look at -- I mean, I'm not sure exactly. I don't recall this e-mail, so I'm not sure what he was implying. But reading it now, I concentrate on the next-to-last paragraph, what he said. "I had hoped the Nature Medicine article on the genomic sequence would settle this, but it probably didn't get much visibility." And it is conceivable that what he is saying is that this is a scientific, peer-reviewed article. It's not surmising. It's not extrapolation. It's just a peer-reviewed scientific article that he feels didn't get a proper amount of visibility. And in the next sentence, he says, "How can we get it to get more visibility? Perhaps ask the National Academy to weigh in and review the evidence to give the evidence more visibility. I think this is typical Francis, who's is a very solid scientist, wanting to stick with the scientific data as opposed to discussions of hypotheses with no basis.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
191:19 - 191:22	<p>Q Did you take any steps to increase the visibility of the article after this?</p> <p>A Not to my knowledge. I don't think so. I was busy with a lot of other things.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
191:23 - 193:21	<p>Q I'm sure you were very busy. Did you respond to the e-mail?</p> <p>A I don't recall if I did. You're probably going to show me an e-mail where I did.</p> <p>Q Can you look at the next page?</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p>Q Next day, April 17, 2022, you respond to that e-mail, saying, quote, "I would not do anything about this right now. It is a shiny object that will go away." ^ correct?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q What did you mean when you said, "I would not" -- "I would not do anything about this right now." Were you saying you don't want to take any steps to increase the visibility of --</p> <p>A Right. No. I think we should let the Nature Medicine article speak for itself is what I meant.</p> <p>Q And you said it is a shiny object --</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q -- that will go away in time?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q What did you mean by that?</p> <p>A By shiny object I mean something that people tend to really get excited about. It's very exciting to say, "Well, this thing was manufactured by the Chinese and they threw it out into the world." That's a shiny object. If you say that, it gets discussed all over the world. That's a shiny object. And I was</p>

	<p>referring to the fact that I stick, as a scientist, with the science. And invariably, the science prevails. So what I was referring to is that I don't think you should do anything about it right now. Let the Nature Medicine and the data essentially prevail. And this issue of -- with no proof at all, people stating this is likely manufactured by the Chinese and released, that's what I meant by a shiny object, it's something with no evidence but a lot of pizzazz to it if you say it. And that's what I was referring to.</p> <p>Q Tying back to your earlier comment, do you think that that theory was a form of misinformation or disinformation that could lead to loss of life? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous. THE WITNESS: No. I'm not sure. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
193:22 - 193:24	<p>Q Well, Dr. Collins described it as a very destructive conspiracy.</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
193:25 - 194:3	<p>Q And I take it that's the destructive conspiracy theory that the virus originated from a lab?</p> <p>A Right, right.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
194:4 - 195:22	<p>Q Did you view that theory as a form of misinformation or disinformation that could lead to the loss of life?</p> <p>A It could be misinformation. Remember, misinformation are things that are untrue, not necessarily deliberately, you know, propagated as untrue, whereas disinformation is when you know it's wrong and you still spread it. So this very well might be, at least at the time there was no indication that this was correct information. So let me categorize it that way. So for someone -- or anyone -- to be going around spreading that this clearly is something that was made by the Chinese and released in society and killed a lot people, that would be misinformation because there's no evidence that that's the case. And the second part of your question was that could lead to a number of other things. When you pursue misinformation and disinformation, often you take away from the effort of pursuing something that is in the line of correct information.</p> <p>Q Did you take any further steps after that e-mail to increase the visibility or the public awareness of the Nature Medicine article? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Asked and answered. THE WITNESS: Again, I'm not really sure what you mean. When the paper came out, it was a peer-reviewed scientific analysis that came to a conclusion that we've already discussed. Did I discuss this with people since this was a topic of considerable concern, likely I did. If you're asking did I do anything to promote the dissemination of that, I don't think I went out of my way, as I mentioned and you agreed, I'm a really busy person. I have a lot of other things to do. I don't think I made this something that was a high level of priority for me. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q You don't think you made -- let me ask you this: You knew what Nature Medicine article he was talking about, right?</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
195:23 - 196:17	<p>Q And in particular, this is the article that has Christian Anderson as a corresponding author?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q Correct?</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p>Q This is the article where he, you know, you had been sent at least four drafts of it, based on the e-mails we saw previously; correct?</p> <p>A That's the same one of which I had very little input into, yeah.</p> <p>Q And this is the article that Christian Anderson had sent you a preprint and had said thank you for your advice and leadership about the article; correct? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Mischaracterizes the evidence. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Correct?</p> <p>A It's the article that we discussed before.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
196:18 - 196:19	<p>Q Proximal Origins of COVID-19?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>

196:20 - 197:10	<p>Q Exhibit 28. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 28 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:  Q And this is a excerpt from the transcript of the Coronavirus Task Force press briefing in the White House dated April 17th, 2020; correct? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. THE WITNESS: That's what it says on the top of the piece of paper of Exhibit 28, it says "Remarks by President Trump, Vice President Pence, and members of the Coronavirus Task Force." BY MR. SAUER:  Q At that time, you were a member of the Coronavirus Task Force; correct?  A That is correct.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
197:11 - 199:1	<p>Q And you participated in this briefing with the president and the vice president; correct? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. I would ask Dr. Fauci have an opportunity to familiarize himself with this document. THE WITNESS: I'm looking at the document now. And as I scan, I see on page 44 of 48, that it says Dr. Fauci, and it says something that it looks like I said at the press -- this looks like a transcript, which it looks like it is, then clearly I participated in that because my name is here. BY MR. SAUER:  Q And if you look little bit above that on that second page, there's a question from a member of the media saying, "Mr. President, I wanted to ask Dr. Fauci, could you address the suggestions or concerns that the virus was somehow manmade, possibly came out of a laboratory in China?" Correct?  A That's what it says.  Q And the president says to you, "Want to go?" Correct?  A That's what the president said.  Q And then the reporter repeated, addressing you. "You studied this virus. What are the prospects of that?" Right?  A That's what the question said.  Q And your response to that was, "There was a study recently that we can make available to you where a group of highly qualified evolutionary virologists looked at the sequences there and the sequences in bats as they evolved. And the mutations that it took to get to the point where it is now is totally consistent with a jump of a species from an animal to a human"; correct?  A That's what it says.  Q Do you remember saying that?  A I don't recall. I was at -- as you probably know, multiple, multiple White House press conferences. I have no reason to doubt that the transcript is not accurate, and it looks like that's what I said. So I would imagine I said it.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
199:2 - 199:20	<p>Q And this is April 17, which is the same day that you had e-mailed Dr. Collins this last exhibit saying this theory is a shiny toy that will go away in time. Correct?  A Shiny object.  Q Sorry. Shiny object that will go away in time. MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: You know, I would have to go back and look where -- you're asking me if it was the same date. And I have to look here. The date on Exhibit 27 is 17th of April. And this is the date of the press conference, yes. So it's the same date. Yeah. BY MR. SAUER:  Q And I've watched the video of this particular comment?  A Yeah.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
199:21 - 200:20	<p>Q And I noted in watching the video that, when you said that sentence about totally consistent, you pause and use that phrase, "totally consistent" with emphasis.  A Right.  Q Do you remember doing that?  A I don't remember doing that. Like I said, it's one of many, many, many press conferences. So I don't remember a pause of a statement I made in one of dozens and dozens and dozens of press conferences.  Q And you have given many, to be sure. But do you remember saying the mutations that it took to get to the point where it is now -- pause for emphasis -- is totally consistent with a jump from species, from animal to human. You don't remember that? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: I don't remember pauses in the hundreds of conferences that I've been at. BY MR. SAUER:  Q You went on to say, "So the paper will be available. I don't have the authors right now, but we can</p>

	<p>make that available to you"; correct?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
200:21 - 201:1	<p>Q This is the same paper that, on the same day, you had been e-mailing with Dr. Collins about in the previous exhibit; correct?</p> <p>A I'm a little bit confused with your question. I'm not sure what you mean. Is the paper --</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
201:2 - 201:6	<p>Q What paper are you referring to here in your comments from the White House podium at the task force briefing on April 17th? Do you know?</p> <p>A I don't know. I assume it was the Nature Medicine paper. I don't know. I think it was.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
201:7 - 201:15	<p>Q Did you make the paper available to any reporters after this press conference?</p> <p>A Not to my knowledge. MR. KIRSCHNER: Mr. Sauer, how long do you want to go before lunch? MR. SAUER: Why don't we do one more exhibit. THE WITNESS: Okay. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
201:16 - 202:9	<p>Q Exhibit 29. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 29 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q If you'll look at the bottom of this page, did you receive an e-mail on April 19th, 2020, from a reporter at the Washington -- at The Times asking: "Dr. Fauci on Friday said he would share a scientific paper with the press on the origin of the coronavirus. Can you please help me get a copy of that paper?" Do you recall that?</p> <p>A This is Bill -- Bill Gertz's e-mail to Katie. I don't recall it, but I'm looking up ahead and I -- this is -- I guess this is Katie Miller, if I'm not mistaken, who is the vice president's press person. I think that's probably who it was. It doesn't say who it's to or from, and then up above I sent a link. So that -- that may be the papers we're talking about.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
202:10 - 203:1	<p>Q Did you send the link to Bill in there in the first line of the e-mail, directly to Bill?</p> <p>A Yeah. He asked for the scientific paper in the press briefing that you asked for. That may have been the press person that asked the question, and it looks like Katie Miller, who is the press person for the Vice President Pence, probably contacted me. I don't see a connecting e-mail here, but she probably contacted me and said, would you send the links to the paper to Bill Gertz, and it looks like I did. It says here, "Bill, here are the links to the scientific papers and a commentary about the papers." So there are two aspects here. There is the original paper that came online that I believe was not yet out or maybe just did come out and a commentary on it in the journal Cell, yes.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
203:2 - 203:23	<p>Q And the first paper is, in fact, the proximal origin of SARS-CoV-2 --</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q -- the Nature Medicine paper that we've talked about?</p> <p>A It looks -- yes, it says here Nature Medicine April 2020. That is the paper that is the peer-reviewed version of the original preprint that came out earlier.</p> <p>Q And then the other two citations are both authored by Eddie Holmes who was --</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q -- involved in drafting that paper; correct?</p> <p>A Right. MR. SAUER: Let's take a break there. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 12:27 p.m., and we're going off the record. (Recess.) THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 1:19 p.m., and we're back on the record. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
203:24 - 204:19	<p>Q Dr. Fauci, I'm handing you Exhibit 30. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 30 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q You see this is an e-mail at the top from you to Peter Daszak dated at -- dated April 19th, 2020?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p>Q And you're responding to an e-mail from him the day before, April 18th, 2020; correct?</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p>Q And his e-mail was the day after that coronavirus task force press conference that we looked at, the previous exhibit; correct?</p>

	<p>A Right.  Q And he said, "Tony, CC'ing David so that you might pass this on to Tony once he has a spare sec"; correct?  A Correct.  Q Is David a reference to David Morens?  A That's true, yes.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
204:20 - 204:23	<p>Q Who is David Morens?  A David Morens is a person who works at NIAID, is a scientist, been with us for a very long time.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
204:24 - 204:25	<p>Q Does he know Peter Daszak?  A I believe he does.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
205:1 - 206:19	<p>Q Do you know Peter Daszak?  A You know -- MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Asked and answered. THE WITNESS: Yeah. To the extent that I've answered that multiple times, I'm acquainted in the sense of I have seen him once or twice. I don't have a friendship or a relationship, if you want to call it that, with him. I'm just aware of him, and I've seen him a couple of times. I think I did a podcast once where he was another member of the podcast group. BY MR. SAUER:  Q These other people he copies, Erik Stemmy, Emily Erbelding, and Aleksei Chmura, are they all people that work on your staff at NIAID?  A Erik Stemmy does for sure. Emily does for sure. I believe Aleksei Chmura does also, but I'm not 100 percent sure. I believe that person does. I've seen his name circulated around in -- in correspondence in our institute, but for sure Erik Stemmy and Emily Erbelding work at NIAID.  Q Do you know how he got all your e-mail addresses? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Calls for speculation. BY MR. SAUER:  Q For example, do you know how he got your e-mail address?  A How Peter Daszak got my e-mail address?  Q Yeah.  A It's pretty easy to get an e-mail address. You just go on to the global NIH and you can get it.  Q That's publicly available, your e-mail address?  A Oh, totally.  Q Even though it's redacted under B6 in this document? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Argumentative. BY MR. SAUER:  Q You may answer.  A I don't know what you're talking about. You don't redact a website. If you go on to the NIH global, you can find my e-mail address.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
206:20 - 207:15	<p>Q You responded to this the day after you received it saying, "Many thanks for your kind note"; correct?  A Right. That's a very typical response of mine. I can show you 45,000 e-mails that say thank you for your kind note.  Q You say you get about 2,000 e-mails a day?  A I get -- yeah, some days -- some days a thousand, two thousand, some days several hundred.  Q Do you respond to all of them like that?  A No, no. The -- the ones that are irrelevant and -- what's the right word for them -- the ones that I don't really need to see.  Q That's how you respond to them?  A I don't respond -- no, to this? No. I don't respond to every one of my e-mails. I get a lot of e-mails from a number of different sources that are completely distracting and irrelevant to me, but when an e-mail comes through, we got -- people think I should see from a legitimate scientist, they let it through and then I see it.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
207:16 - 207:23	<p>Q And that Peter Daszak is a legitimate scientist in that category. Fair to say? MR. KIRSCHNER:</p>

	<p>Objection. Vague. THE WITNESS: Peter Daszak is a -- is a grantee of NIAID. So it would be perfectly appropriate to let an e-mail from a grantee of NIAID through to me. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
207:24 - 209:2	<p>Q Are you aware that -- generally, that after your comments at the White House April 17th, coronavirus task force briefing speech about the lab leak hypothesis was censored on social media? Are you aware of that? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. Vague. MR. SAUER: I've asked him if he's aware of it. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Are you aware of it?</p> <p>A I'm not aware of suppression of speech on social media to my knowledge. If -- if it was brought to my attention, it went (unreportable sound.) I -- I don't recall being aware of suppression of anything.</p> <p>Q Were you -- were you aware that Twitter, for example, removed content that suggested the virus may have escaped from a lab? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q If you know?</p> <p>A You know, I don't know for sure. I can say I am not aware of it. It may be someone somehow sent me one of the thousands of e-mails and said, "Hey, this is happening," but I was not aware to the point of noting it in my memory that Twitter or any other social media was suppressing anything.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
209:3 - 209:11	<p>Q Exhibit 31. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 31 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Here's a report in The Hill, if you see that at the top, headline is Twitter suspends accounts of Chinese virologist who claimed coronavirus was made in the lab; correct?</p> <p>A That's what it says.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
209:12 - 209:18	<p>Q Does this incident ring a bell? Were you aware of an incident like this which -- THE REPORTER: Counsel, please slow down. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Were you aware of a -- Twitter suspending the account of a Chinese virologist --</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
209:19 - 210:24	<p>Q -- who claimed it was removed from a lab?</p> <p>A You know, Mr. Sauer, I might have -- been brought to my attention then. I don't recall this. If you show me this now and ask me the question: Do you recall this? I'd have to say I don't recall. Is it possible that back then somebody said, "Hey, you know, Twitter suspended a Chinese virologist's account," and I would have went, ah, okay, and move on to the other things I do in life. This is not something that would be catching my attention because, you know, the social media and Twitter, I told you, I don't have a Twitter account. I don't tweet. I don't do Facebook. I don't do anything. So social media stuff, I don't really pay that much attention to.</p> <p>Q Exhibit 33? MR. KIRSCHNER: Thirty-two. MR. SAUER: Thirty-two. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 32 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Is this a document from Meta entitled, "Update on our work to keep people informed and limit misinformation about COVID-19"? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. Speculative. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Is that what it says on the front of it?</p> <p>A The title say "Meta," and it says, "Update on our work to keep people informed and limit misinformation about COVID-19."</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
210:25 - 211:2	<p>Q Third page of this document, can you turn to that?</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
211:3 - 211:19	<p>Q It says at the top, the very first line, mostly across, "We are expanding the list of false claims we will remove to include additional debunked claims"?</p> <p>A I'm sorry. What -- where is it?</p> <p>Q Top page.</p> <p>A "We are expanding," the middle of the sentence. Okay. I got it.</p> <p>Q "We will remove to include additional debunked claims about the coronavirus and vaccine"; correct? MR. KIRSCHNER: I object. I'd like to have Dr. Fauci to have a moment to familiarize himself with this document. THE WITNESS: So I'm not -- is this -- what is Meta? That is a ^ Facebook. BY</p>

	MR. SAUER: <a href="#">Summary</a>
211:20 - 212:10	Q Let me cut past all that. If you look at the top of page 3, there's a reference to removing debunked claims in that first bullet point that COVID-19 is manmade or manufactured. Generally, were you aware that Meta, which controlled Facebook and Instagram, changed its policy alleging that it would remove its content alleging that COVID-19 is manufactured or manmade? A I don't recall being aware of this -- some -- again, when you say were you aware, you're talking a couple of years ago. Could someone have passed me in the hall and said, "By the way, were you aware that Meta did this?" Would have been one of 10,000 things that that was said to me that day. I don't recall being aware of anything that Meta did. In fact, I didn't even know what the Meta was. <a href="#">Summary</a>
212:11 - 212:14	Q You've heard of Facebook; right? A If I -- yeah, I understand now. Somebody told me that they are part of Facebook or own Facebook or something like that. <a href="#">Summary</a>
212:15 - 212:18	Q Exhibit 33. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 33 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER: <a href="#">Summary</a>
212:19 - 212:23	Q Very briefly -- oh, sorry. Very briefly, this article is headlined "Facebook Censors Award-Winning Journalist for Criticizing the WHO." Is that correct? A That's what this title of Exhibit 33 says. <a href="#">Summary</a>
212:24 - 213:6	Q And the article referred to a man named Ian Birrel, B-i-r-r-e-l. Have you ever heard of him? A I don't recall of ever hearing of Ian Birrel. Maybe back then somebody said something about him. But right now, I wouldn't know. It says here a multiaward-winning investigative reporter. But if it hadn't said that, I wouldn't know who Ian Birrel is. <a href="#">Summary</a>
213:7 - 213:16	Q Did you ever have any communications with anybody removing speech about the lab leak theory of the origins of the COVID from social media platforms? A I don't recall ever having any conversation. But again, no, I would say it would be unlike me because I don't get involved in that sort of stuff. Like I said, my association with social media is almost zero. I don't have an account. I don't tweet. I don't pay attention to social media. I wouldn't know how to access a tweet if you paid me. <a href="#">Summary</a>
213:17 - 213:20	Q Exhibit 34. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 34 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER: <a href="#">Summary</a>
213:21 - 214:15	Q During 2020, was there a controversy about the effectiveness of hydroxychloroquine in treatment of COVID-19? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous. THE WITNESS: There were claims that hydroxychloroquine was effective against coronavirus. BY MR. SAUER: Q And did you disagree with those claims? A I did. Q What was your basis for disagreeing with those claims? A Lack of any evidence whatsoever that hydroxychloroquine was effective against coronavirus, followed by clinical studies that showed that, in fact, was not effective against hydroxychloroquine ^ and statements by clinical trials guideline groups stating explicitly that there's no evidence whatsoever that hydroxychloroquine works against coronavirus. <a href="#">Summary</a>
214:16 - 215:19	Q Did you -- you're referring to the studies and so forth. Did you collect those studies yourself and review them or did someone collect them for you? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Assumes evidence not in the record. THE WITNESS: What studies are you referring to? MR. SAUER: Well, I think you referred to studies. THE WITNESS: Well, there were claims based on anecdotal data. And if you look at the record, it was clear that when people made definitive claims about efficacy based on anecdotal data that's not scientific, that does not indicate that a drug is effective. Subsequently, papers were published showing a lack of effect of hydroxychloroquine. BY MR. SAUER: Q And my question is: Did you do all this research yourself where you are getting all the studies --

	<p>A No.</p> <p>Q -- or did someone else do the research for you?</p> <p>A I don't do research myself on the efficacy of drugs. The research is performed by researchers who publish their data in peer-reviewed journals, and that's how you get information that's applicable to the real world.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
215:20 - 216:16	<p>Q Did you have discussions with others in NIAID about the efficacy of hydroxychloroquine?</p> <p>A The subject of the hydroxychloroquine and the claims based on no data that hydroxychloroquine was effective against coronavirus was a topic of discussions on and off, both in NIAID and in the scientific community in general.</p> <p>Q Who did you discuss it with at NIAID, to your recollection?</p> <p>A I'm sure I discussed it with a number of people. Probably Dr. Cliff Lane, who was the clinical director of my institute. It's likely that I discussed the efficacy of hydroxychloroquine with him.</p> <p>Q Anyone else within NIAID?</p> <p>A I'm -- I would imagine there were other people. I don't specifically recall. But given the fact that Cliff Lane is one of the top infectious disease clinicians in the country and happens to be my clinical director and the director of my division of clinical research, it is highly likely that I had that discussion with him.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
216:17 - 217:17	<p>Q How about outside of NIAID? Anyone else within government that you discussed its efficacy with?</p> <p>A I can't say for sure. As I mentioned, it was a topic of considerable discussion. So I would not be surprised if somehow you pulled out a piece of paper where I spoke to someone about it. It was a very important subject because hydroxychloroquine can have some deleterious effects in people, and it was concern within the established medical community that based on claims based on no data, anecdotal data at best that hydroxychloroquine works, that people would be taking it, in which it does not help, but possibly harms them.</p> <p>Q Is that one of the pieces of misinformation or disinformation that may cause loss of lives that you referred to earlier, in your view?</p> <p>A The claim, based on no data, juxtaposed on clear-cut clinical data showing that hydroxychloroquine does not work. If one propagates this concept that hydroxychloroquine is highly effective and people take it based on that information, which is incorrect, yes, that would be misinformation or even disinformation that could lead people to take a drug that would not help them, that could possibly hurt them.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
217:18 - 218:3	<p>Q Did you make a series of public statements about the efficacy of hydroxychloroquine in the summer of 2020?</p> <p>A I don't know when I made it, whether it was the spring or the summer, but I definitely made public statements. I recall, when people asked at a White House press conference whether hydroxychloroquine worked, and I said those data are anecdotal, and there's not definitive proof that it works. So I have made public statements in places like a White House press conference.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
218:4 - 219:15	<p>Q Just looking at the exhibit in front of you. This is a Politico article entitled, "Fauci: Hydroxychloroquine not effective against coronavirus." Correct?</p> <p>A That's what the title says, yes.</p> <p>Q And then the second page of it gives a date of May 22nd, 2020. Correct?</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p>Q And in the second paragraph there, it quotes you as saying, "The scientific data is really quite evident now about lack of efficacy;" correct?</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p>Q And the next page, when you said that, you're referring to the hydroxychloroquine; correct?</p> <p>A I guess so. I guess if the topic of discussion was hydroxychloroquine, it isn't explicitly stated hydroxychloroquine, but in the antecedent paragraph, the author, Zachary Brennan, is referring to hydroxychloroquine. So I would imagine that I was also referring to hydroxychloroquine.</p> <p>Q And the next page, third page, it says, "Fauci's comments come days after the Lancet published" --</p>

	<p>(Discussion off the record.) THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 1:37 p.m. (Recess taken.) THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 1:38 p.m. and we're back on the record. BY MR. SAUER:  Q Turning your attention to the third page there, it says, "Fauci's comments come days after you The Lancet published a 96,000-patient observational study that concluded that hydroxychloroquine has no effect on COVID-19 and may have even caused some harm"; correct?  A That's what it says, yes.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
219:16 - 220:3	<p>Q It says that -- was that, in fact, the basis of your statement that the scientific data is really now quite evident about lack of efficacy?  A That could be. Again, you're going back a couple of years. It is quite consistent with that. I can't say definitively that that was the specific study that I was referring to. There was information coming from a number of studies, some of which were negative studies that showed that it did not work. And others were positive studies to show that it did not work. So this could have been the study that I was referring to. I'm not 100 percent certain.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
220:4 - 220:16	<p>Q In the time frame, was there discussion of -- was there a situation with the FDA first in March of 2020 issuing an EUA as to hydroxychloroquine? Did that occur, do you recall?  A I don't recall exactly when, but I -- and again, you're going back and they may have -- I think they did, but I'm not 100 percent sure, that they did issue an EUA for the emergency use of hydroxychloroquine, but I believe that that EUA was subsequently pulled back.  Q Would that have been in June of 2020?  A Could possibly have been. I don't recall exactly.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
220:17 - 220:21	<p>Q Were you consulted in that process by the FDA? Did you have any input on the decision by the FDA to revoke the EUA?  A I don't recall. It is possible that I was but I don't recall.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
220:22 - 221:9	<p>Q Do you have any recollection of why the EUA was revoked?  A I don't have any recollection now of why it was revoked then, but I would imagine, as the data accumulated, that clinical trials showed a lack of efficacy. The criteria for an emergency use authorization that a drug that has not been proven to be effective, that the potential benefit of the drug might outweigh the risk. If data comes in to show that there's no benefit for the drug, then that would be a basis for pulling back on the EUA.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
221:10 - 221:22	<p>Q Next 35. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 35 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:  Q Is this The Lancet study that was referred to in the Politico article that we just discussed, to your knowledge? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. BY MR. SAUER:  Q If you know?  A I don't know if it's the same article, to be honest with you.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
221:23 - 222:9	<p>Q If you look on the front page of this exhibit on the right?  A Yeah.  Q Do you see where it says at the top -- the very top, "Published online May 22nd, 2020"?  A Okay.  Q The word "May" is under the D and retracted.^ Do you see that?  A Yeah.  Q And that's five days before that Politico article dated May 27th?  A Right.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
222:10 - 224:4	<p>Q And the Politico article referred to a study in The Lancet that surveyed 96,000 patients; correct?  A That's what the Politico article says.  Q And if you look at the third paragraph here in the summary, the very beginning of it, it says, "Findings: 96,032 --"  A Yeah.</p>

	<p>Q -- patients --</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q -- are discussed"? Then this study was later retracted; correct?</p> <p>A Well, it says "retracted" across the front. I don't recall it being retracted, but if it says "retracted" --</p> <p>Q Were you aware that it was retracted at the time? Do you have any recollection of that? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q If you know?</p> <p>A I don't recall it being retracted. I might have at the time heard that it was retracted, but it wasn't the only paper that was on hydroxychloroquine. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Did you -- was your opinion based on other papers as well?</p> <p>A My -- I mean, I'm thinking back, then, my -- my opinion of the effect of hydroxychloroquine was based on accumulating data from a number of studies. I don't recall specifically what those studies are now.</p> <p>Q Some of -- obviously not every doctor agreed with your views on hydroxychloroquine; correct? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Argumentative. THE WITNESS: Not every doctor agreed. I don't think every doctor in the world agrees on everything, but I'm sure there was some doctors who disagreed with it despite the fact that the evidence was ample, accumulating, and continued to accumulate that hydroxychloroquine was not effective. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
224:5 - 224:21	<p>Q Were you aware that there were doctors who continued to prescribe it for their patients with COVID?</p> <p>A I heard that doctors were continuing to prescribe it.</p> <p>Q If a doctor makes that clinical judgment with respect to their patient, are you qualified to second guess that clinical judgment? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Argumentative. THE WITNESS: I don't - - I don't know what you're talking about. Am I qualified to -- what do you mean by qualified to question? BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Well, do you have qualifications --</p> <p>A There's no -- you mean, like, a written statement that says you are qualified to -- I'm not sure what you mean am I qualified to.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
224:22 - 226:8	<p>Q What is your qualification to second guess a decision that's made between a doctor and their individual patient about the prescription of hydroxychloroquine for -- to treat COVID?</p> <p>A Well, I mean, you're using the word "second guess." If a physician is prescribing a medication that has no benefit and can clearly cause harm, that would make me pause as to whether or not that was an appropriate thing. When you say "second guess," I'm wondering what you mean. Second guess, go out and demonstrate in front of his or her office? No, that's not it, but I can certainly have an opinion that if a physician prescribes a medication with no proven efficacy and clearcut potential toxicity, then I would be concerned about that because as a physician, I never want to see a patient harmed by an intervention that has no benefit to begin with.</p> <p>Q Were you aware -- or do you recall that in July of 2020, a couple of months after the -- your statement that -- from Politico that we talked about, there were a group of doctors who had a -- posted a video in front of the Supreme Court touting the -- what they perceived as the benefits of hydroxychloroquine? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: I don't recall. I do vaguely recall a group of doctors -- I forgot who they called themselves -- got up and were talking about a bunch of things regarding COVID. I don't precisely recall what they were saying. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q You don't remember --</p> <p>A I think at the time I knew what they were saying, but quite frankly, I've forgotten what they were saying.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
226:9 - 227:6	<p>Q Exhibit 36. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 36 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Do you recall appearing on Good Morning America around July 27th or 28th of 2020?</p> <p>A No. I don't recall. Do you know how many times I've appeared on television?</p> <p>Q I'm just asking if you remember this particular one, sir.</p>

	<p>A Yeah, I don't recall.</p> <p>Q Can you turn to the fourth page -- or fifth page of this document? MR. KIRSCHNER: What -- what -- the top of the page, Mr. Sauer? MR. SAUER: There's white space and then it says, "Responding to questions about an antimalarial drug." MR. KIRSCHNER: I would ask for Dr. Fauci to have the time to familiarize himself with this document. THE WITNESS: Yes. What about it? BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
227:7 - 227:13	<p>Q And -- sorry. That -- that quote on overwhelming prevailing clinical trials that have looked at the efficacy of hydroxychloroquine have indicated that it is not effective in coronavirus disease"; correct?</p> <p>A Right. Correct.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
227:14 - 229:23	<p>Q And do you recall those comments being made in response to a video of doctors -- they called themselves America's Frontline Doctors --</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q -- appearing on the -- I think the steps of the Supreme Court --</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q -- and touting the perceived benefits of that drug?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q Do you remember that?</p> <p>A Let's make sure we get the connections right. I do recall a group of doctors that were in front of the Supreme Court. I guess there were six or seven of them. One, I believe, was an African-American woman, female physician, if I'm not mistaken. Could be. I think that -- I think that's the group that we were referring to who were in front of the Supreme Court making a bit of statements. I don't precisely recall what they were talking about, but I know that in general the people who were watching that were concerned about the -- the truth of what they were saying. They were making -- I don't recall specifically what they were saying, but there was some concern about the accuracy of what they were saying.</p> <p>Q Exhibit 37. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 37 was marked for identification.) MR. KIRSCHNER: Mr. Sauer, I have one version of this. Do you have two versions of that? THE WITNESS: I have one. MR. KIRSCHNER: That's fine. What number are we on? BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q This is a -- is this a Bret Baier article with the headline "Fauci uncensored: Hydroxychloroquine video. A bunch of people spouting something that isn't true"</p> <p>A That's what it says.</p> <p>Q And the next -- if you look at the second page, just look at the first paragraph of this -- this report. It quotes you appearing on MSNBC's Andrea Mitchell Reports saying that a video re-tweeted by President Trump that featured doctors at a press conference touting hydroxychloroquine as a coronavirus treatment was, quote, "people spouting something that isn't true"; correct?</p> <p>A That's what it says here.</p> <p>Q Do you recall saying that? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: You know, I certainly may have said that. Yes, I think the general impression that if one looked at the video, some -- I recall -- I don't know exactly, but it was pretty clear among physicians and those involved that what was being said on the steps in many respects didn't make much medical sense. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
229:24 - 230:24	<p>Q In your review, what was being said was that misinformation or disinformation that could lead to loss of lives?</p> <p>A Well, it's possible. I don't recall exactly. If you want to play the tape for me and we could go over it, and I could then properly answer your question. I just know that there was a lot of negative response on the overwhelming representation of the medical community that was said on that press conference on the steps, I believe, of the Supreme Court. It was really quite unorthodox.</p> <p>Q I'm sorry. I didn't really follow what you just said. You said there was an overwhelming medical response --</p> <p>A In general, if you were to take a poll of physicians in established medical centers throughout the country and have them look at the tape of what was being said at that time, I believe -- it's not been proven, but I believe you would find that the overwhelming majority would find that what was said</p>

	<p>there really didn't make much medical sense.</p> <p>Q Did you take such a poll at the time?</p> <p>A I did not, but I know my community and everyone who has ever looked at that just raised their eyebrows and said what the heck are they talking about?</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
230:25 - 232:11	<p>Q You say you know your community. Who in your community did you discuss the efficacy of hydroxychloroquine with?</p> <p>A We discussed the efficacy of hydroxychloroquine with a number of people in the community.</p> <p>Q Can you name one?</p> <p>A Yeah, I can name a whole group.</p> <p>Q Please do.</p> <p>A We -- we have clinical trials -- I want to get the correct name of it. It's the NIH Treatment Guidelines Panel. The Treatment Guidelines Panel is made up of, oh, I would say a total, mostly physicians and health care providers, of about 40-plus individuals who are representative of the infectious diseases community throughout the country. Most of them are the chiefs of infectious diseases throughout the medical centers in the country. Harvard, Cornell, San Francisco. These are the real leaders in infectious diseases in the country. They came to a determination based on an examination of all the literature that hydroxychloroquine had no evidence at all of efficacy.</p> <p>Q When was that determination made?</p> <p>A I don't know the exact date, but it is a group that can easily be asked about when that occurred and you could find out on the record, but it was very, very clear that that was the case that they felt that way. They kept an open mind, but they looked at the literature and said that they really felt that there was no evidence at all that hydroxychloroquine -- and it isn't an individual person. It's a treatment guidelines panels that represents the leadership of infectious diseases in the entire country.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
232:12 - 232:15	<p>Q I'm going to give you Exhibit 38. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 38 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
232:16 - 232:21	<p>Q Do you see this Breitbart report that says Facebook/Google/YouTube/Twitter censor viral video of doctors, Capitol Hill Coronavirus press conference?</p> <p>A Yes. I see that, another Breitbart statement.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
232:22 - 237:16	<p>Q And then can you turn to the third page of -- actually can you see what the date of this report is?</p> <p>A The date. Let me see.</p> <p>Q Actually, if you turn to the third page there at the top, is the date, July 27, 2020.</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p>Q So this is within a day of the comments -- your comments to Good Morning America and Andrea Mitchell that we just talked about. Correct? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection, lack of foundation. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Is that correct?</p> <p>A I'm getting confused about dates here. So let's go back, and what's the date of the Andrea Mitchell thing?</p> <p>Q If you look at the last two exhibits, July 28th was your comment on Good Morning America. Or the 27th.</p> <p>A On Tuesday, well the news article here, it says: Updated July 28th. So I assume that the statement was either July 28th or it was reported on July 28th and the statement was July 27th. I can't tell from this exhibit.</p> <p>Q So it would be within a day of this article we're looking at now, that's page 127; correct?</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p>Q Okay. So staying on the third page, the report says Facebook entered a ^ video posted by Breitbart News earlier today, which was the top-performing Facebook post in the world Monday afternoon of a press conference in DC held by the group, America's Frontline Doctors. You see that?</p> <p>A I see that, yes.</p> <p>Q And that group and press conference has been saying that -- that group and press conference that</p>

	<p>you were disagreeing with in your two prior statements; correct? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. Speculative. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Your two prior statements to Andrea Mitchell and to Good Morning America; correct? MR. KIRSCHNER: Again, objection. Lack of foundation. Speculative. THE WITNESS: It is likely it was that. I can't say absolutely for sure, but if you were talking about the press conference by a group of doctors on the steps of wherever, the Capitol or the Supreme Court, and I was referring to that, it is likely that's what I was referring to but I can't say for sure. I don't have a precise recollection of that. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Looking down on this page, do you see under that big paragraph, there's a smaller paragraph that says, "The video accumulated over 17 million views during the eight hours it was hosted on Facebook." A Correct.</p> <p>Q Does the widespread dissemination of this video touting the benefits of hydroxychloroquine, would that trouble you as a doctor who was concerned about -- MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q -- misinformation and disinformation being disseminated? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: You know, I don't really pay much attention to the quantity. Like I said, for maybe now the ninth or tenth time, I don't get involved in social media stuff. I don't follow -- I wouldn't even know how to access how many views something has, so --</p> <p>Q If you were aware that a video did have 17 million views, would that bother you as a doctor who is concerned about the dissemination of misinformation and disinformation about COVID treatments? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. THE WITNESS: I don't know what 17 million views means. What's the denominator? Is 17 million a large amount? Is it a small amount? I don't go on social media, so I don't know what 17 million views means. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q So that doesn't bother you or you have no opinion one way or the other on that question; fair to say? A Well, I don't know how to quantitate the number of views with whatever it is, the point you're trying to make.</p> <p>Q But those 17 million people watching that video, were those doctors standing on the steps of the Supreme Court and touted the benefits of hydroxychloroquine, would that bother you? A It would likely bother me if a very large number of people were given information that was not only based on no data, but in which data actually showed that those statements were untrue. As a physician who takes care of patients and cares about the health of patients, I think that information that spreads falseness not based on data, as physician would be troublesome to me. What does troublesome mean? Would I do anything about it? Not necessarily at all. But it's just I don't like false information that hurts patients.</p> <p>Q Could you turn two pages forward in that document, please? MR. KIRSCHNER: When you say two pages forward, you mean page 5 of 19? MR. SAUER: Correct. THE WITNESS: Okay. What do you want me to look at? BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
<p>237:17 - 237:24</p>	<p>Q Fourth paragraph down, there's a quote on the Facebook copy, stating, "We removed the video for sharing false information about curious and treatment for treatment of COVID-19?" A That's what it says. MR. SAUER: Objection. Lack of foundation. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
<p>237:25 - 238:5</p>	<p>Q Are you aware of anyone communicating with Facebook about that decision to remove the video? A I don't recall anybody communicating with them about that. Could have been, but I don't recall anybody -- I don't recall anybody communicating with the social media people.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
<p>238:6 - 238:20</p>	<p>Q Do you recall anyone at NIAID communicating with social media people? A To my recollection, I don't recall. But I don't know everything that everybody does. But I don't recall anybody communicating with social media.</p> <p>Q Were you aware of anyone associated with the federal government communicating with Facebook about that decision? A I don't recall anyone in the federal government that I know. They might have. Possible. But I don't recall specifically anyone in the federal government communicating with them. Like I said, I don't pay attention to those types of things. I have a really important day job that I work at, so --</p>

	<a href="#">Summary</a>
238:21 - 239:7	<p>Q How about any other topics, setting aside this America's Frontline Doctors, are you aware of anyone the U.S. Government communicating with social media platforms about what can and can't be posted on their platform?</p> <p>A You know, I have to say I don't recall any of that. I mean, it could be that back then someone did and brought it to my attention, but I don't recall any federal official or anybody communicating directly with social media. That doesn't ring a bell for me now. That doesn't mean it hasn't happened. It just doesn't ring a bell to me right now.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
239:8 - 241:13	<p>Q Can you turn one page forward in this exhibit, in that first full paragraph that goes all the way across the page. "Facebook's decision to censor the Livestream was quickly followed by YouTube, the Google-owned video sharing platform"?</p> <p>A Yes, I knew of that.</p> <p>Q Or at the time, were you aware of Google or YouTube pulling down this video about hydroxychloroquine? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Asked and answered. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Were you aware?</p> <p>A Well, as I've said multiple times, I don't pay attention to what social media organizations like Google and YouTube and Twitter, and all that, what they do because I'm not involved in that. So was I aware -- could someone have cursorily mentioned to me that they did? Possibly. And it probably went over my head, because that's not something that I pay attention to.</p> <p>Q Next paragraph down, following Facebook and YouTube's removal of the video, Twitter follows suit, removing Breitbart News's Periscope Livestream of the press conference; correct?</p> <p>A Where is that? What paragraph? I'm sorry.</p> <p>Q Immediately below, there's a two line?</p> <p>A Yeah, I'm on the wrong page. MR. KIRSCHNER: Dr. Fauci is on page 7 of 16. Turn back another page. THE WITNESS: Okay. And what's the paragraph, Mr. Sauer, you're talking about? Yes, Twitter followed suit, removing Breitbart's Periscope, whatever that is. Jack Dorsey's platform also -- yeah. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Same question. Were you aware at the time that Twitter followed suit with Facebook and YouTube and pulled this video down? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation.</p> <p>Q Were you aware?</p> <p>A I was not aware, to my knowledge, and when you say aware, it's possible that somebody walking in the hall said, "Hey, did you hear this happened?" Very likely, I would have paid no attention. Because like I said, I do not get involved in any way with social media. I don't have an account, I don't tweet, I don't Facebook, and I don't pay attention to that. So you keep asking questions about am I aware of what's going on with people putting things down, I don't pay attention to what gets put up and put down on social media.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
241:14 - 241:17	<p>Q Are you generally aware of the terms of service about content moderation on the social media platform? Do you know anything about them?</p> <p>A Terms of service?</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
241:18 - 242:9	<p>Q Their policies with respect to what people can and can post to social media. Do you have any knowledge of what those policies say?</p> <p>A I'm not even knowing what you're talking about. The answer would be, like I said -- I'll repeat it again. I don't pay attention to social media issues. That's something I don't do. I don't follow it. I don't have an account. I don't follow it. I don't even know what the condition is.</p> <p>Q Never once?</p> <p>A Well, I can't say never ever. I'm sure when you're in a place where there's thousands of people, and you get thousands of e-mails, somebody somewhere is going to say something and I'm going to say, "Oh, good." So if you're going to show me one time where someone mentions, good. Show me.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
242:10 - 242:13	<p>Q Exhibit 39. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 39 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>

242:14 - 243:19	<p>Q This is a report from the Washington Standard entitled "America's Frontline Doctors website shut down." Do you see that?</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p>Q And right there in the front page it indicates that this is dated August 1st, 2020?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q So this is just a couple of days after the report about their video being pulled off Twitter, Facebook and YouTube; correct? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I'm getting confused here. So it says the Washington Standard America's Frontline Doctors website shuts down on the first page. Now, what's the next issue you're pointing out to me? BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Is the date of it August 1st, 2020?</p> <p>A Yes, it is.</p> <p>Q Were you aware of their website being taken down by their web hosting provider? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: I don't recall that. I might have been aware. Someone may have pointed it out to me, but that's not something, as I say, that would normally attract my attention or my interest. I could have been aware, but, again, I concentrate on other things besides this. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
243:20 - 243:24	<p>Q Do you still -- you testified about your views about the efficacy of hydroxychloroquine. Is that still your view today that there's still no evidence of its efficacy?</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
243:25 - 244:7	<p>Q Are you aware of any metaanalyses of the studies that have been done on a global scale of the efficacy of hydroxychloroquine?</p> <p>A I'm not specifically aware of that, but there really are some real ^ failings of metaanalyses, and when you get statisticians to look at them, they often debunk some of those metaanalyses.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
244:8 - 244:14	<p>Q Do you recall saying in connection with the discussion of hydroxychloroquine that a randomized double blind placebo based study is the gold standard?</p> <p>A That is the gold standard for everything. It isn't always needed, but for the most part, it's the gold standard.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
244:15 - 245:3	<p>Q Do you remember criticizing publicly a -- a study done by -- a sort of real-time study done by practitioners of the Henry Ford Medical Center who has about a thousand participants that found an observational benefit to hydroxychloroquine? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Do you remember that?</p> <p>A I don't recall. It's possible. I see a lot of studies, hundreds and hundreds of studies that come across my desk. Some that are put there, some that I find myself. So I can't say for sure what my opinion or comment was on any given study.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
245:4 - 245:7	<p>Q Exhibit 40. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 40 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
245:8 - 245:21	<p>Q Is this the first page of a meta-analysis of the studies addressing the efficacy of hydroxychloroquine? Is that what it appears to be?</p> <p>A This is confusing. Global HCQ/CQ studies. Let me read this paragraph first. I'm not sure what the summary is saying. Negative evaluations typically ignore treatment delay. Some in vitro evidence suggests that therapeutical level could not be reached, however, that was incorrect.</p> <p>Q Let's just focus on that first sentence for a minute, would you, where it says, 449 HCQ COVID-19 studies; correct?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
245:22 - 247:14	<p>Q HCQ is a common -- a Shortlander for hydroxychloroquine; correct?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q And it indicates there's -- 351 of these 449 studies are peer reviewed; correct? MR. KIRSCHNER:</p>

	<p>Objection. Lack of foundation. BY MR. SAUER:  Q Is that what it says?  A 351 peer reviewed, 371 comparing treatment and control groups. Late treatment in high dosages may be harmful while early treatment consistently shows positive results.  Q Just focusing on that comparing treatment and control groups, is that a description of a placebo based double blind study?  A Well, it's not -- MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection -- BY MR. SAUER:  Q To your understanding?  A To my -- MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Speculative. THE WITNESS: I'm not sure what they're referring to. There's a difference between a treatment and a control group versus a randomized placebo control group. Lack of randomization very infrequently leads to confusing, if not inaccurate, results. It depends on what the control group was. If it was a historical control, you want to make sure that there were no confounding variables in the control group that could have skewed the data, and that's the reason why I said if you look at the preponderance of evaluation of these studies by groups such as the NIH clinical trials guideline group, they come to the conclusion that the studies that claim efficacy are statistically not valid studies. BY MR. SAUER:  Q Would that apply to all 371 studies here that are reported to --  A If --  Q If I may finish my question, please?  A Oh. Please, go ahead.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
247:15 - 248:12	<p>Q 371 comparing treatment and control groups that indicates that early treatment, that is, receiving hydroxychloroquine early within the course of infection with the virus, consistently shows positive results?  A Yeah. That's what this says. I would have go to back, take a look at the study, and consult with our statisticians, who I believe were the ones that looked at the study and allowed the treatment guidelines panel, which, as I said, is comprised of anywhere from 30 to 40 of the top infectious disease physicians in the country, have still come to the conclusion that there's no evidence that hydroxychloroquine works and that, in fact, it can harm.  Q But that --  A So you can show me this study, and I don't see the study. It would probably take, when you talk about meta-analysis, a long period of time to look at each thing. What are they referring to as a control group? Is it randomized or is it not randomized? All of those factors play a major role in the validity or not of a study.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
248:13 - 248:15	<p>Q Are you familiar with the Great Barrington Declaration?  A Yes, I am.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
248:16 - 248:24	<p>Q What is the Great Barrington Declaration?  A It's a declaration signed by a number of people who proposed letting the virus circulate in the community with the statement that you can protect vulnerable people and if you let the virus circulate freely, that you would get what's called herd immunity, and then ultimately the virus would essentially go to such a low level because of herd immunity.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
248:25 - 249:8	<p>Q And if you look at Exhibit 40 in front of you, is that a copy of the Great Barrington Declaration?  MR. KIRSCHNER: I think -- is this Exhibit 41 or 40? MR. SAUER: Forty-one, I apologize. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 41 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
249:9 - 249:13	<p>Q Looking at Exhibit 41 in front of you, is that a copy of the Great Barrington Declaration?  A Well, it says on the front page Great Barrington Declaration. I'm not sure if it is. I have no reason to believe it isn't.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
249:14 - 252:21	<p>Q Did you ever review the Great Barrington Declaration?  A I have read it some time ago.</p>

	<p>Q Flipping ahead to the third page where it says the Great Barrington Declaration at the top, does that look like the Great Barrington Declaration? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: What page are we on? Three of 13? BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Correct.</p> <p>A It says the Great Barrington Declaration.</p> <p>Q And is this familiar to you? You said you've read it before?</p> <p>A I read it some time ago when it first came out.</p> <p>Q At the end of the first paragraph there it just talks about recommending an approach called focus protection; correct?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q And is that what you described earlier as --</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q -- by circulating among certain populations --</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q -- while trying to provide targeted protection for more vulnerable population?</p> <p>A I believe that's what they're referring to.</p> <p>Q You -- this was published on October 4th, 2020; correct? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: I don't know when it was published, to be honest with you. very top.</p> <p>A It says on October 4th, the declaration was authored and signed.</p> <p>Q Okay. So that's when at least it purports to have been executed?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q Were you -- when did you become aware of it after it was published?</p> <p>A I don't recall.</p> <p>Q Would it have been soon after that to your knowledge?</p> <p>A Possibly. I don't recall.</p> <p>Q Do you know these three scientists who are listed as the leaders of it -- or the authors of it, Dr. Martin Kulldorff, Dr. Sunetra Gupta, and Dr. Jay Bhattacharya? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Vague. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Do you know them?</p> <p>A I don't know them. I know their names now because it's been kicked around a fair amount over the last -- period of time. I don't -- I don't know them.</p> <p>Q You did -- and you didn't -- were you familiar with them or their reputations at the time that this was published?</p> <p>A I don't know them so I'm not familiar with them.</p> <p>Q Okay. Flipping ahead to Page 8 of 13. There's a list -- in the list of joiners there, second from the bottom, it lists Dr. Michael Levitt at Stanford?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p>Q And he was a Nobel Prize winner?</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p>Q Do you know him?</p> <p>A I don't know him. I've heard of him. I don't know him.</p> <p>Q You said earlier, I think, that you don't recall how you first became aware of the Great Barrington Declaration?</p> <p>A I can't say the moment I became aware of it. I don't recall. I became aware of it. I don't know precisely when I became aware of it.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
252:22 - 253:13	<p>Q Do you remember the context in which you became aware of it? Was it raised to you by a colleague or surfing the internet or something like that?</p> <p>A I don't recall how that -- how that occurred. MR. KIRSCHNER: I would like to, Mr. Sauer, take a break in the next five minutes. Do you want to take a break now or do you want to take a break after the next exhibit. MR. SAUER: Let's do it now. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. Time is 2:17 p.m. and we're going off the record. (Recess taken.) THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 2:28 p.m. and we're back on the record. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>

253:14 - 254:22	<p>Q Exhibit 42. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 42 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:  Q Dr. Fauci, do you recognize this e-mail dated October 8th, 2020, at 2:31 p.m.? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: I don't recognize it like I remember it, but it's sitting right in front of me and it's an e-mail from Francis Collins to myself and Cliff Lane, with a copy to Larry Tabak. So I'll read it and see what it says. Yes, I've read it. BY MR. SAUER:  Q Do you remember getting this e-mail?  A Yeah. Vaguely, yeah.  Q Dr. Collins sent it to you on October 4th, four days after the Great Barrington Declaration was offered; correct? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. It says October 8th on it. BY MR. SAUER:  Q Sorry. He sent it to you on October 8, after the Great Barrington Declaration was offered on October 4th. Correct?  A Correct.  Q And he sent it to you and Cliff Lane; correct?  A Correct.  Q And he says, "Hi, Tony and Cliff. See <a ;="" correct?<br="" href="https://urldefense.com/v3/__https://gbdeclaration.org__;!!NtP9J7iH11vXGg!OfjQ3HS19TPlz9Q_r-u4RtZWR1naETdrZpFm3si2l2_NbcloUbvSz3asoQn-l8Dm2C-z5uDtNV26mSJ8uMD5iM6vYqN78_3ajww\$ "></a> A Correct.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
254:23 - 256:3	<p>Q And is that a reference to the Great Barrington Declaration?  A I believe so. I believe so. I would imagine. It's a link and it says gbdeclaration, so I would imagine.  Q Did you read the Great Barrington Declaration for the first time when you got this e-mail? Or do you not know?  A I don't recall.  Q Did you click on that link when you got the e-mail?  A I don't recall.  Q He goes on to say, "This proposal from the three fringe epidemiologists who met with the Secretary"; right? Were you aware of those three authors of the Great Barrington Declaration meeting with the Secretary?  A I don't recall. This may have been my first awareness of it, or I could have been peripherally aware of it at the time. I can't say for sure.  Q So you don't know -- when he refers to the three fringe epidemiologists, is he referring to a prior conversation or communication where you discussed them with him, if you know? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection, speculative. THE WITNESS: I don't know.  Q You don't remember?  A No.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
256:4 - 260:13	<p>Q Do you recall Dr. Bhattacharya, Gupta and Dr. Kulldorff meeting with Secretary Azar?  A You know, I don't. I think after the fact, I would have known because Francis said they did. It is very likely, although I'm not 100 percent sure that the meeting of the epidemiologists, authors of the declaration with the Secretary, this was very likely the first time it was brought to my attention, although I can't say for sure. I would imagine -- again, getting back to context, this is not something that I would have been paying a lot of attention to. I was knee deep in trying to do things like develop a vaccine that wound up saving the lives of millions of people. That's what I was doing at the time. So an e-mail like this may not have necessarily risen to the top of my awareness and interest.  Q So he goes on to say, "You believe that this didn't catch your interest at the time that you received it"? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Mischaracterizes his testimony. THE WITNESS: I don't know if it did or not. I wouldn't imagine that I would be overwhelmingly interested. I may have responded. I'm sure you're going to pull out my e-mail and show my response. But I don't recall -- this is an e-mail from Francis just bringing it to my attention. I don't recall what, if any, was my response to this.  Q It seems to be getting a lot of attention and even a cosignature from a Nobel Prize winner, Mike Levitt at Stanford.  A Right.  Q And that was the person we referred to a minute ago.</p>

	<p>A Yes.</p> <p>Q Then Dr. Collins goes on to say, "There needs to be a quick and devastating published takedown of his premises." Do you know what he's referring to when he talks about a quick and devastating takedown? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Speculative. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q If you know.</p> <p>A I do not know what he was referring to. I would imagine I was thinking that someone would take the counterargument of what the premise was, and I believe, you know, knowing now what's in the declaration, the premise that you could actually selectively target susceptible people and protect them and yet let the virus spread through society without doing considerable damage. I would imagine that that is the premise that Dr. Collins felt was an invalid assumption.</p> <p>Q And did you discuss this with him at the time? Did you talk to him about getting a quick and devastating published takedown of the Great Barrington Declaration?</p> <p>A I don't recall. You know, quick and devastating takedown, that doesn't sound like some terminologies that I would use. So I don't believe I had a conversation about that specific.</p> <p>Q And so you don't know specifically what he meant?</p> <p>A I don't know specifically what he meant. But knowing Francis, he is a scholar. He's likely talking about writing a scholarly article to contest some of the premises. That's what I would imagine Francis is referring to. That would be his style. That if someone writes an article that he disagrees with, that he would write a counterargument to challenge the premises. Again, I don't know for sure, but knowing Francis, I believe that's what he means, to provide a counterargument.</p> <p>Q Do you know for sure, then, what he meant or we would ask him if -- if you know? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Speculative. THE WITNESS: Again, I'm not sure -- again, I'm not 100 percent sure. You can never be sure what's in someone's mind, but knowing Francis, he is a scholar, a fair person. Highly respected in the community. When he talks about premises, just the way he would with a scientific article with scientific data, if he had an issue with it, he would write a scholarly article to try and challenge it. And I believe that's what he's referring to. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Okay. He goes on in the e-mail to say, "I don't see anything like that online yet. Is it underway?" Do you see that?</p> <p>A I see that.</p> <p>Q Why would he think that you and Cliff Lane would know whether or not there was a swift and devastating takedown of this declaration underway? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Speculative. THE WITNESS: Certainly speculative. I don't know what he meant. I just think he was speaking bluntly. I don't think he was specifically pointing to us to have known if there was something online. He scours the online better than we do. He's got an entire staff that does that. So I think it was a just a casual comment, "Hey, you guys. Did you see anything online yet?" BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q And he says not "Is there something up there?" He says, "Is it underway?" Did he have any reason to think that you guys might be working on --</p> <p>A Absolutely not.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
260:14 - 262:9	<p>Q Let me finish the question -- of some kind of refutation of the Great Barrington Declaration?</p> <p>A No. This is not something I would be involved in. As I told you, I have a very important day job that is running a \$6.4 billion institute. I would not be involved in examining this and doing something that would, quote, counter it.</p> <p>Q Do you know why he copied Cliff Lane on this e-mail with you? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Speculative. THE WITNESS: I don't know why he copied Cliff. But as I mentioned, Cliff is the clinical director of the Institute, the deputy director for clinical research, and a highly -- what's the right word -- respected clinical scientist in the institute. So it would not be unusual for Francis to send me an e-mail and have Cliff Lane, as my deputy director for clinical research, be copied. That would not be surprising. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Is Cliff Lane the same one who went on the WHO-sponsored trip to China in February of 2020 that we talked about this morning? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Asked and answered. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Is he the same guy?</p> <p>A Cliff Lane is the same person, and the same motivation that led to his going to China was probably the same motivation that Francis copied him in the e-mail, that he's highly respected and well thought</p>

	<p>of and a very knowledgeable physician scientist.</p> <p>Q When he came back from China, he was the one who had reported about China -- I think he called them extreme lockdown measures being effective in controlling the spread of the virus. Do you recall that? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Asked and answered. THE WITNESS: I answered that question, but he was the one that said social distancing that they have done was, in fact, effective. He believes in curtailing the spread of the virus. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
262:10 - 262:16	<p>Q Do you recall any discussions between you, Francis Collin, and Cliff Lane in that time frame of him returning from the WHO-sponsored trip to China that related to the efficacy of extreme lockdown measures or extreme social distancing measures?</p> <p>A We're going back to the same question. I think I answered that. I think --</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
262:17 - 263:6	<p>Q I'm just asking if you had any discussions on that topic that I just described, you, Cliff Lane, and Francis Collins back when Cliff Lane returned from the trip to China?</p> <p>A Did we have any discussions about the efficacy of -- of severe social distancing on shutting down to spread a virus?</p> <p>Q Correct.</p> <p>A It's entirely possible that we had that conversation. I don't specifically recall that conversation, but it would not be unusual. Cliff went to China, and we wanted to find out what was going on there to see if there could be any lessons learned from what they were doing compared to what we're doing.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
263:7 - 263:10	<p>Q Exhibit 43. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 43 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
263:11 - 264:5	<p>Q Do you recognize this e-mail exchange also dated October 8th, 2020?</p> <p>A You know, you say do I recognize it.</p> <p>Q Do you remember it?</p> <p>A I don't remember it, but now that you've put it in front of me, it's got my name on it next to "from" and Francis next to "to." So I get back to my statement before. I receive literally thousands of e-mails, many of which get screened. So I generally wind up seeing only a few hundred. I don't remember this one specifically, but clearly it was sent by me to Francis.</p> <p>Q And to the same list of recipients on his e-mail to you that was in the previous exhibit; correct?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q And you said to him, "Francis, I'm pasting in below a piece from The Wire ^ that debunks this theory"; correct?</p> <p>A That's what it says.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
264:6 - 264:12	<p>Q If you look at the top, your -- the subject line is the Great Barrington Declaration; correct?</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p>Q And Francis responds to you "Excellent"; correct?</p> <p>A That's what it says.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
264:13 - 264:20	<p>Q You've pasted in here an article from Wired magazine by Matt Reynolds; right?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p>Q How did you find that?</p> <p>A I don't recall.</p> <p>Q Did someone find it for you or did you Google it yourself?</p> <p>A I don't recall.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
264:21 - 264:24	<p>Q Do you know this author Matt Reynolds?</p> <p>A Doesn't ring a bell. I may have run into him or interacted with him in the past, but doesn't come out - - jump out of the page at me.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
264:25 - 265:2	<p>Q Did you have any communications with Mr. Reynolds before he published this article?</p> <p>A I don't recall.</p>

	<a href="#">Summary</a>
265:3 - 266:3	<p>Q Do you know of anyone at NIAID communicating with him before publishing this article?</p> <p>A I don't recall.</p> <p>Q Do you know Gregg Gonsalves?</p> <p>A I do.</p> <p>Q Who is he?</p> <p>A Gregg Gonsalves is the person on the faculty of the Yale School of Public Health, I believe, certainly Yale University of New Haven, who formerly was a member of the AIDS activist group ACT UP, and then a member of the therapy group, TAG, treatment action group, of ACT UP.</p> <p>Q How long have you known him?</p> <p>A I've known Gregg since the first decade of HIV. So I would imagine that would likely be sometime in late 1980s, early 1990.</p> <p>Q Is he a friend of yours?</p> <p>A Well, it depends on what you mean by a friend. He's someone I know. He's an associate. I think he's a solid person. He cares deeply about public health. Yeah, I -- again, it depends on definition of friend or not. He's somebody that's more than just hello. I mean, I've -- I've interacted with him a fair amount.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
266:4 - 266:22	<p>Q Exhibit 44. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 44 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Another e-mail chain between you, Francis Collins, and Cliff Lane regarding the Great Barrington Declaration; correct? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: This is an e-mail from me to Francis in which I forwarded to him a commentary or a Twitter, I guess, a commentary by Gregg Gonsalves concerning the idea of herd immunity and focused protection. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q And you said above -- sending that, you said, "another refutation of the herd immunity approach"; right?</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
266:23 - 267:25	<p>Q And this is also addressing essentially the approach -- the herd immunity approach, are you there referring to the approach espoused by the authors of the Great Barrington Declaration?</p> <p>A Could be. I would imagine it was, but, you know, since herd immunity was a significant component of the declaration, I don't see specific reference to the declaration here, but it is compatible with this being -- referring to the declaration, though I -- I don't see any specific indication of it.</p> <p>Q Can you turn to the second page of this document? In the Gonsalves article, the second paragraph begins "However, after some acknowledgment." Do you see that?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p>Q And if you go about five lines down, there's a sentence beginning "Fast forward to this week." Do you see that?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p>Q It says, "Fast forward to this week where one of the Harvard professors in question, Martin Kulldorff, along with Dr. Jay Bhattacharya from Stanford University and Sunetra Gupta from the University of Oxford were in DC meeting with Scott Atlas ^ and Health and Human Services as secretary Alex Azar ^ ?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
268:1 - 268:4	<p>Q And then it goes on to say they were promoting their new focus protection strategy; correct?</p> <p>A That's what it says.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
268:5 - 269:15	<p>Q And focus protection is a phrase used in the Great Barrington Declaration; correct?</p> <p>A That's correct.</p> <p>Q Did you have any communications with Gregg Gonsalves before he wrote this piece?</p> <p>A I don't recall. I might have. I don't recall specifically having any communications with Gregg before he wrote this. I might have, but I don't know. It doesn't come out at me as something I remember having a communication with him.</p> <p>Q Do you -- do you remember consulting -- him consulting with you or anyone at NIAID staff in any</p>

	<p>way about his piece on this?</p> <p>A You know, I don't recall. It's possible, but I don't recall.</p> <p>Q Do you know what Francis Collins was going to do with this information? You're sending him these articles refuting the Great Barrington Declaration. What was his plan to do with them? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Speculation. THE WITNESS: I don't know what his plan -- I think he was getting back to a prior e-mail that you showed me. He was wondering what the community in general's response was to the Great Barrington Declaration, and I believe, if I can recall from a few moments -- minutes ago when he was talking -- is anybody else refuting this premise? That's one of the things he asked in an e-mail he sent to me. So I would imagine -- I'm trying to piece it together -- that the things that I forwarded to Francis were in response to his question "Is anybody else refuting this premise?" And this looks like a refutation that I forwarded to him on October 8th and then on that same day what Gregg Gonsalves tweeted. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
269:16 - 270:4	<p>Q Do you know if Francis Collins has any contacts or acquaintances that work for social media companies? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Calls for speculation. THE WITNESS: I don't know of Francis Collins's connection to any -- I don't know of it. I mean, whether he does or not, I don't -- I don't -- I have no knowledge of that.</p> <p>Q Does he have social media accounts?</p> <p>A His office does. I think he tweets. I have heard he tweets. Since I don't have a Twitter account, I don't see tweets.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
270:5 - 270:9	<p>Q Exhibit 45. MR. KIRSCHNER: Yes. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 45 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
270:10 - 270:14	<p>Q Before we -- before we get to this exhibit, has Dr. Collins ever discussed with you the content of matters posted on social media that you recall?</p> <p>A I'm sorry. What's the question again?</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
270:15 - 270:20	<p>Q Has Dr. Collins ever discussed with you the content of speech posted on social media? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Ambiguous. THE WITNESS: You know, I'm -- I'm not sure. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
270:21 - 271:1	<p>Q Has he ever discussed with you any communications that he or his staff has had with social media companies?</p> <p>A Not specifically that I can recall. He may have but, again, it's not something that rings a bell with me that I would remember.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
271:2 - 271:4	<p>Q Can you look briefly at the exhibit in front of you, Exhibit 45?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
271:5 - 271:18	<p>Q This is a Washington Post article dated October 14th, 2020?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q And the headline is "Proposal to hasten herd immunity to the coronavirus grabs White House attention but appalls the top scientists"; correct?</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p>Q If you go to the fourth paragraph on the first page, Dr. Collins quoted in this article -- MR. KIRSCHNER: Again, I would ask for Dr. Fauci to have an opportunity to familiarize himself with this document. THE WITNESS: Just give me a sec. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
271:19 - 272:3	<p>Q Do you see that -- the fourth paragraph on the first page, where it says that, "A senior administration official told reporters in a background briefing called Monday that the proposed strategy, which has been denounced by other infectious disease experts and called, quote, fringe, and, quote, dangerous by NIH director Francis Collins." Do you see that?</p> <p>A Yes.</p>

	<a href="#">Summary</a>
272:4 - 272:18	<p>Q Did you consult with Dr. Collins before he told the Washington Post that this was a fringe and dangerous idea?</p> <p>A Yes. MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: Yeah. I'm not sure of the connections because it's saying here, "which has been denounced by other infectious disease experts and called fringe and dangerous," whether Francis spoke to Joel directly and said it was fringe and dangerous or whether Joel was reporting on statements that Francis Collins made not directly to him, but he may have heard of statements that Francis made. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
272:19 - 275:11	<p>Q Why don't we flip ahead to page 4 of this document -- 4 of 6 in the bottom left corner? You --</p> <p>A Four of 5.</p> <p>Q Page 4 of 5?</p> <p>A Got it.</p> <p>Q You see that third full paragraph? There's a quotation from Dr. Collins that says, "What I'm worried about with this is it's being presented as a major alternative view that's held by large numbers of experts in the scientific community." That is not true, correct? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: That's what this says. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q And he goes on to say in the next paragraph, "This is a fringe component of epidemiology. This is not mainstream science. It's dangerous." Correct? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: Well, I'm reading the quote from Dr. Collins. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Did he consult with you before he gave that quote or made those statements to the Washington Post? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: I can't say for sure whether he consulted with me or spoke to me about it. It was clear how Dr. Collins felt about the premise of the declaration. He felt that it was, in fact, an ill-founded premise, and that it would be dangerous because it would lead to the unnecessary infection, sickness, hospitalization, and death of larger numbers of people if you pulled back and let the virus freely circulate, even if you tried to protect targeted populations. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Did he think it would be dangerous if those communications were conducted on social media platforms? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection, speculative. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q To your knowledge?</p> <p>A To my knowledge, I don't see a connection here with what he's saying and things being spread on social media, but perhaps, since a lot of things get spread on social media, I'm sure that -- I'm not sure, but that could have been something that he was concerned about.</p> <p>Q Did you ever discuss that with him, his concerns about it circulating on social media? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Asked and answered. THE WITNESS: You know, we've been down that question before. And I said, "I'm not certain at all." I've had discussions with Dr. Collins a few years ago about these issues and I don't know if we discussed the implications of social media on it. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Did you become aware -- did he -- did he let's do the next exhibit, 46? (FAUCI Exhibit No. 46 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
275:12 - 276:15	<p>Q On October 13th at 3:36 p.m., did Dr. Collins send you and some others a link to the Washington Post article that we just looked at?</p> <p>A The link on the bottom, is that the same article? I don't know if it is. Let me see if the link is the same. "COVID herd immunity 2020," yeah, it looks like it's the link to the article that we were referring to.</p> <p>Q So this is on October 13th, which would be the day after -- or no -- strike that. So he e-mails you and others and says, "My quotes in the article are accurate but will not be appreciated in the White House"; correct?</p> <p>A It says here, "My quotes are accurate, but will not be appreciated in the White House."</p> <p>Q Did he discuss with you whether the White House would approve the quotes he made about the Great Barrington Declaration?</p> <p>A I don't recall him discussing whether they would be appreciated or not, but he clearly states in the e-mail to me -- is it to me? Yes, to me and others -- that his quotes are accurate. Namely, that he rejects</p>

	<p>the premise of herd immunity, but that will not be appreciated in the White House.</p> <p>Q And you responded, "They are too busy with other things to worry about this"?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q What you said was entirely correct?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
276:16 - 277:23	<p>Q So was it your view at the time that the Great Barrington Declaration was a fringe and dangerous idea?</p> <p>A I'm not sure I would have categorized it like that. I would say that the premise, I believe, is invalid. And the invalid premise of essentially letting the virus freely circulate under the assumption which has already been proven to be incorrect with the one million deaths that we've had in the country, that the premise of allowing the virus to freely circulate is a premise that is invalid because it is not possible to selectively protect all the vulnerable people.</p> <p>Q Do you think --</p> <p>A So I agree that the premise of the Great Barrington Declaration is ill-founded and incorrect and I'm joined by the overwhelming majority of physicians, public health officials, and epidemiologists.</p> <p>Q Do you think it's nonsense?</p> <p>A You know, you're putting words. It could be nonsense. In fact, I believe that you're going to show me an e-mail shortly in which I call it nonsense, you know.</p> <p>Q Why don't we go with that?</p> <p>A Okay.</p> <p>Q Exhibit 47.</p> <p>A All right. Thank you. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 47 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Is this a -- can you look at that?</p> <p>A I see it.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
277:24 - 278:1	<p>Q Can you see this is an NBC News article dated October 15, 2020.</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
278:2 - 278:25	<p>Q And the headline says, "Dr. Fauci says letting the coronavirus spread to achieve herd immunity is, quote, nonsense, and quote, dangerous." Correct?</p> <p>A That is correct.</p> <p>Q Turn to the third page of the document in the first full paragraph.</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q You describe the view of letting everybody get infected and then we'll have herd immunity. And you say, "Quite frankly, that is nonsense and anybody who knows anything about epidemiology will tell you that that is nonsense and very dangerous." Correct?</p> <p>A That is correct.</p> <p>Q Were those the statements that you made at the time?</p> <p>A That's the quote there. I have no reason to believe that it's a misquote.</p> <p>Q Do you still believe that?</p> <p>A Do I believe that the Barrington Declaration premise of letting the virus rip through society and infect people, leading to their illness, hospitalization, and death is nonsense and dangerous? I still do.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
279:1 - 279:3	<p>Q Are you an epidemiologist?</p> <p>A I'm an infectious disease person with some pretty good experience in epidemiology.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
279:4 - 279:10	<p>Q Is Dr. Bhattacharya an epidemiologist?</p> <p>A I don't know. I guess you'll have to look up his credentials. I don't know precisely his credentials.</p> <p>Q How about Dr. Kulldorff?</p> <p>A Again, I'm not familiar offhand with their qualifications.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
279:11 - 279:13	<p>Q So your statement was made within two days of Dr. Collins' statement?</p> <p>A Right.</p>

	<a href="#">Summary</a>
279:14 - 279:24	<p>Q With the Washington Post; correct?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q Did you coordinate with making those statements, discussing with each other that you were going to make these statements criticizing the Great Barrington Declaration, other than the e-mails you've already seen?</p> <p>A I don't believe so, but I don't -- no, I'm not -- that's not our style to be coordinating things. I don't know -- it's possible we discussed it, depending on what your coordination is.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
279:25 - 280:10	<p>Q In this same time frame, did you become aware that the Great Barrington Declaration was being censored in social media? I'm not aware of anything being censored. Like I said multiple times -- and I'll repeat it again -- I don't follow what goes on on social media, censoring or otherwise. That's not something that I pay attention to. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 48 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
280:11 - 280:18	<p>Q Would you look at exhibit 48. And is this an article from the website Spiked entitled, "Why has Google censored the Great Barrington Declaration?" MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: The first page says: Why has Google censored the Great Barrington Declaration? BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
280:19 - 282:4	<p>Q Without going into details of the article, were you aware that there were reports that Google had deboosted the Great Barrington Declaration in the search results. So if you search for it on Google, the declaration itself would be buried in the results and you would only get articles that were critical of it, like for example, the Washington Post article that quoted Francis Collins and the NBC? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation and compound. Many compounds. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Did you know about that?</p> <p>A Could you repeat ^ the specific question. Did I know about what?</p> <p>Q Did you know about the fact that the Great Barrington Declaration had been deboosted in people's search results in the same time frame? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Did you know?</p> <p>A I believe not. It is possible that someone walking by the hall mentioned that to me. But as I mentioned to you, I don't pay much attention to what goes on in social media, and I certainly would not have had this pop up on my radar screen so I would say, "I can't say 100 percent," but it is highly unlikely that I am aware -- was aware of, or if I was, I paid any attention to this thing of Google censoring the Great Barrington. I don't pay attention to that whole culture of social media censoring or not censoring. I've said that maybe 50 times today. That's not what I do.</p> <p>Q Let me ask you a new question then.</p> <p>A Sure.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
282:5 - 282:9	<p>Q Are you familiar with the social media platform Reddit?</p> <p>A Reddit?</p> <p>Q R-e-d-d-i-t?</p> <p>A I'm heard the that term, but --</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
282:10 - 282:20	<p>Q Are you aware that Reddit also censored the Great Barrington Declaration, along with Google? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q If you know.</p> <p>A Again, I'm not even sure what Reddit is, and so I don't think I could be aware of its censoring. If I did -- was aware at one time, I certainly didn't register it as something that I would want to remember.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
282:21 - 282:23	<p>Q Have you ever heard of YouTube?</p> <p>A Have I ever heard of YouTube? Yes, I have. There you go. I've heard of one thing, yeah.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>

282:24 - 283:10	<p>Q Were you aware that YouTube actually amended its terms of service in October of 2020 to clarify that it would remove content related to the Great Barrington Declaration? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Do you know?</p> <p>A I don't know for sure whether someone pointed that out to me, but, again, with the repetitive theme that I keep saying if I was aware of it, I would not have paid much attention to it.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
283:11 - 283:14	<p>Q Exhibit 49. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 49 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
283:15 - 284:5	<p>Q This is a copy of YouTube's online site admissions relations ^ policy. Have you ever seen it before?</p> <p>A Not to my recollection, no.</p> <p>Q And on the second page, there's a kind of rolling chronology. Do you see on the second page in the far left it indicates 2020 in the middle?</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p>Q And then there's various links. So if you go on to the third page, there's one from October of 2020 called fighting misinformation?</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p>Q And that indicates in kind of one sentence that they have updated their COVID-19 medical misinformation policy in October of 2020; correct?</p> <p>A Correct. It looks that way.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
284:6 - 284:11	<p>Q Exhibit 50. (Dr. Fauci Exhibit No. 50 was marked for identification.) THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. What -- what was the question? I didn't see any question. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
284:12 - 284:15	<p>Q Oh, I was -- now I was going to give you what you get when you click on that. That's Exhibit 50.</p> <p>A Okay.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
284:16 - 284:23	<p>Q Did I slide over an extra copy to you? Oh, no. Here it is. Sorry. I take it you've never seen this sort of document before either, Exhibit 50, the sort of detailed version of the COVID-19 medical misinformation policy that you're privy ^ to?</p> <p>A No. I don't recall ever seeing this before.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
284:24 - 285:5	<p>Q Can you go to Page 4 of 5, the fourth bullet point from the bottom on the list of items that YouTube does not allow on its platform, quote, "Claims that achieving herd immunity through natural infection is safer than vaccinating the population." Do you see that?</p> <p>A I see it, yes.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
285:6 - 286:2	<p>Q Is that a claim that paraphrases the recommendations in the Great Barrington Declaration? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Speculative. THE WITNESS: You know, I'm not sure. I know that the Great Barrington Declaration promotes the concept of herd immunity through natural infection. I am not certain -- I don't recall if they specifically mention that it's safer than vaccinating the population. It might. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Did you have any knowledge of any update to YouTube's terms of service in October of 2020 to add that as a disfavored claim? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Asked and answered. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Did you? Yes or no?</p> <p>A Not to my knowledge. It doesn't ring a bell.</p> <p>Q Do you know of anyone who communicated to YouTube about that topic?</p> <p>A Not to my knowledge.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
286:3 - 286:6	<p>Q Exhibit 51. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 51 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
286:7 - 286:10	<p>Q This is Meta's online misinformation policy, and I think we talked about earlier how Meta is the company that --</p> <p>A Now I know what Meta is. We can proceed.</p>

	<a href="#">Summary</a>
286:11 - 286:20	<p>Q It's Facebook and Instagram.</p> <p>A Yes. Okay.</p> <p>Q And the CEO of Meta is someone you're on a first-name basis with, a man called Mark Zuckerberg; is that correct? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Mischaracterizes the evidence. THE WITNESS: Yeah, right. I'm on a first-name basis with a lot of people. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
286:21 - 287:23	<p>Q Apparently. Did you do some PSAs with Mark Zuckerberg back in March of 2015?</p> <p>A I don't know --</p> <p>Q I'm sorry. March of 2020?</p> <p>A I'm not sure of the date, but I did some Facebook PSAs encouraging people to get vaccinated and answering questions about the virus.</p> <p>Q And in your interrogatory responses, you identify 13 communications with Mark Zuckerberg consisting of both e-mails and phone calls. Do you recall that?</p> <p>A Interrogatories, when you and I were talking -- what is he talking about? MR. KIRSCHNER: Well, Dr. Fauci, I would ask not to talk about -- about our communications. THE WITNESS: Yeah. I'm not sure what you mean by "interrogatory." What is that? BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Did you prepare information in response to written discovery requests in this case identifying 13 communications with Mark Zuckerberg during 2020? MR. KIRSCHNER: Mr. Sauer, if you have a document to show Dr. Fauci, I would ask that you show -- THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm not sure what you're talking about. Interrogatory about -- show me something, and I'll tell you. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
287:24 - 288:13	<p>Q Do you dispute that you had 13 conversations -- or communications with Mark Zuckerberg in 2020?</p> <p>A I don't know how many I had. I do know some time ago that of the many, many, many thousands of e-mails of mine that were FOIA'd, that someone mentioned that there were e-mails between Mark and I. And I don't know how many there were so I can't answer the question completely accurately.</p> <p>Q Let me ask you this. Can you turn to</p> <p>A And remind me what's this -- this is the misinformation policy document of --</p> <p>Q Meta.</p> <p>A Meta, okay.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
288:14 - 288:17	<p>Q Page 4 of 12 under Roman II, harmful health misinformation, there's a bullet in bold saying "Misinformation about vaccines"; correct?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
288:18 - 288:23	<p>Q And it says, "We remove misinformation primarily about vaccines when public health authorities conclude that the information is false and likely to directly contribute to imminent vaccine refusals"; correct?</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
288:24 - 289:5	<p>Q Are you one of the public health authorities whose conclusions Meta relies on when they're deciding to remove information? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Speculative. THE WITNESS: I have no idea who the public health authority is. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
289:6 - 290:3	<p>Q Did you ever have a conversation with Mark Zuckerberg where he told you that you're a respected public health authority?</p> <p>A Did I ever have a conversation with Mark saying that I was a respected public health authority?</p> <p>Q Or something like that.</p> <p>A My conversations with Mark are documented on the PSAs that we have. I'm not sure whether he said now I'm going to introduce the public health authority. I'm not sure about that.</p> <p>Q How about in the phone calls you had with him?</p> <p>A The phone calls, I believe, were related to saying, you know, look forward to being on the PSA with you. You got any questions about the technical aspects of it or stuff like that. I don't think there was anything more substantiative than that on the e-mails.</p>

	<p>Q Did anyone ever say to you that you're a public health authority that platforms like Meta and Facebook and so forth would rely on in --</p> <p>A Not to my knowledge.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
290:4 - 290:9	<p>Q If I may finish -- may rely on in modulating content on their platform?</p> <p>A No, no. To my knowledge, I've never had anyone mention me and my authority or my reputation that has anything to do with influencing social media platforms.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
290:10 - 290:15	<p>Q After the Great Barrington Declaration was published, did you ever communicate with anyone at Stanford about it?</p> <p>A I don't recall. It's possible. Like I say, I made thousands of phone calls and thousands of e-mails. I may have, but I doubt it.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
290:16 - 291:13	<p>Q Well, more generally, do you recall communicating with anyone outside of the government and aside from the reporters that quoted you about the Great Barrington Declaration and its approach?</p> <p>A Outside of government, I don't know. That's possible, but I don't recall.</p> <p>Q How about do you know a man named Dr. Phil Pizzo or Pizzo? P-I-Z-Z-O --</p> <p>A I do. I do.</p> <p>Q Who is he?</p> <p>A Phil Pizzo is a pediatric infectious disease expert who used to be at the NIH who then went on to become the dean at the School of Medicine at Stanford who now, I believe, is either dean emeritus or professor emeritus at Stanford.</p> <p>Q And did you know him from his time at the NIH?</p> <p>A I did.</p> <p>Q So you've known him for decades, then?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p>Q Did you ever contact him to discuss the Great Barrington Declaration?</p> <p>A I don't recall. That's possible.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
291:14 - 291:16	<p>Q Is it possible you had a conversation with him about Dr. Jay Bhattacharya also at Stanford?</p> <p>A I don't recall.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
291:17 - 291:20	<p>Q How about Lloyd Minor? Who's that? Someone named Dr. Lloyd Minor?</p> <p>A I've heard the name. I -- it doesn't ring a bell of any connection.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
291:21 - 292:12	<p>Q How about Mark Tessier-Lavigne? Do you know him?</p> <p>A Mark is the current president of Stanford.</p> <p>Q Did you ever have a conversation with him? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Vague. THE WITNESS: Yeah. I don't know what you mean by a conversation with him. He used to be at the Rockefeller Institution. I had conversations -- scientific conversations with him, and I met him at meetings. So I'm not sure what you mean. Yeah, I've had conversations with Mark, but I don't recall the content of the conversation. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Have you ever discussed the Great Barrington Declaration with him? Or --</p> <p>A Not my knowledge.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
292:13 - 293:1	<p>Q How about the focused protection or herd immunity approaches?</p> <p>A I don't recall. These are possible. It's not ringing a bell when you're asking that question.</p> <p>Q How about any of the following names: Harry Greenberg? Do you know him?</p> <p>A Harry Greenberg is the scientist who used to be at the NIH and is still now at Stanford.</p> <p>Q Did you ever talk to him about focused protection or herd immunity?</p> <p>A I doubt it. I can't say 100 percent, but I doubt it. I don't recall discussing this issue with these people, but it's possible it came up in a discussion about something else, but I don't recall.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
293:2 - 293:10	<p>Q How about Jack Rowe, R-o-w-e? Do you know him?</p>

	<p>A I know Jack. I don't know him well. He used to be the CEO of a medical center maybe in New York. I'm not sure.</p> <p>Q Do you know a scientist with the last name of Ioannides, I-o-a-n-n-i-d-e-s?</p> <p>A I've heard of him. I don't know him. I've heard the name Ioannides, but I don't know him.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
293:11 - 293:16	<p>Q Are you are familiar with a serial prevalence study of people in Santa Clara County from March of 2020? It was done by him and some others. MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Vague. THE WITNESS: No. It doesn't ring a bell. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
293:17 - 294:8	<p>Q So you don't remember there being a study of the people in Santa Clara County early in the pandemic to assess how widespread the virus already was at that time?</p> <p>A Again, I get hundreds and hundreds of studies that come across my desk. It is possible that someone brought such a study to my attention, but I don't specifically recall it.</p> <p>Q Exhibit 52. MR. KIRSCHNER: What time are we at? THE VIDEOGRAPHER: 5:41. MR. KIRSCHNER: What exhibit number is this? MR. SAUER: 52. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 52 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
294:9 - 295:3	<p>Q Is this an e-mail from Greg Folkers to you dated November 2nd, 2020?</p> <p>A Me to Greg, November the 2nd. Greg to me, November the 1st.</p> <p>Q Gotcha. So on November 1st, he sent you a list of articles and highlighted the three he found most useful?</p> <p>A Right. MR. KIRSCHNER: Is there a question, Counsel? BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Is that what he did in this e-mail?</p> <p>A It appears in this e-mail that he has sent me, it looks like blanks maybe or at least titles of articles -- let me read them -- see what connection there is to the article. (Reading.) "Herd Immunity, the false premise of the herd immunity." Yeah, there's a bunch of articles to -- from different scientific and lay press.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
295:4 - 295:22	<p>Q And these are all articles that are critical of the herd immunity approach of the Great Barrington Declaration; correct?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q Do you know why Greg sent you these?</p> <p>A I don't recall. Greg would probably send me something that I've asked for. So somehow, back then, a couple of years ago, I asked for articles concerning herd immunity and I believe he sent them.</p> <p>Q Did you forward these on to Francis Collins? Sorry. Were you still talking?</p> <p>A Yeah. I mean, I don't know. This would be something Greg would do if I asked him to get some articles for me. And looks like -- I likely -- and I don't see the e-mail requesting them. I either e-mailed him or called him up, or walked in his office and said, "Get some articles on the issue of herd immunity." Yes, so --</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
295:23 - 296:5	<p>Q Did you ever communicate with the authors of any of these articles about this topic?</p> <p>A I don't recall. I'm looking at the people here and I don't recognize the names, except for John Barry and Gregg Gonsalves and ^^ Michelle -- some people I know and I -- some people I've never heard of. I don't recall if I communicated with any of them about these articles.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
296:6 - 296:21	<p>Q Which one do you know? Do you know John Barry?</p> <p>A I know John Barry.</p> <p>Q And who else do you know?</p> <p>A All right. Let's go through the list. John Barry. I've been interviewed by Apoorva Mandavilli and Sheryl Stolberg, two reporters for the New York Times. I've met Mark Lipschitz. I don't know him well. I know Gregg Gonsalves, Carlos del Rio, and Rochelle Walensky well.</p> <p>Q Did you communicate with any of those people about the Great Barrington Declaration in any connection?</p> <p>A I don't recall. I mean --</p>

	<a href="#">Summary</a>
296:22 - 297:20	<p>Q Did you ever take any steps to ensure there would be an online criticism of the Great Barrington Declaration in any -- MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Asked and answered. THE WITNESS: I don't ever recall -- I don't recall ever taking any steps to do anything online or influence online criticism of them. I just knew how I felt personally about the Great Barrington Declaration and we already discussed that. I felt that it was and is misguided and could lead to the unnecessary infection, hospitalization, and death of individuals if you follow the premise of the Great Barrington Declaration. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Did you share that view with the people in the media other than the ones we talked about?</p> <p>A I don't recall necessarily what I said to people in the media, but my opinion of the nature of the premise of the Great Barrington Declaration, I believe, is reasonably well known and shared by a very large number of scientists throughout the country, as actually stated in some of these articles.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
297:21 - 298:16	<p>Q Are there large numbers of scientists who disagree with your view, who signed the Great Barrington Declaration? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Vague. THE WITNESS: I haven't quantitated the number of people. I haven't done a quantitative study on the number of people who agree with it. But I can tell you that I interact with a lot of scientists in the country. And overwhelmingly, they disagree with it. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Does that include the 15,000 who signed it? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Argumentative. THE WITNESS: Yes. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q It does or does not?</p> <p>A I haven't even looked at the names of the 15,000 who signed it. A lot of people sign petitions and are not fully aware of what the implications of those petitions are.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
298:17 - 298:20	<p>Q Exhibit 53. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 53 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
298:21 - 299:5	<p>Q Can you turn to the second page of this e-mail chain on the bottom half? Do you see there's an e-mail from someone at Twitter to a Carol Crawford dated March 14th of 2020?</p> <p>A Right. MR. KIRSCHNER: I would ask for Dr. Fauci to be able to familiarize himself with this document. THE WITNESS: I'm all confused. I don't recognize anything on this piece of paper. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
299:6 - 299:9	<p>Q Could you just point to the part where I'm pointing to where there's an e-mail from someone at Twitter to a ^^ Carol Cross?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
299:10 - 299:17	<p>Q And this other client is @anthonyfauci_ account. Correct?</p> <p>A Right. Yes.</p> <p>Q And the Twitter person says, "Hi CDC team.</p> <p>A few folks have flagged this account to me wondering if it's real or not. Is it a legitimate account?" Do you see that? A Yes.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
299:18 - 300:17	<p>Q And there's a reference to an Anthony Fauci Twitter account; correct?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q And then if you go up above, you see Carol Crawford on March 14th, the response I'm adding someone at NIH and someone at HHS to verify that.</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q And then if you go further up on the page, the NIH person, Scott Prince. Do you know him?</p> <p>A No. I mean, it says here, "Deputy director for public information." You know, I have about six thousand employees work for me. I don't recognize this name.</p> <p>Q But he works in NIH?</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p>Q Is that fair to say?</p> <p>A Yeah. He probably works in Building 1 which is the NIH director's office. Not my -- it doesn't say</p>

	<p>NIAID, which means he doesn't work for me.</p> <p>Q And he e-mailed Twitter back, and said, "Fake/Imposter handle," and then in all caps, "Please remove, exclamation point, exclamation point, exclamation point." Correct?</p> <p>A That's what it says right here.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
300:18 - 301:4	<p>Q Were you aware that staff at the NIH were communicating with Twitter about removing accounts from Twitter because they were impersonating you?</p> <p>A I don't -- I kind of vaguely recall that there was a fake account of people using my name under false pretenses. I'm not 100 percent sure what they did about it. I'm sure that when they found out that it was a false account, that they would want it to be removed. I didn't say remove it. I believe I have a communication staff that I'm sure, if they found out it was a false and misleading account, that they would want it to be removed.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
301:5 - 301:12	<p>Q And would your communication staff contact the social media platforms to have that false and misleading content removed? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Speculative. THE WITNESS: I don't know how they would do it. Again, I said I don't pay attention to things related to social media accounts. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
301:13 - 301:14	<p>Q Who's in your communication staff?</p> <p>A A lot of people.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
301:15 - 301:16	<p>Q Can you name -- who's the leader of it?</p> <p>A Courtney Billet.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
301:17 - 302:15	<p>Q Okay. Did you ever tell Courtney Billet to communicate with a social media platform about taking down an imposter account or fake account? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Asked and answered. THE WITNESS: I don't recall doing it, but I assume, when Courtney found out that it was an imposter handle, that she would have asked to take it down herself, possibly without even telling me except to say, "There's an imposter account on you. We'll take care of it." Something like that. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Do you remember her having that conversation with you?</p> <p>A I don't specifically remember it, but I vaguely remember somebody mentioning something about an imposter account. I didn't even know what an imposter account was. And I likely would have said, "Well, how can they do that?" And I found out that people do imposter accounts, so I don't get involved in searching for them or doing anything about them. We have an entire communication staff that worries about that.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
302:16 - 303:1	<p>Q To be clear, your entire communication staff worries about things like false and misleading accounts like this on social media? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Mischaracterizes the evidence -- or the testimony. THE WITNESS: My staff worries about me, not other people's accounts and what's spread on other people's -- they don't worry about -- they work for me. They don't scour the social media looking for things that may or may not be true.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
303:2 - 303:8	<p>Q Do they scour social media looking for imposter accounts or ^ accounts --</p> <p>A I don't think they spend time looking for them, but when someone like Lauren Duvall says, "Hey, we have an Anthony -- @Anthony Fauci," and brings it to the attention of the NIH, then they would obviously be concerned about an imposter account.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
303:9 - 304:1	<p>Q Turn to the first page. The HHS official says, "Thanks, Lauren. Is there anything else you can do to block other variations of his name from impersonations so we don't have this occur again"; correct? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Speculative. THE WITNESS: It says, "Thanks, Lauren." They're trying to make sure that other people don't impersonate me. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Correct.</p> <p>A I think impersonating me is a bad thing, isn't it? I think so.</p> <p>Q Perhaps. If you go further up on March 14th, it says -- the Twitter official responds, "Will freeze this</p>

	<p>at -- @ handle and some other variations so no one can talk on that"; correct?</p> <p>A That's what it says.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
304:2 - 304:22	<p>Q So they would freeze a number of different account handles to make sure that no one uses them to impersonate you?</p> <p>A I don't know what this -- I don't know what this statement means. I don't -- I know it says will freeze the @ handle and some other variations of the @ handle. I don't know what they're referring to.</p> <p>Q Let's do another exhibit.</p> <p>A I think what they're trying to say possibly is that someone is impersonating me and that's a bad thing, and they're trying to stop it.</p> <p>Q Correct. Specifically they're trying to stop it by removing accounts from the social media platform Twitter; correct? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Speculative. THE WITNESS: I'm not sure where you're going with this, but I believe if someone is saying they're Fauci and they're not, that that would be disturbing to my communication staff. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
304:23 - 306:16	<p>Q Exhibit 54. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 54 was marked for identification.)</p> <p>Q Can you look at the third page of this e-mail chain? At the very bottom there's an e-mail from someone called Nicole Burkholz or Burkes. Do you see that?</p> <p>A Nicole Berkowitz, yes.</p> <p>Q Do you know who she is?</p> <p>A I don't recognize the name.</p> <p>Q And if you look at this e-mail, if you look up at the top of this e-mail, it looks like she sent an e-mail to the NIH.gov list?</p> <p>A It looks that way, yes.</p> <p>Q Do you know what that list is? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Spec- -- BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q F -- MR. KIRSCHNER: Sorry. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q @list.NIH.gov?</p> <p>A No, I don't know what that is. I mean, it says "NIH.gov" so it has something to do with the NIH, but I don't really know what @list is.</p> <p>Q Third paragraph down in her e-mail there she says, "Reason for the request, I have come across a very misleading YouTube video titled "How to Kill Coronavirus" that because of the unfortunate placement of the ad banner and the algorithm which chose my ad makes it look like this is a CDC video on COVID-19"; correct? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation, and I would ask for Dr. Fauci to have an opportunity to familiarize himself with this document. THE WITNESS: Yeah. Let me read it. Hold on. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Do you see that reference?</p> <p>A I don't know what this is. This looks like a CDC thing. Let me read it carefully so that I can answer your question. Okay. So what's the question? I'm sorry.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
306:17 - 307:5	<p>Q Were you aware of someone -- or do you see where she refer -- describes the content of the video she's looked at as incredibly dangerous information?</p> <p>A Yeah, and I want to make sure I'm not confused. So she is an NIH -- who is she?</p> <p>Q I think if you look at the next page, she's identified as a communications lead for the EPA. Do you see that?</p> <p>A Where's that next page?</p> <p>Q The very next page. The one we're looking at.</p> <p>A This one? EPA.gov.</p> <p>Q Yeah.</p> <p>A Environmental Protection Agency; right?</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
307:6 - 307:17	<p>Q Let me ask you this: Did you have any knowledge of someone from the EPA consulting with an NIH list to try and find a contact at social media to have dangerous information taken out?</p> <p>A I don't have any recollection of any of this.</p> <p>Q Let's move on to another exhibit.</p>

	<p>A I don't even know what you're talking about. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 55 was marked for identification.)  BY MR. SAUER:  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
307:18 - 307:22	<p>Q Here's an e-mail chain from April of 2020. Can you turn to the second-to-last page where there's an e-mail from someone called Judith Lavelle of NIAID sent to Facebook?  A Yeah.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
307:23 - 308:3	<p>Q And here -- do you know who Judith Lavelle is?  A She -- it says NIAID, NIH. So I'm the director of NIAID. So she obviously works in my multi-thousand-person institute. So maybe I've run into her, and I don't know exactly what she does.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
308:4 - 308:13	<p>Q And the next page it indicates she's a technical writer editor in her signature block. Do you see that?  A Right. And she's located at Fishers Lane, which is not the building that you and I are now sitting in. So it is unlikely I would have run into her.  Q She's copied on this e-mail someone called Jennifer Routh at the last CRC.^ Do you see that?  A Yes.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
308:14 - 308:16	<p>Q Who is Jennifer Routh?  A Jennifer Routh is a member of my communications staff.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
308:17 - 309:3	<p>Q Is Judith Lavelle a member of your communications staff?  A Let me look. It says Judith Lavelle, technical writer editor. So that would probably put her in the communications staff.  Q Okay. So she is on the communications team? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. THE WITNESS: Well, that's what technical writers generally fall under, the broad group of communications all under Courtney Billet. BY MR. SAUER:  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
309:4 - 309:7	<p>Q And she's e-mailed Facebook and said, "We wanted to flag a few more fake Dr. Fauci accounts on Facebook and Instagram for you." Do you see that?  A Yes.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
309:8 - 309:13	<p>Q And she says she's also reported them from at NIAID and her personal Facebook account; correct?  A Correct.  Q And there's a list of about eight accounts there in this e-mail?  A Correct.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
309:14 - 309:19	<p>Q And then if you flip to the next page, there's another one called Dr. Fauci the hero where she says, "I think this one may be fine as a fan page but just as a reminder that it could have been more clear"; correct?  A That's what it says.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
309:20 - 310:21	<p>Q So really you -- were you aware that, in fact, your communications staff was flagging many fake accounts from Facebook to have them removed?  A I was not aware that they were flagging many accounts, but from looking at this, they are trying to get rid of fake accounts because fake accounts are bad things, I believe.  Q "They" are -- "they" are your communications staff, right, when you say "they are working to remove fake accounts"? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Mischaracterizes testimony. THE WITNESS: Yeah. I'm not sure what you're saying or what you're getting at, but I'm reading here that there are people that are using my name falsely and creating fake accounts which people in the communications staff saying that this is troubling because they're doing things like selling masks and doing things like that. So I think that that would be kind of appropriate for my communications staff to be concerned when people are falsely impersonating me. BY MR. SAUER:  Q Are some of them parody accounts? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Speculative. THE WITNESS: Who? BY MR. SAUER:</p>

	<a href="#">Summary</a>
310:22 - 311:14	<p>Q Parody. If I may finish the question? Are some of them parody accounts? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Speculative. THE WITNESS: What is a parody account? BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Someone pretending to be you in a way that's ironic or making a point. MR. KIRSCHNER: Again, objection. Speculative. THE WITNESS: I don't know what these are. I just got a bunch of links to them. I'm not sure what they are. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q And there's one more. She sent a second e-mail flagging one more -- apologies for one more in the middle of that page. Do you see that?</p> <p>A Apologies for one more, right.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
311:15 - 311:21	<p>Q And then the -- directly above that, the Facebook person responds, "Hi, all, flagged this for the fake accounts team and they have confirmed that all but two accounts were removed for the impersonation of Dr. Fauci"; correct?</p> <p>A Right. Right. Impersonation are bad things.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
311:22 - 312:1	<p>Q And bad things should be removed from social media on your --</p> <p>A No. I mean, I think when someone says they're me and they're not me, I think someone should take a close look at that.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
312:2 - 312:9	<p>Q Should someone take a close look at other false statements on social media?</p> <p>A That's not my lane. I don't -- I never get involved in that, nor do I concentrate on that, so I don't have an opinion on that. Like I've told you maybe now, I can repeat it for the hundredth time, I really don't get involved in social media issues.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
312:10 - 312:13	<p>Q Do people on your communication staff get involved in social media issues regarding false information or misinformation?</p> <p>A Not to my knowledge.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
312:14 - 313:5	<p>Q If I may finish my question. Other than impersonation accounts? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Speculative. THE WITNESS: To my knowledge, they don't get involved in trying to influence social media in any way. But when someone impersonates me, I think it's totally appropriate for them to be concerned about that. MR. KIRSCHNER: And after this, can we take a break? MR. SAUER: Why don't we do that now? THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 3:39 p.m. and we are going off the record. (Recess.) THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 3:55 p.m. and we're back on the record. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
313:6 - 313:11	<p>Q Dr. Fauci, do you know Sylvia Burwell?</p> <p>A I do.</p> <p>Q Who's that?</p> <p>A Sylvia Burwell is the former Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services and the current president of American University.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
313:12 - 314:7	<p>Q Did she e-mail you in February of 2020 asking whether she should wear a mask if she was traveling in an airport in the early stages of the pandemic? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Speculative. THE WITNESS: Sylvia has, over the past couple of years, asked me advice about personal safety during the COVID-19 pandemic. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q And in particular, in February of 2020, did she e-mail you and say, "I am traveling to -- redacted -- folks are suggesting I take a mask through the airport. Is this something I should do?" MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: You know, I don't recall specifically that. I -- I do know that Sylvia has called me over the last couple of years asking me questions about health. I don't specifically recall that. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
314:8 - 314:25	<p>Q Do you recall writing this in response: "Masks are really for infected people to prevent them from spreading infection to people who are not infected, rather than protecting uninfected people from</p>

	<p>acquiring infection. The typical mask you buy in the drugstore is not really effective in keeping out virus, which is small enough to pass through material. It might, however, provide some slight benefit in keep out gross droplets if someone coughs or sneezes on you. I do not recommend that you wear a mask, particularly since you're going to a low risk location." Do you recall writing that? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: I vaguely recall talking to her about certain safety issues regarding masks.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
315:1 - 315:16	<p>Q Do you specifically recall recommending that she not wear a mask as she's traveling --</p> <p>A If that's an accurate -- I mean, you're asking if I recall?</p> <p>Q Yeah.</p> <p>A I don't recall. I mean, these things -- thousands of things happen. If you show me an e-mail that has my name and the proper identification and I said that, I would not argue with you. It would not be out of the question that at that time in the outbreak, I would have said that.</p> <p>Q In fact, you made several statements that are similar to that at that time frame; fair to say?</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p>Q Saying that masks are not effective --</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
315:17 - 317:17	<p>Q -- in keeping out the virus, and I don't recommend you wear masks, in February of 2020?</p> <p>A Yeah, in the very early months prior to our understanding of the virus and its modality of transmission, I, the surgeon general, and the CDC were not recommending masks for people for three reasons. I'd be happy to tell you those three reasons.</p> <p>Q Please do.</p> <p>A The three reasons are as follows: There was this understanding and discussion that the best masks that we used in hospitals were in short supply, and if people did a run on masks and bought them all, that masks would not be available for the people in the medical community who needed them; point number one. Point number two, there was no evidence at the time or any studies that showed outside of the medical environment, i.e., in a hospital or in an ICU, that masks actually worked in protecting transmission or acquisition. At the time, there were no studies. And thirdly, we were not aware at the time that 50 to 60 percent of the transmission occur from someone who is without symptoms, either someone who never will develop symptoms or someone who is in the presymptomatic stage. So based on those three considerations, both myself, the surgeon general, and the CDC were saying you really don't need to wear masks. Then things changed. Three things changed: A, it was clear that there was not a shortage, and that if people wore masks, they would not be taking masks away from the medical community. Two, it became clear that there was an asymptomatic spread of -- of -- of virus where people walking around not knowing they're infected were spreading virus. And then three, it became clear -- let me see. It was three? There was asymptomatic spread -- oh. Evidence began accumulating that masks actually work in preventing acquisition and transmission. So the three reasons that I might have said and did say -- if that is correct -- that you don't need to wear a mask now, particularly in a low risk situation, the basis for those statements dramatically changed over a period of time, which then made me be a very vocal proponent of wearing masks.</p> <p>Q And you became a vocal proponent as soon as April 3rd of 2020 -- correct -- when you joined a universal recommendation --</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
317:18 - 318:11	<p>Q -- a recommendation for universal masking; correct?</p> <p>A I'm not sure of the dates, why --</p> <p>Q How many studies were done between February of 2020, when you e-mailed Ms. Burwell and told her that "the typical mask you buy in the drugstore is not really effective in keeping out virus, which is small enough to pass through the material," between when you said that and April 3rd of 2020, what studies were done of the efficacy of masks --</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p>Q -- in preventing the spread of -- of COVID-19? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Speculative. THE WITNESS: I could find those and -- and get them for you, but I don't have them in my fingertips right</p>

	<p>now. BY MR. SAUER:  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
318:12 - 318:15	<p>Q Who'd you consult with about the efficacy of masks during that time period? Who'd you talk to in the government about it?  A I don't recall who I spoke to.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
318:16 - 318:23	<p>Q Did your opinion on masking change based on new information and new scientific evidence that came forward?  A I believe it did, yes.  Q Was there disputes about the efficacy of masking at that time? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Vague. BY MR. SAUER:  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
318:24 - 319:16	<p>Q For example, on March 31st, 2020, where you forwarded a -- a study showing that masking is ineffective; a review of masking on March 31st, 2020 that said there was no evidence that masks works -- that masks worked? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: Yeah, I don't recall that, so I'm not able to answer that accurately, I believe. BY MR. SAUER:  Q Is it important for that kind of development of your view that you had access to both sides of that debate? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. Vague. THE WITNESS: You always have access to both sides of the debate. BY MR. SAUER:  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
319:17 - 319:21	<p>Q Do you? In science, do you always have access to both sides of the debate?  A Most of time.  Q Is that important for people --  A Yeah.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
319:22 - 321:25	<p>Q -- to have access to both sides of the debate?  A Yeah, and then you make a decision based on your judgment based on the preponderance of the correct data.  Q Right. And so you would look at the studies --  A Yeah.  Q -- that come one way --  A Yeah.  Q -- or the opinions --  A Sure.  Q -- one way and look at the studies that go the other way? Is that --  A Yeah, but often there are studies that when you subject them to proper physical statistical analysis, that the conclusions don't hold up; that happens often. So you've got to be careful when you're looking at one study versus another that it goes through the proper statistical analysis and there's proper design.  Q Part of the reason that you recommended against masking in February was to avoid too many people going out and buying masks to ensure that they were available for --  A That was one of the reasons, yes.  Q -- to be available for healthcare providers; correct?  A That was one of the reasons is that we were told multiple times at the coronavirus task force meeting, that there was a shortage of masks, and that if, in fact, there was a run on the purchase of masks, that that could potentially lead to a shortage for the healthcare providers that really needed them.  Q So the recommendation you gave as to masks was motivated in part by not wanting people to go out and -- and buy a bunch of masks, so that the people who really needed them wouldn't have them?  A That was one of the considerations that was discussed at the coronavirus task force, that there was a shortage of masks, which led to a lot of activities of trying to increase the supply of masks, either by importing them because many of the masks were made outside of the United States, increasing production of masks, or using alternative masks, such as cloth masks. So the -- the discussion, the dialogue -- the discussion at the time was that there is a shortage of masks. We were trying desperately to get masks as well other personal protective equipment into the country, and there was a concern that</p>

	<p>there was a shortage of them. That was one of the considerations which went into a lack of promoting, go out and buy masks and wear masks.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
322:1 - 322:5	<p>Q Were there placebo-based, randomized, double-blind studies of the efficacy of masking that were done between February and April of 2020?</p> <p>A I don't recall. I'd have to go back and take a close look at the literature. I don't recall.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
322:6 - 322:16	<p>Q Have you seen any studies that contradict the efficacy of masking?</p> <p>A There were some studies early on -- I don't know the dates of them -- that made the statement that masks were not effective. When those studies were subject to statistical scrutinization, they were felt to be not definitive. Subsequent to that time, there have been studies to indicate that in situations where mask wearing was compared to not mask wearing, that masks clearly have an effect.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
322:17 - 324:9	<p>Q In a situation like this, a debate about the efficacy of mask wearing, is it important for people to have access to both sides of the debate but to propose -- to expose the different viewpoints reflected in the debate? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Argumentative. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Is it important?</p> <p>A Is it important for people? I think it's important for people to have all of the information that's available.</p> <p>Q And so they can assess what's good information and what's bad information?</p> <p>A Yeah. Well, you know, it depends. If information is clearly inadequate and statistically not sound, there can be a danger in people who don't have the ability or the experience of being able to understand that it's a flawed study, that that's when the literature is self-correcting. Science is self-correcting. So if you have something that makes a certain statement based on data that isn't statistically significant, that often there are studies that come out and examine that and do proper statistical analysis to try and get the real truth of what the data are showing. MR. SAUER: Can you give the witness Exhibit 56? (FAUCI Exhibit No. 56 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q It's right there. We marked it before the break. Here's an e-mail chain from October of 2020. Do you see that at the top?</p> <p>A October 30th, 2020, from Jen Routh?</p> <p>Q Yeah, and she's on your communications team; is that right?</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p>Q And she's e-mailing with people -- some people from -- with Google.com e-mail addresses in the "to" line?</p> <p>A Yeah. There's Google, yeah.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
324:10 - 325:6	<p>Q And then she's copying Courtney Billet, who is the head of your communications team; correct?</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p>Q And the second page of this e-mail, can you turn to that? There's an e-mail from -- that -- this chain begins with an e-mail from a Sandra Sitar from NIAID; correct?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q Do you know who she is?</p> <p>A It says director of communications, clinical trials program, VRC. I don't recognize the name, but the signature block indicates she is part of the vaccine research center at NIAID.</p> <p>Q And she's e-mailing Jen -- Jennifer Routh saying, "As I mentioned, Jan and the Google team are hoping to connect on vaccine communications, specifically misinformation." Do you see that? It's the second full paragraph on this page. MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. Mischaracterizes the evidence. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
325:7 - 326:13	<p>Q Do you see where Sandra writes that Jen and the Google team are hoping to connect on vaccine communications, specifically misinformation?</p> <p>A I'm reading it, yeah.</p> <p>Q Did your communications team communicate with the Google, YouTube team about vaccine misinformation? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Speculative. THE WITNESS: Not to my knowledge. I</p>

	<p>don't -- I don't know if they did. I have no knowledge that they did. BY MR. SAUER:  Q Page before this, go to the first page; e-mailing from the Google person, says, "Hi, Sandra and Jen, thank you so much for reaching out. It would be great to find a time early next week for a quick call on vaccine communications." Do you know if your team had that call in October 30th of 2020 or thereabouts with Google about vaccine communications? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Speculative.  BY MR. SAUER:  Q Do you know?  A Not to my knowledge.  Q Did you --  A I don't recall that, no.  Q Did you authorize them to talk to Google about vaccine communications including misinformation - or, actually, specifically misinformation?  A That would be unlikely that I would authorize or not authorize someone to do that, again.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
326:14 - 327:14	<p>Q You don't believe you authorized your communication team to communicate with Google about vaccine misinformation?  A When you say "authorize," I'm -- it doesn't work -- it doesn't work that way in the institute. The communication team would -- if they were going to do it, they would do it.  Q Okay. So they would just do this on their own to the extent they did it?  A Yeah. I don't think that they would need my permission to communicate with people. That's -- that's their job.  Q And then Jan -- sorry -- Jen Routh then looped in Courtney Billet, who's the head of your communications team; correct? At the very top of the e-mail? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Speculative. BY MR. SAUER:  Q Where it says, "Hi, Jen, I'm adding Courtney Billet, Director of the Office of Communications and Government Relations at NIAID" --  A Right.  Q -- "to talk about vaccine communications." She's -- Courtney Billet is the director of your whole communications team; right?  A Right. Yes, she is.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
327:15 - 327:23	<p>Q And you never discussed with her having communications with Google about vaccine misinformation? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Asked and answered. THE WITNESS: I don't recall having specific conversations with Courtney about communicating with Google. BY MR. SAUER:  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
327:24 - 328:3	<p>Q Exhibit 57. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 57 was marked for identification.) (Discussion off the record.) BY MR. SAUER:  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
328:4 - 328:7	<p>Q Just briefly, if you look at the second page of this exhibit, do you see an e-mail from someone called Clarke Humphrey?  A Clarke Humphrey, July 2021. Okay.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
328:8 - 328:19	<p>Q The second page -- do you know who Clarke Humphrey is?  A She -- Clarke, I believe, is one of the communications people at the White House.  Q And she e-mailed to -- at Facebook in July of 2021 saying, "Hi there, any way we can get this pulled down? It is not actually one of ours," with a link to an Instagram account called Anthony Fauci official; correct?  A It says, "Subject: Deactivating the fake Fauci IG," which I would imagine is Instagram. I don't know if that's what that is.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
328:20 - 329:7	<p>Q Were you aware that the White House was communicating with Facebook to have accounts with your name taken down?  A The only thing I remember is someone mentioning that there's fake stuff impersonating me going on. I don't specifically recall who specifically was asked to address that problem of people</p>

	<p>impersonating me, but I know that there was some talk. Someone mentioned to me in my group that there's an impersonation of you going on out there. I don't recall anything specific except that they're obviously trying to do something about it.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
329:8 - 329:19	<p>Q And, in fact, they succeeded, it looks like, where Carrie Adams says, "This account has been removed. Thank you for flagging," in the second e-mail on the first page. Do you see that?</p> <p>A "This account has been removed. Thank you for flagging." So they removed a spurious, fake account, which I think was a good thing --</p> <p>Q At the request of the --</p> <p>A -- because those accounts are bad.</p> <p>Q At the request of the White House? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Speculative. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
329:20 - 330:4	<p>Q Or Clarke Humphrey, the digital director for the White House? Is that your understanding of that e-mail? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Speculative. THE WITNESS: I wasn't even know you were asking me questions. Clarke Humphrey is at the White House, and there was communication that there was a fake, impersonating Fauci Instagram that was deactivated. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
330:5 - 330:9	<p>Q Can you look at Exhibit 58? (FAUCI Exhibit No. 58 was marked for identification.) THE WITNESS: Okay. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
330:10 - 330:20	<p>Q Here is an e-mail chain between people at Google and people at the CDC that include Carol Crawford; correct?</p> <p>A Hold on. Carol Crawford of the CDC; right? So I'm -- there's a bunch of e-mails here. So what -- what do you want -- you want me to read this and then you'll ask your question or --</p> <p>Q No. I just want to ask you on the first page, do you see there's an e-mail from Catherine Jamal of the CDC; right?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
330:21 - 331:14	<p>Q And she's sending it to two people at Facebook and copying Carol Crawford; correct?</p> <p>A Copy Carol Crawford, yes.</p> <p>Q And it says -- the subject is: Ivermectin questions for the CDC; correct?</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p>Q And in that e-mail, this -- Ms. Jamal notifies -- or gives Facebook the CDC's position on three claims: The claim that ivermectin -- ivermectin is effective in treating COVID with the answer that that is not accurate; correct? That's the first item.</p> <p>A That's Item Number 1. That's what it says: Ivermectin is effective in treating COVID. And, I believe -- is this what the CDC said, "Answer is not accurate"? I would imagine that that's what they typed in.</p> <p>Q Yeah, and if you look at each of those --</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
331:15 - 332:5	<p>Q -- what they're citing for their claim that ivermectin -- the claim about ivermectin's effectiveness is not accurate --</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q -- is they link to something from the NIH; correct? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Speculative. THE WITNESS: I see a guideline that says: Practice guideline, COVID-19 guideline, treatment management.</p> <p>Q And do you see something before that or nearly before that where it says: Ivermectin COVID-19 treatment guidelines, and then in parentheses NIH.gov?</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
332:6 - 333:9	<p>Q Were you aware that the CDC citing NIH provided information to debunk claims about efficacy of ivermectin to Facebook? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Were you aware?</p> <p>A I was -- I was not aware of this, but this is not surprising. Just a second somebody is -- just let me --</p>

	<p>I was not aware, but it's not surprising that organizations, including the CDC, would use the treatment guidelines of the NIH, which is, as I mentioned before in a prior question you asked me, it's a group of, you know, up to 40 people who are infectious disease experts from throughout the country, usually the chiefs of infectious diseases at various medical centers throughout the country. So it's not at all surprising that when people want to find out what the latest documented information and clinical opinions among the top infectious disease people, that they would refer to or access the treatment guidelines.</p> <p>Q Would it be surprising if the social media platforms also relied on the public statements of someone like yourself on matters of health policy for their own decisions? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Speculative. BY MR. SAUER:  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
333:10 - 333:14	<p>Q You just said it would not be surprising if they relied on the published NIH guidelines --</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p>Q -- to debunk --</p> <p>A Right.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
333:15 - 334:1	<p>Q -- ivermectin claims. Would it be surprising if they relied on public statements by Dr. Fauci about the efficacy of --</p> <p>A I don't think that --</p> <p>Q -- ivermectin?</p> <p>A I don't think that would have as much weight as the measured, scholarly analysis of hundreds of articles that the treatment guideline panel -- so the weight of the opinion of 30 to 40 infectious diseases experts would likely carry considerably more weight than the statement by an individual physician or scientist.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
334:2 - 334:5	<p>Q Multiple times today you've characterized your opinions as reflecting and reporting on the consensus of that 40 scholars --</p> <p>A Right.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
334:6 - 334:18	<p>Q -- and if you make a public statement, is it surprising if social media platforms take your public statement and view it as reflecting knowledge of that kind of consensus of government experts or public health authorities? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Speculative. Compound. THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm not -- it's a convoluted question. I'm not sure really what the point you're making. BY MR. SAUER:  Q Exhibit 59.  A Yeah.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
334:19 - 334:22	<p>Q Have ever heard of -- sorry. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 59 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
334:23 - 335:13	<p>Q Have you ever heard of Alex Berenson?</p> <p>A I've heard of him. I'm not sure -- I'm trying to remember what context, but now you've put this in front of me, and it -- it's the person who says that the White House demanded Twitter ban -- ban me months before the company did so. I had never heard of who Alex Berenson was before this, but -- I mean, not before this but I had heard that there was an issue that he was complaining that he was being banned. I don't even know who -- who he is.</p> <p>Q What -- what issue did you hear about?</p> <p>A I think he was complaining that he was being muzzled or something. I -- something like that. Again, I don't pay attention to these social media things of people getting banned or impeded or what have you. That's not an interest of mine.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>
335:14 - 335:16	<p>Q Can you look at the second paragraph of this document, Exhibit 59?</p> <p>A Yes.  <a href="#">Summary</a></p>

335:17 - 335:25	<p>Q See how it says -- you know, in this subset post by Alex Berenson, he says, "In a White House meeting in April 2021, four months before Twitter suspended my account, the company faced one really tough question about why Alex Berenson hadn't been kicked off the platform." Do you recall -- you were the White House chief medical advisor in April of 2021; correct?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
336:1 - 336:12	<p>Q Do you recall any communications or discussion of Alex Berenson, as a vaccine critic, being on Twitter, or being booted off Twitter?</p> <p>A I don't recall that, no.</p> <p>Q Do you remember -- were you aware of any meeting between -- do you know who Andy Slavitt is or Slavitt?</p> <p>A Andy Slavitt for a relatively small period of time was a part of the coronavirus team. He was at the White House a fair amount, and then he left, and I forgot where he went, but he was with the group at the White House for a few months.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
336:13 - 336:16	<p>Q How about Rob Flaherty? Do you know who that is?</p> <p>A No. I know Andy Slavitt. I don't know Rob Flaherty.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
336:17 - 337:6	<p>Q Do you know who the digital director is at the White House, coronavirus response team?</p> <p>A Digital? I thought that was Clarke, or maybe Clarke reports to the director.</p> <p>Q Let me ask you this: Were you aware of a meeting between Andy Slavitt, Rob Flaherty, and people at Twitter in April of 2021 to discuss vaccine misinformation? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Were you aware of it?</p> <p>A I don't recall. I mean, you're bringing it up. It doesn't ring a bell that I was aware of it.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
337:7 - 338:9	<p>Q Can you turn to the third page of this document? At the very bottom, in the Twitter employee Slack message thread, it says: Andy Slavitt -- it says, "They really wanted to know about Alex Berenson"; the very bottom post. Do you see that?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p>Q And then it says, "Andy Slavitt suggested they had seen data viz that had showed he was the epicenter of the disinfo that radiated outwards to the persuadable public." Do you see that?</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p>Q Were you aware of any discussions of someone on Twitter who was, you know, an epicenter of disinformation radiating outward to the persuadable public about vaccines? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: You know, you're asking me if I was aware of -- I mean, there was always talk about misinformation and disinformation. I'm not aware of any connection, to my memory. Maybe someone casually mentioned it of -- you know, I don't even know the connection, whether An -- Berenson was -- no. I mean, this does -- this does not ring a bell to me, to be honest with you. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
338:10 - 340:6	<p>Q Well, do you remember any discussions more generally of misinformation and disinformation on social media leading to vaccine hesitancy?</p> <p>A You know, there's a lot of different discussions about misinformation. You're making a connection between misinformation and something about social media. It's all blob about misinformation.</p> <p>Q Well, let's take the whole blob. What sort of discussions were there about misinformation? You say there's discussions about --</p> <p>A Well, I'll give you an example.</p> <p>Q Yeah, that'd be great.</p> <p>A The misinformation that Bill Gates and I put a chip in the vaccine to monitor people, and, therefore, people should not get vaccinated. I think that falls under the category of disinformation.</p> <p>Q Or misinformation if people honestly --</p> <p>A No, this is dis --</p> <p>Q Okay.</p>

	<p>A Because I didn't put a chip, so this dis.</p> <p>Q I think they're both false -- right -- mis and dis are both incorrect --</p> <p>A Yeah, yeah --</p> <p>Q -- under your definition.</p> <p>A Yeah, but --</p> <p>Q You testified to earlier --</p> <p>A Yeah, right, but the disinformation -- MR. KIRSCHNER: Please let the witness finish. THE WITNESS: Yeah, but the disinformation is when you deliberately get -- propagate information that you know to be true.^ there's no evidence because it isn't true that I put a chip in the vaccine. So I think that qualifies as disinformation. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Were there discussions of that with your colleagues at the White House about that particular issue of trying to stop the spread of that kind of disinformation?</p> <p>A No, no, I -- you know, you just said something important. I never engaged in any discussion about stopping the spread. It just was been disconcerted that there's so much disinformation going on out there. I don't recall, to my knowledge, that I got involved in any discussions about stopping or blocking things.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
340:7 - 340:10	<p>Q So your testimony is that you were never involved in any discussions about stopping the spread of disinformation --</p> <p>A Not -- no.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
340:11 - 340:24	<p>Q If I may finish the question. So your recollection is that you have never been involved in any discussions about stopping the spread of disinformation, whether on social media or elsewhere?</p> <p>A I don't recall. Someone may have mentioned that we should be stopping misinformation, but I don't recall specifically that I was involved in interfering with the dissemination, not to my recollection. Like I said, someone may have made a mention of that, but I didn't put it squarely on my radar screen. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 60 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
340:25 - 341:14	<p>Q If you'd look at Exhibit 60, is this a report from The Hill dated July 11th of 2021?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p>Q And if you turn to -- it reports on some of your public comments on a Sunday talk show -- correct -- I think on CNN State of the Union? MR. KIRSCHNER: I would ask for the witness to be able to familiarize himself. THE WITNESS: I have to -- I have to read this before I make any comments, so I'm going to read the whole thing. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q You'll see there at the top of the second page of the document --</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
341:15 - 341:18	<p>Q Where it says, "Fauci was responding to a clip of conservative author Alex Berenson, who spoke at CPAC on Saturday"; correct?</p> <p>A Correct.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
341:19 - 342:25	<p>Q Does that jog your memory as to who Alex Berenson is?</p> <p>A It does jog my memory to who he is because at that time, they were talking about this CPAC where people were cheering on not taking a lifesaving intervention. And it says in this Exhibit 60, Fauci was responding to a clip of conservative author Alex Berenson who spoke at CPAC. So it looks like on the show, the Sunday show, that they showed me a clip of this person who I very likely had not heard of before saying that, quote -- they quote Berenson, "The government was hoping that they could sort of sucker 90 percent of the population into getting vaccinated, and it isn't happening," he added, to applause.</p> <p>Q And then you made a response to that on CNN State of the Union where you described it as horrifying; correct?</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p>Q It quotes you as saying, "It's horrifying." Is that what you said?</p> <p>A Well, this is the quote that they're saying here. I don't recall saying it's horrifying, but I have no</p>

	<p>reason to believe that CNN would misquote me.</p> <p>Q And they went on to -- or The Hill -- it goes on to say in the next paragraph that "Fauci said it was almost frightening for people to say they don't want health officials to save their lives"; right?</p> <p>A That's what it says that I said. I have no reason to believe that's not what I said.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
343:1 - 343:15	<p>Q Were there any discussions before you made these comments on CNN State of the Union on -- in July of 2021, were there any -- did you have any discussions with anyone in the government about making statements to criticize Alex Berenson in any way?</p> <p>A I don't recall. Again, the context of this "almost frightening for people to say," if one looks at the data comparing the hospitalizations and deaths of vaccinated people and unvaccinated people, it is overwhelmingly weighted towards unvaccinated people. So someone cheering to the statement that you shouldn't be vaccinating people, I think is really very much contrary to the principles of good public health.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
343:16 - 343:23	<p>Q Before you made those comments, do you recall discussing Alex Berenson with anyone in the government?</p> <p>A I don't recall that. It is possible, but, again, Alex Berenson rings the bell here when you show me this clip. But, again, I -- I don't recall any necessary discussions with him. They may have occurred, but I don't recall.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
343:24 - 344:2	<p>Q Exhibit 61. Five days -- oh, sorry. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 61 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
344:3 - 344:16	<p>Q You see this is a New York Times report dated five days later on July 16th of 2021?</p> <p>A I don't see the date. Yeah, July 16th, 2021. MR. KIRSCHNER: Just to clarify the record, it also says it was updated July 19th, 2021. THE WITNESS: Right. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q And the first line says, "President Biden unleashed his growing frustration with Social Media on Friday saying that platforms like Facebook were killing people by allowing disinformation about the coronavirus vaccine to spread online"; correct?</p> <p>A That's what the first sentence says.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
344:17 - 345:2	<p>Q Do you recall the president saying that, that social media companies are, quote, "killing people"?</p> <p>A I don't recall him saying that, but this is reported by the New York Times saying that that's what he said. So I have no reason to believe that he did not say that, but I don't specifically recall him saying that specific comment. I may -- I may have been aware of it when he said it, but I don't recall now that he said it except when you put this statement in front of me.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
345:3 - 345:15	<p>Q Do you recall any discussions with anyone in the government of how disinformation or misinformation on social media platforms are killing people?</p> <p>A Well, it is very clear that, as I've said multiple times before, that misinformation and disinformation, particularly that encourages people to avoid lifesaving interventions, can certainly result in the unnecessary death of people whose lives would have been saved. So when misinformation and disinformation leads people to avoid a lifesaving intervention, that is equivalent to contributing to the death of that person.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
345:16 - 346:4	<p>Q My question was: Do you recall discussing that with anyone in the government in this time frame?</p> <p>MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. Vague. THE WITNESS: You know, when you say "anyone in the government," I have often said that misinformation and disinformation is the enemy of public health. Could I have said it to someone in the government? It is certainly possible that I did because I do feel strongly that misinformation and disinformation, when it leads to people avoiding lifesaving interventions, can be deadly. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
346:5 - 346:7	<p>Q Misinformation and disinformation are the enemy of public health you said just now?</p> <p>A Yeah.</p>

	<a href="#">Summary</a>
346:8 - 346:13	<p>Q Is that true when they are propagated on social media platforms, on your view? Yes or no?</p> <p>A If social media is propagating disinformation that leads to the death of people by encouraging them to avoid lifesaving interventions, I believe that's contrary to public health.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
346:14 - 346:20	<p>Q Can you look at Exhibit 62? (FAUCI Exhibit No. 62 was marked for identification.) MR. KIRSCHNER: Can I get a copy, Counsel? There's -- I don't know what this is. MR. SAUER: Oh. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
346:21 - 347:14	<p>Q Do you know who Scott Gottlieb is?</p> <p>A I do.</p> <p>Q Do you know him personally?</p> <p>A Well, I've met him. I -- I don't socially interact with him. I know him because for a time he was the commissioner of the FDA, and currently he is frequently on CBS Sunday Morning shows commenting on COVID-19 and other health matters.</p> <p>Q In 2021, did you have any communications with him about vaccines or misinformation? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Compound. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Do you recall communicating with him in any way in the summer of 2021?</p> <p>A You know, I may have, but I don't recall. I communicate with hundreds, if not many more people. So I don't recall specifically. But if you showed me a document of some sort that showed I communicated with him, I would not be surprised.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
347:15 - 348:6	<p>Q Why don't you look at the Exhibit 62 on the first page in the middle of that page? Do you see there's a -- you see this is another subset post by Alex Berenson talking about how he was banned from Twitter, generally?</p> <p>A I'm sorry. What paragraph are you referring to?</p> <p>Q I'll tell you, will you look at that -- that kind of e-mail that's pasted in the middle of the page --</p> <p>A Pasted in the middle -- oh, the pasted e-mail.</p> <p>Q The one that shows --</p> <p>A Scott Gottlieb to someone that has been redacted.</p> <p>Q Someone at Twitter?</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
348:7 - 349:6	<p>Q And he's forwarded a posting by Alex Berenson that's critical of you; right? "Quite frankly," said Alex Berenson, "the arrogance of Anthony Fauci and what it means for the rest of us"; correct?</p> <p>A So Berenson said the arrogance of Anthony Fauci and what it means for the rest of us?</p> <p>Q And then Gottlieb forwarded that to someone at Twitter; correct? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Lack of foundation. THE WITNESS: Yeah. So I want to make sure I understand what you're saying. So this is a -- this is a tweet from Berenson calling me arrogant, and then it's Scott forwarding the tweet to Twitter saying this is what is promoted on Twitter and this is why Tony needs a security detail? BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Correct, yeah. Tony is a reference to you, I presume?</p> <p>A There's a lot of Tonys around, but I guess he's talking about me.</p> <p>Q I mean, that's the one that's referred in the e-mail.</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
349:7 - 349:23	<p>Q Did you ever have a discussion with Scott Gottlieb about needing a security detail because of the things that people posted about you on the Internet?</p> <p>A I don't recall having that discussion with him, but it is possible in a discussion I had with him that -- it's no secret that I have a security detail. My life has been threatened multiple times. So I might have discussed that I need a security detail with him, but I -- that doesn't ring a bell as something -- unless there was a reason for me to -- I don't usually talk to people about my security detail.</p> <p>Q He refers to you as "Tony" in this e-mail --</p> <p>A Everybody refers to me as Tony. We said -- we got that established before.</p>

	<a href="#">Summary</a>
349:24 - 350:2	<p>Q Is there somebody at Twitter who was on a first-name basis with you? I would refer to you as Dr. Fauci --</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
350:3 - 350:15	<p>Q -- if I was sending it to someone who didn't know you. Is there someone who works for Twitter who -- who you're on a first-name basis with?</p> <p>A Scott -- Scott refers to me as Tony, but I don't see anybody on Twitter referring to me as Tony.</p> <p>Q He's referring you to some unidentified person --</p> <p>A But he's using his own --</p> <p>Q If I may finish the question?</p> <p>A Yeah, yeah. Sure. Sorry.</p> <p>Q He's referring to you as Tony to some unidentified person at Twitter?</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
350:16 - 350:23	<p>Q Are you on a first-name basis with anyone who works at Twitter? Yes or no?</p> <p>A Am I on a first-name basis of anyone who works at Twitter?</p> <p>Q Correct. That's my question.</p> <p>A Well, right now, no, but when my daughter worked at Twitter, I was on a first-name basis with her.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
350:24 - 351:2	<p>Q Did she work at Twitter in August 24th of 2021?</p> <p>A I don't recall. She may have already left then.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
351:3 - 352:11	<p>Q Did anyone else -- have you ever been on a first-name basis with anyone else who worked at Twitter?</p> <p>A Not that I know of. Not that I know of. I mean, I'm trying to think of people that I know at Twitter, and the only person that I've really known that works at Twitter, I believe, is my daughter.</p> <p>Q Did you have any communications with -- at this time, Scott Gottlieb was on the board of Pfizer; is that right?</p> <p>A He might -- I know he's on -- I believe -- I believe he's on the board of Pfizer. I don't know if he was on the board of Pfizer at this time.</p> <p>Q Did you have any communications with him in connection with the development of the vaccines that you talked about earlier?</p> <p>A You know, I don't know. I mean, we talk about the development of vaccines all the time. Vaccines was a big subject of discussion from the time we began developing the vaccines; right? In a few weeks into January we began developing the vaccine. So we spoke about vaccine development a lot. Did -- would I have mentioned vaccine development to Scott? I don't see any reason why I would not, but I don't specifically recall discussing vaccine development with Scott.</p> <p>Q How about discussing any speech on the internet that would lead to vaccine hesitancy? Did you discuss that with him? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Vague. THE WITNESS: You know, again, I don't -- I don't recall specific conversations with Scott about hardly anything. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
352:12 - 352:18	<p>Q How about Alex Berenson? Did you ever discuss Alex Berenson with Scott Gottlieb?</p> <p>A You know, again, you had mentioned before, I -- Alex Berenson doesn't ring a bell. It's possible associated with some of the things you showed me before, but I don't recall discussing Alex Berenson with Scott Gottlieb.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
352:19 - 352:22	<p>Q Exhibit 63. (FAUCI Exhibit No. 63 was marked for identification.) BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
352:23 - 353:4	<p>Q Who is Ezekiel J. Emmanuel?</p> <p>A Ezekiel J, better known as Zeke Emmanuel, is a vice provost at the University of Pennsylvania and was at a time and might still be the director of the division or program of medical ethics.</p> <p>Q At the university? At that university?</p> <p>A At the University of Pennsylvania.</p>

	<p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
353:5 - 355:25	<p>Q In this e-mail chain, he says to you on the second to last page, "I'm a bit perplexed by your seeming strong endorsement of remdesivir. Was it just a bit forced? My reading of the data were weak and in normal times for normal disease. It is not enough to approve and very likely to really impact COVID-19 disease pattern regardless of supply issues." Do you see that?</p> <p>A Yeah.</p> <p>Q And what were you talking -- what was he talking about there? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Again, I ask for Dr. Fauci to have an opportunity to familiarize himself with this document. THE WITNESS: So there was a clinical trial that showed a modest effect but nonetheless a clear but modest effect of remdesivir, which is an antiviral drug used for the treatment of COVID-19. And when the announcement came out of the clinical trial, I believe, I said this is a good thing that we have a drug when we had no other drugs. This is well before Paxlovid, so we had no good drugs for COVID. And when the study came out, I was pleased that we had a drug that at least had a modest effect. Zeke, who is a good person, said my reading of the data were weak and normal times for normal disease, not enough to approve, yada, ya, and I write back, and say, "Zeke, I did not strongly endorse it." I specifically said that it was not a knockout drug but was only a baby step in the development -- in the direction of developing more and better drugs. I said it was important because it proved in a well-powered -- which it was -- "randomized" -- which it was -- "placebo-controlled trial that one can suppress the virus enough to see a clinical effect as modest as that effect was." I do not think -- BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q If I may right there.</p> <p>A -- that I forced anything.</p> <p>Q Dr. Fauci, thank you. Why don't we go off the record now? MR. KIRSCHNER: Okay. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Time is 4:46 p.m. and we're going off the record. (Recess.) THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 4:55 p.m. and we're back on the record. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p>Q Dr. Fauci, we've discussed a lot of opinions today about COVID and treatments for COVID and related things. For example, we talked about hydroxychloroquine; we talked about masks for a while and whether they're effective; we talked about the origins of COVID, whether it came out of a lab; we talked about vaccines and the efficacy of vaccines; we talked about herd immunity. And you've made some pretty strong statements in media about a lot of these issues -- is that fair to say -- using strong language to disagree with opinions that you disagree with? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Vague. THE WITNESS: No, I'm not sure what you mean by strong language. Most of the time it was measured language. I think you pointed out at one point when I was talking about the premise of herd immunity that I believe I said that it was nonsense which is -- if you want to call that strong language. I believe it resulted in the deaths of -- unnecessary deaths of individuals.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
356:1 - 356:4	<p>Q And people have disagreed with you in strong language as well. For example, Alex Berenson saying -- calling the arrogance of Dr. Fauci --</p> <p>A Right.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
356:5 - 356:17	<p>Q -- and so forth. Do you think people should be able to post their opinions on social media, for example, about the efficacy of hydroxychloroquine, even if you disagree with them? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Compound. THE WITNESS: You know, I'm not an expert on what should or should not be on social media. I ^ audio cuts out here believe that people certainly can express their opinions. I'm not an expert. I've said that multiple times during the deposition. I'm not a social media person. BY MR. SAUER:</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
356:18 - 357:18	<p>Q Do you have an opinion about whether people should be allowed to post on social media opinions that you think, for example, are dangerous and might lead to loss of life? What's your view on that?</p> <p>A You know, again, you say allowed, I don't know what the legal or other First Amendment issues are associated with that. That's not my lane or my area of expertise. As a physician and a scientist and a public health person, I'm very sensitive to the fact that disinformation, including some of the disinformation that we discussed that, for example, has people avoid lifesaving interventions, is dangerous to health. How you -- how you counter that I think is open to question. My way of</p>

	<p>countering false information, and I've been on the record multiple times as saying that, is that my approach is to try to ^ and flood the system with the correct information as opposed to interfering with other people's ability to say what they want to say. And I've said, I think, if you, in your investigations and your discovery, you looked into how many times I've often said the best way to counter misinformation and disinformation is to flood the system with correct information.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
357:19 - 358:4	<p>Q Do you think social media platforms have a responsibility to take down dangerous misinformation that gets posted on their platforms?</p> <p>A You know, I'm not an expert in the legal and other aspects of that to make an informed comment. I would leave that to experts. I told you I'm not someone fluent in the ins and outs of what could or should be on social media, so I don't really have any comment on that, because that's not an area that I've seriously thought about and analyzed about the pros and cons of that.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
358:5 - 358:19	<p>Q Do you think that allowing both sides to openly debate their positions on hotly contested issues, like the efficacy of hydroxychloroquine or where the COVID-19 virus came from, do you think it's important to allow both sides to freely debate those issues? MR. KIRSCHNER: Objection. Argumentative. THE WITNESS: You know, when you say allowed to debate, I think honest debate is important, but when it goes beyond debate and leads people who are unwitting about these things to do things that are clearly detrimental to their life and their safety, I find that disturbing. How you mitigate against that, I would leave to other people. That's not in my lane.</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>
358:20 - 359:22	<p>Q Have you taken steps to mitigate against it in the last two and a half years?</p> <p>A As I said, the theme that I've gone by is the best way to counter misinformation and disinformation is to flood the system with correct information. That's the reason why I very often am involved with the media with writing, with interviewing, with podcasts to get people to get vaccinated. The most recent of which was yesterday, I believe, when I was -- or the day before -- when I made my final press conference at the White House and my message was: Please go out for your own safety, the safety of your community and your family, to go out and get the updated booster. That's how I counter misinformation and disinformation. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: That is it. That's the seven hours. MR. KIRSCHNER: Very well. Two things: One, first, we have no questions for the witness, and second of all, we want to reserve the right to read and sign. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. If there's no further statements for record, we'll be going off. The time is 5:01 p.m. on November 23rd, 2022. We are going off the record completing today's video recorded session. (Whereupon, at 5:01 p.m., the taking of the deposition ceased.)</p> <p><a href="#">Summary</a></p>