

9 / 20 annotators highlight a paraphrase

**Guest:** Well, they do have an obligation to get the information out partly because, unless scientists and graduate students can get at this DNA information, they're not going to make new drugs. It's going to be tougher to get things studied in the laboratory. On the other hand, strangely enough, if you have the patent, you can make it available to those very groups that are doing research. To put it another way, they don't have an obligation to make it available to a big drug company. I think the big drug company can pay for it. But for the university scientist, for the student, there you can say: I have the patent, but I'm going to give it to you for free.

**Host:** Can a company have it both ways, though? Can they patent the information, profit from whatever research they develop, as well as share it with the rest of the scientific community? Can everybody be happy?

14 / 20 annotators highlight a paraphrase

**Guest:** Well, I said in another earlier today that he's not going to shoot the low score in every round. Maybe I'm going to be wrong about that.

**Host:** You might be wrong. He has a history in the last five of seven tournaments, when led after the first round, he won the whole thing. So we'll have to see if it plays out. I want to focus on this course, that your company put out this incredible book about – once, there are other public courses where the public is allowed to play, like Pebble Beach, but this is the first publicly owned court where the U.S. Open has been held.

19 / 20 annotators highlight a paraphrase

**Guest:** I think they do - in their defense, they do take attempts over the years to save money and become more efficient. I think they do it on a much smaller scale. But what was different about this case was when the results came back to the Pentagon, they acknowledged that one of the reasons they tried to bury this study is they were worried about the political ramifications from Congress - that Congress would use this as an excuse to slash the defense budget. As you know, Pentagon leaders over the last several years have been complaining in public that they don't have enough money to train troops, to put aircraft overseas and have ships on missions - that they need more money. They're really strapped. And what this study showed is that, yes, maybe they need more money for those things. But they're wasting an awful lot of money on the bureaucracy on the back office.

**Host:** You say the Pentagon buried the report. It was briefly posted online. There was some reporting on it when this came out in 2015.

18 / 20 annotators highlight a paraphrase

**Guest:** Well, there was no warning. It had been raining all day in the area, heavy at times, but this area of the turnpike, insofar as we can determine, has never had water go across the roadway in our 50-year history. So it certainly was an unexpected event and you know, sometimes we're just no match for nature. I think this was one of those times.

**Host:** So there were no prior indications of vulnerabilities on this I-35 stretch that in part was washed away along with these seven vehicles?

11 / 20 annotators highlight a paraphrase

**Guest:** Well, to paraphrase that famous bank robber Willie Sutton, Medicaid is where the money is. Even though the federal government pays more than half of the bill for Medicaid, the share that states pay consumes 22 percent of the average state's budget. That's more than states pay for education, more than they pay for transportation, more than they pay for prisons, which tend to be the next-largest items in states budgets. Then you have the complication that Medicaid is what we all a counter-cyclical program. That's a fancy way of saying that when the economy gets bad, more people lose their jobs, they get poor and they become eligible for Medicaid. So at the very time when states have less tax money coming in, they have more people who are qualifying for and getting on Medicaid.

**Host:** But it's not the people who've lost their jobs who cost Medicaid the most, is it?

20 / 21 annotators highlight a paraphrase

**Guest:** Well, what happened was we finally waved down a Coast Guard helicopter. And what they were looking for were people with disabilities and medical conditions, which none of us really had. They didn't lift any of us into the helicopter or anything. What they told us was to basically walk out of our house, up the street, trying to fight against the current that was going the opposite way of where we needed to go. And the rain was falling on - rushing onto our street, which is helping the current basically push against us.

**Host:** So you walked through that current to get to the higher ground or get to a drier spot? That's what you all did?

17 / 21 annotators highlight a paraphrase

**Guest:** That's correct. In many cases, the CDC would put out these charts and graphics. Dr. Birx would brief them. She did a lot of work every single night. I saw this woman wake up at 4:00 a.m. in the morning, she would use a lot of the CDC data for these task force meetings. Dr. Redfield would be in attendance. Dr. Fauci would be there as well, where we would review exactly where we were across the country, where the hot spots were and what was happening. A lot of these discussions also focused on the breakdown amongst age ranges, who we were seeing the most affected by this, was it affecting certain populations? And all of these discussions were being had. In terms of the manipulation of the data, it was people within the White House specifically tasking more junior level staff to try to find alternate, data that fit the narrative that they wanted, which was it only affects, you know, people above the age of 75 and it doesn't affect younger schoolchildren. It was all part of the narrative of we need to open up these schools, we need to open them up now.

**Host:** They were trying to minimize the risk of reopening schools and trying to go around the CDC is what I think you're saying or muscle the CDC into conforming to their views. And you were asked to be a part of this?

16 / 21 annotators highlight a paraphrase

**Guest:** Well, parents, it's really not a matter of what they say just once, but really, the quality and the quantity of the conversation really matter hand-in-hand. We know for the conversations to have an impact, there needs to be great frequency in the discussions, and we're seeing that now for the first time in many, many years. As you point out, the majority of parents now are having these discussions on a frequent basis, that needs to take place not only when the kids are teenagers, but when they are pre-teens and right through the teen years to add up, to have an impact.

**Host:** So a consistent message?

10 / 20 annotators highlight a paraphrase

**Guest:** This is not good.

**Host:** This is what you don't want happening with your menorah, folks.

7 / 21 annotators highlight a paraphrase

**Guest:** Well, I think there will be no question that either Bush or Gore, whoever gets the presidency, will attempt that. And this is what Mr. Bush has said all along: He's a unifier, not a divider. So you can be sure they're going to push that point forward. However, there will be lingering doubts, lingering tensions; and, of course, we'll see what happens over the next two, three years.

**Host:** What does that mean, Bob Dallek, if there is a crisis of legitimacy, or a problem with legitimacy, both here at home and overseas?