

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, D.C.

INTERVIEW OF: [REDACTED]

Friday, July 21, 2023

Washington, D.C.

The interview in the above matter was held in room 2237 Rayburn House Office Building, commencing at 10:00 a.m.

1 this letter was made public. The first time that I learned or became aware that the
2 Department was aware of and considering what, if any, action to take with respect to the
3 issue of threats of violence and acts of violence at school board meetings and other
4 school functions, I believe, was a few days before that.

5 Q Before the October 1st date you mentioned or that Friday?

6 A Yes.

7 Q And do you know what due diligence occurred at the Justice Department
8 between when this letter came out and the memo?

9 A So if I could ask you just to clarify, what due diligence?

10 Q Regarding the threats of violence or any violence that was alleged at school
11 board meetings?

12 A Sure. So the October 4th memo that you referred to earlier is not and was
13 not a direct response to this letter. So it was not a situation where diligence was
14 performed on this letter to decide whether a memo should issue. The Department of
15 Justice, prior to this letter being made public, was aware of a concern about violence
16 at -- violence and threats of violence at school board meetings and other school events.
17 And a process began to, you know, draft our language similar to what we did with
18 election threats and others. But there wasn't diligence -- because of -- the October 4th
19 memo was not a response to this, or it wasn't as if this letter was diligenced. The
20 concerns in there were known to the Justice Department already.

21 BY [REDACTED]:

22 Q I think in response to my colleague's question, you spoke about how -- you
23 know, what action the Justice Department would take on the issue. You knew a few
24 days before. Was that before the Friday, October 1st date or before the
25 September 29th date that the letter was sent?

1 A Yes, it is. I agree with that.

2 Q Okay.

3 I'm going to ask you some more questions about the task force operation --

4 A Sure.

5 Q -- as it existed there.

6 Can I mark for the record it will be number nine. Thank you.

7 [REDACTED] Exhibit No. 9

8 Was marked for identification.]

9 BY [REDACTED]:

10 Q Exhibit 9, this is an email chain that includes -- well, let me just read the
11 Bates number first. It's part of a DOJ production. It starts with Bates number 1367.
12 There are a couple of pages, for the record, here, and the Bates number is only on the
13 first page because we just blew it up so that you could see the text on the PowerPoint
14 slides on the second page.

15 If you have a minute, just look at that exhibit, if you would, [REDACTED], and let
16 me know if you have had a chance to familiarize yourself with it.

17 A So I'm not familiar with this email.

18 Q Okay.

19 A And I don't see my name on it. So I don't know if I was bcc'd or not, but I'm
20 familiar with the content of the email --

21 Q Okay.

22 A -- but not seeing this email itself.

23 The document, I don't know if it's an attachment or it just follows, I am familiar.
24 It appears to be a portion of a PowerPoint deck that I prepared for the initial task force
25 meeting.

1 Q If it's helpful, just on the first page within the body of the email, the
2 paragraph that has the redacted line --

3 A Uh-huh.

4 Q It refers to [REDACTED], and I don't know if that is you. Do you think that might
5 be referring to you?

6 A Yes, that's me.

7 Q Okay. Does that help you kind of orient what the email might have been
8 about with respect to you?

9 A Oh, I'm sorry. I know what the email is about.

10 Q Okay.

11 A This is just somebody reporting out our first task force meeting.

12 Q Okay.

13 A I guess what I'm saying is I don't think I received this email.

14 Q Okay.

15 A It appears to be from somebody at EOUSA to someone else at EOUSA saying
16 this is what we just discussed.

17 Q Okay. And the date on the email, though, is October 13th, 2021. Is that
18 fair?

19 A Yes, that's correct.

20 Q Do you believe this was the first meeting of the task force?

21 A I think so. I remember it being -- a decision being that we held on
22 Wednesdays. The timing of this makes it sound right, so yeah.

23 Q Okay.

24 And then the PowerPoint slides, did you say that you prepared them yourself?

25 A Yes, I did.

1 Q And so you're familiar with their content?

2 A Yes. Yes, I am.

3 Q Okay.

4 Let's just go through them a little bit.

5 A I mean, it's been almost 2 years.

6 Q I understand.

7 A So if I have to spend a little time looking, I hope you'll indulge me.

8 Q No worries. The pace is yours.

9 A Please go ahead.

10 Q Can you just tell -- so at the very top of the second page of the first

11 PowerPoint here, there is a sentence that says, quote, expectation of USAO is to meet

12 with LE, not school officials, end quote.

13 Do you see that statement?

14 A Yes.

15 Q And do I understand that correctly that what they're saying is that the U.S.

16 attorneys' offices should be holding meetings with law enforcement, referring to local law

17 enforcement, and not with school officials?

18 A That's correct.

19 Q And why is that?

20 A So this part of kind of the do-out or what you're going to do once this task

21 force is stood up, this portion, convening these meetings, was really for law enforcement

22 to be able to coordinate with each other, have discussions about what they're seeing and

23 then come up with an appropriate response. It was not to interact directly with school

24 officials or board members or really anyone outside of the law enforcement community.

25 This was a law enforcement effort to address a particular concern, that concern being

1 violence and threats of violence at school board functions.

2 Q Okay. And I'm going to direct your attention to the first slide.

3 A Okay.

4 Q The very first slide here, it is titled school board, school administrator threats
5 task force, and then it addresses examples of violence and threats. Is that correct?

6 A Yes.

7 Q And can you just go through some of these. The very first example, I don't
8 know what your eyesight is, but can you read the text in that first slide that describes the
9 first example?

10 A My eyesight is not good, but I can read this. So you just want me to read
11 the text?

12 Q If you don't mind. Let's start with the first one.

13 A Yes, so the first lighter blue box on the left of this exhibit, top row, says a
14 parent attacked a teacher following a mask dispute on the first day of school, a California
15 superintendent said. And then beneath that, Amador County Unified School District,
16 California, August 2021, and physical education.

17 Q Okay. And can you read the second one, please?

18 A Sure.

19 A parent physically assaulted a teacher by ripping a mask off her face. Eanes
20 Independent School District -- that's embarrassing -- Texas, July 2021, physical altercation.

21 Q And the third one, please.

22 A Three men carrying zip ties show up at a Tucson, Arizona elementary school
23 and threatened the principal with a citizen's arrest after the child of one man was told to
24 quarantine under county health guidelines. Mesquite Elementary School, Arizona,
25 September 2021, in-person confrontation.

1 Q And underneath that, there are three more examples. Can we go through
2 those as well?

3 A Sure.

4 Quote, I'm going in with 20 strong men, ellipses. I'm going to speak to the school
5 board, and I'm going to give them an option. They can leave or they can be removed,
6 end quote.

7 North Hampton County School District, Pennsylvania, August 2021, communicated
8 orally at rally.

9 Q And then continuing to the second middle slide there?

10 A Quote, all of you are going to be spoiled in severe ways. Get ready. All of
11 you targeted. Writer then -- sorry. In parentheses, writer then lists the school board
12 members' addresses. And this is a Waukesha school board, Wisconsin, August 2021,
13 communicated via social media.

14 Q And finally, the last slide or last example, I'm sorry.

15 A At the bottom?

16 Q The one right next -- the third one. I'm sorry.

17 A Okay.

18 Quote, we know who you are. We'll find you. We know who you are, end
19 quote. Williamson County school board, Tennessee, August 2021, communicated orally
20 to victim.

21 Q Okay. And there is one final one, which is at the very bottom, that little
22 visual.

23 A Sure.

24 It's an image of two men in a crosshair. It says at the top, you will be taken out
25 by vote or by force. And beneath their pictures are the words in all caps, in large font,

1 public enemies. And this is the Hackensack Board of Education, New Jersey,
2 September 2021.

3 There is a tool bar at the bottom of that slide that's covering some language. I'm
4 fairly confident that that language underneath says something to the effect of
5 communicated by U.S Mail. But there is a full version of this document that would not
6 have that tool bar covering the language if you want to check that.

7 Q All right. Thank you for that.

8 These examples are examples that you found when you were preparing for this
9 meeting. Is that correct?

10 A That's correct.

11 Q And where did you find those examples?

12 A These were public reports, news reports. I don't think it was anything
13 more sophisticated than, you know, a review of publicly available news reports online.

14 Q And why did you choose each of these as an example?

15 A So, you know, we talked a little bit before about jurisdiction. In each of the
16 94 U.S. attorney office districts, there was going to be a meeting of Federal, State, local,
17 tribal, territorial law enforcement. My goal was to educate the task force who may or
18 may not be interacting with these groups about what was and what was not in this area
19 of threats of violence and actual violence.

20 Each of these examples is a reported threat of violence, actual violence, as
21 opposed to someone just, you know, spouting off or speaking their mind or saying
22 controversial things, and I thought it was important for our task force to understand that.

23 And I think later in this document there's another slide that talks about, you know,
24 what is and what isn't outside of our agreement.

25 The other thing that I thought was important to do was to provide examples for

1 discussion amongst ourselves and possibly with these groups about, you know, what may
2 be purely local, what may be, you know, possibly Federal, what may be unquestionably
3 Federal, and that's the reason that at the bottom of each of these I try to describe -- well,
4 in each of these I describe not only the threat or the act of violence but also either how it
5 was communicated or how it was affected.

6 Q Because it's relevant to the Federal statute?

7 A Because it's relevant to whether there's Federal jurisdiction or not.

8 Q And is it fair to say that each of the examples as you've described them
9 involve either violence or threats of violence?

10 A Yes.

11 Q And all of these examples are occurring in --

12 A I'm sorry. Let me back up.

13 Q Go ahead.

14 A They involved in my view violence or threats of violence. I think part of the
15 discussion is whether, you know, for example, somebody saying we know who you are,
16 we'll find you, we know where you are. You know, I'm sure someone can argue that
17 that's not violence and not a threat of violence. But I think it was important for our task
18 force to understand the entire panoply of what kind of threats were out there. You
19 know, I take the view that's a threat of violence. Somebody else may not. But it's
20 something that as a task force we need to understand.

21 Q And as a former prosecutor, you know that -- I mean, it may be. It's a
22 factual question for a jury, and it's something that you might consider at the DOJ level
23 whether it's chargeable?

24 A What I can say is this is something that should be reviewed and considered,
25 as opposed to someone just saying, you know, I don't like our football field. I don't like

1 masks. I don't like this. This is the kind of stuff that our task force was focused on,
2 and, quite frankly, this is the kind of stuff that the memo is focused on.

3 Q Okay. And each of the examples that you just discussed occurred in either
4 the summer of the fall of 2021. Is that correct?

5 A Yes, it appears that's right.

6 Q I think the latest example that you have here was September of 2021.

7 A Yes.

8 Q And they also occurred over several jurisdictions within the United States.
9 Fair to say?

10 A Yes. Yes, geographic -- right. So these are not all the examples that, you
11 know, one would find if they searched for them, but I had a goal of, you know, geographic
12 diversity, different types of threats communicated in different ways, actual of violence
13 versus threats, that sort of thing. So my goal was to try to give an example of
14 everything. So geographic diversity is certainly part of it.

15 Q Okay.

16 And would you turn to the second page, please, of the exhibit. It appears that at
17 the meeting, according to these notes, after the examples of threats of violence were
18 presented, the task force proceeded to discuss, quote, purpose of the task force.

19 A Yes.

20 Q And this slide here, the section notes -- refers to the AG's October 4th
21 memorandum and the, quote, disturbing spike in instances of threats.

22 Do you see that reference?

23 A I do.

24 Q Now, did the disturbing spike in instances of threats refer to the type of
25 conduct that you just discussed in those examples, which occurred in various locations

1 throughout the country in the summer and fall of 2021?

2 A It refers to what I viewed as an increase in the incidents, some of which are
3 described on the prior page, you know, but, again, you know, when things like this
4 happen, they are typically -- you know, when these things unfortunately happen, they are
5 typically reported in the news.

6 So, you know, it was my view that as you went through the spring and the
7 summer, there was an increase in these things, similar to the increase that we saw incited
8 with respect to election threats, similar to the increase that we saw incited with respect
9 to violence on commercial aircraft.

10 Q So all of those things are actually happening at the same time that DOJ is
11 observing an increase in threats in these various substantive areas?

12 A Yes, that's correct.

13 Q That same slide that's titled purpose, there is a discussion of, quote, DOJ
14 response. Do you see that section?

15 A Yes.

16 Q And can you just read the bullet points that are listed under DOJ response?

17 A Sure. Instructions to USAOs, U.S. attorneys offices to convene meetings
18 with local law enforcement.

19 Next bullet, create training and guidance for use by potential victims.

20 Next bullet, nonenforcement ways to assist.

21 Next bullet, threat tracking and trend identification.

22 Q Okay. And did you prepare that portion of the presentation?

23 A Yes, I did.

24 Q And is that your understanding of what the DOJ's response was going to be
25 of the rise in threats?

1 A It was part of our discussion. So this is a discussion paper. But between
2 our -- you know, between what appears in I think the memo or the press release to the
3 memo and possibly my conversations with John Carlin, it was decided that, you know, the
4 task force was actually going to have tasks and these are what they were.

5 Q Okay. Could we go over each of them briefly.

6 A Of course.

7 Q The first one, instructions to U.S. attorneys' offices to convene meetings with
8 local law enforcement. What did that mean?

9 A So as we discussed a bit earlier, it was important to me, it was important to
10 the Federal Government, more -- sorry, important to DOJ, more importantly, to
11 understand the contours of its jurisdiction, where it had primary jurisdiction, where it had
12 shared jurisdiction, where it had no jurisdiction. And also, you know, the frequency and
13 severity of these kinds of instances throughout the Nation.

14 With that in mind, it was decided that the task force would instruct the U.S.
15 attorneys' offices, the U.S. attorneys in each office to bring together their local partners
16 and, with those partners, have a discussion about the concern about increased violence
17 at school meetings and whether U.S. attorneys' offices could assist, whether there
18 was -- you know, the issue was prevalent, whether local law enforcement thought they
19 had it in hand.

20 But the first task was we can't make decisions about what's actually going to
21 happen until we understand what the issue, what the problems are, and that problem is
22 not going to be the same across the entire country. It may be different in, you know,
23 Virginia, Eastern District of Virginia, and Western District of Virginia. So the idea was to
24 make sure that we didn't -- that we took a nuanced and fact-specific approach to
25 whatever the Federal response would be.

1 Q So with respect to that first bullet point, was DOJ in the mode of receiving
2 information from local law enforcement?

3 A Absolutely.

4 Q The second bullet point, create training and guidance for use by potential
5 victims. Can you explain what that meant?

6 A Sure. So one of the things that we learned as part of our work on the
7 election threats issue, and I think something else that prosecutors generally know is that
8 when someone is potentially the victim of crime, they may not always take the steps
9 necessary to preserve evidence that will allow prosecutors to bring defendants to justice.

10 So, for example, if in the context of what we're discussing here, if someone
11 received a voicemail on their phone saying -- and this is sadly one that I recall, but, you
12 know, don't bring your kid to school because, you know, you don't know what will
13 happen to her. And that was something reported to a teacher or school administrator
14 or something like that.

15 It might be that person's first inclination to just get that garbage off of their phone
16 and hit delete. Or if they get an email, do the same thing. Or these gentlemen in New
17 Jersey, you know, who found -- who received mail on their doorstep or in their mailbox
18 targeting them for death, it might be the easier thing just to say I don't want to think
19 about this. I'm going to delete it. I'm going to rip this up and throw it out. That, of
20 course, would frustrate efforts to prosecute the cases.

21 So part of our thinking here is that similar to what they did in the election threats
22 case is to create a one page or a slick sheet that would say, you know, these are the steps
23 you take in the unfortunate event that you're the victim of crime. So, you know, call the
24 police. You know, take pictures of any evidence. You know, if your car is vandalized or
25 something like that and a death threat is written on your car, take a picture of it before

1 you go wash it off. Save your emails, save your voicemails.

2 You know, do not -- and there is also a component of if it's safety oriented, right.
3 If somebody is a victim of a threat, we don't want them engaging with someone in that
4 case. So it might say do not respond to this threat. Get law enforcement involved.

5 So that was some of the thinking behind the create training and guidance for use
6 by potential victims.

7 Q Thank you.

8 And then the next one, nonenforcement ways to assist. Could you describe what
9 that was about?

10 A Sure. So I think people often think that the Department of Justice is just
11 the FBI and, essentially, prosecutors, but the Department, for ages, has played a much
12 broader role, and that's evident through a few of the components that we mentioned
13 earlier.

14 I think I made reference to CRS, community relations service. Community
15 relations is a unit that is not a prosecuting component. It's not a law enforcement
16 component in the traditional sense, but it's a component that will go into communities
17 with an eye towards providing nonenforcement-type assistance.

18 So just to give you a couple examples, in spring of '21, when the Chauvin trial was
19 going on for the murder of George Floyd, CRS had a critical role in going into the
20 communities and talking to them about how the process would work in court, you know,
21 the importance of, you know, maintaining order, you know, nonenforcement ways that
22 the Department of Justice could be of assistance.

23 So now fast-forward to this situation where we're dealing with violence and
24 threats of violence taking place at school board meetings. The way that CRS would be
25 able to assist in that situation is to, you know, offer, for example, de-escalation training

1 where they go in and say, look, if you are running a school board meeting, whether it's
2 the school board or whomever, and you find yourself in a situation where temperatures
3 are getting inflamed, maybe even threats are levied, here are some of the things you can
4 do to reduce that tension.

5 I am not an expert in that stuff, so I can't tell you what those things are, but I can
6 tell you that they would play a very important role in addressing this concern that does
7 not involve Federal statutes and bringing charges and having trials and, say, a
8 nonenforcement method that the Department has to achieve the desired result, which is
9 less crime, less threats, less acts of violence.

10 Q Okay.

11 And the final one that you have listed here is threat tracking and trend
12 identification. Can you explain that one?

13 A Sure. So this ties in a little bit to the first bullet, which is about, you know,
14 the frequency and degree to which these issues are prevalent in various U.S. attorneys'
15 offices. I think with anything that's important, you want to measure it, and the thing
16 here is how do we measure, you know, where this is happening? Do we have pockets or
17 particular districts where this is more of an issue than others?

18 One, we want to know that from a macro standpoint, which is what is the degree
19 of this issue, but we also want to know from a -- sorry. I keep saying we. I mean the
20 Department also wants to know from the standpoint of, you know, where best to allocate
21 resources. You know, how to address things on a micro level. So, you know, the
22 tracking and trend analysis is important.

23 The other thing that's important is if you're going to undertake to do something
24 related to these threats, these acts of violence, you also want to know that it's working.
25 So, you know, if you see threats decrease over time, then you can say, okay, this is having

1 some effect. If you're not, you might want to, you know, rethink the approach.

2 So it's nothing fancy. I mean, simply put, the Department wanted to know, you
3 know, what trends were related to these threats and acts of violence.

4 Q Okay.

5 And is it fair to say that the four purposes that you've broadly described here for
6 the task force is fairly inclusive of the purpose of the task force as you understood it?

7 A It is the purpose of the task force, yes.

8 Q So there are no other purposes that are not listed there that you're aware of
9 that the task force was meant to accomplish?

10 A No, there were not.

11 Q Okay.

12 A Give me one second to just make -- that's a fair question. I just want to
13 make sure I give an accurate response.

14 Q No worries.

15 A Yeah, that's accurate --

16 Q Okay.

17 A -- with an overall goal of discouraging, reducing, identifying violence and
18 threats of violence.

19 Q Okay, thank you for that.

20 So it's fair to say the DOJ did not have a purpose in the formation of this task force
21 to interact in any way with, quote, parents?

22 A No, and nothing about the memo is directed towards parents in particular.
23 It's directed towards persons, parents or not, who would commit acts of violence or level
24 threats of violence in the context of these school board meetings and other function
25 events. Parents was never uttered as far as I can recall and certainly not a part of the

1 focus of the memo or the task force.

2 Q And it was not the purpose of the task force to engage with any particular
3 type of speech or content of speech that was being articulated at school board meetings
4 or elsewhere?

5 A Absolutely not, and I don't think it can be any clearer from the memo that
6 constitutionally protected speech was not part of the concern about violence and threats
7 of violence.

8 Since we have this document in front of us there, the next slide after the purpose
9 slide is one that I think makes abundantly clear that it was not about ideology. It's not
10 about whether you like masks or don't like masks, like vaccines or don't like vaccines.
11 It's about really one thing or two things, violence and threats of violence by anyone
12 against anyone at these school board meetings and other school-sponsored events.

13 Q I was about to ask you about those, so let's look at that next slide. Can you
14 first look at the left-hand portion that's titled what this effort is, and just read us those
15 bullet points, if you can read it from this document.

16 A Sure. So the first one is understand range of potentially criminal conduct
17 and where Federal enforcement authority rests.

18 Next bullet, assist State and local law enforcement through training and
19 information sharing.

20 Next bullet, help protect school board members and school administrators from
21 violence or threats of violence.

22 And then fourth, educate victims of threats on how to report threats to law
23 enforcement.

24 Q I think those are fairly self-explanatory, and I think you explained them
25 already in your testimony. So let's move on to the right side, and can you read, quote,

1 what this effort is not?

2 A Sure.

3 Not based in ideology. Focuses on acts or threats of violence not on underlying
4 ideologies.

5 Not an attempt to suppress speech. Memo clearly stated that nonviolent debate
6 is protected and will be respected.

7 And not about federalizing State and local offenses. Where Federal authority is
8 not present, DOJ defers to State and local authorities and offers assistance where helpful.

9 Q And let's just go over those a little bit. The first one that says not based on
10 ideology. The focus is on acts or threats of violence. Can you explain?

11 A Sure.

12 I think in a lot of context, but particularly when you're talking about schools, it's
13 almost unavoidable that there are going to be people speaking very passionately about
14 particular issues, parents and nonparents alike. What I wanted to be clear about is that
15 our mandate was to address violence or threats of violence no matter where you stood
16 on a particular topic.

17 So you could be a person who thinks that every kid should be vaccinated and
18 make those views known. You can be a person who thinks that no kid should be
19 vaccinated and make those views known. And as long as you don't threaten violence or
20 commit a crime that's an act of violence, we, the Department, this task force, has no role
21 there. It's only when that behavior crosses those lines into threats of violence and acts
22 of violence that, you know, this task force and law enforcement has a role.

23 And I wanted to make sure -- and I think it was very clear to our group. I wanted
24 to make sure they understood what that was. And also, let me be completely candid, in
25 the aftermath of this memo being issued, there was a lot of discussion about this being

1 BY [REDACTED]:

2 Q Did you or anybody at DOJ receive specific information about bomb threats
3 that were directed at school board officials or other school officials?

4 A My recollection is that, as part of the progress report -- and I have to be
5 careful. I'm not going to speak about specific investigations.

6 Q Understood.

7 A But as part of the progress reports that we received from Luz, I do recall
8 there being discussions of incendiary devices, bombs, being threatened against -- I don't
9 know if it was school board members, administrators, or the like, but related to this issue.

10 Q And you said that information came from the FBI when it came to you?

11 A Yes.

12 Q And was that under the "EDUOFFICIALS" threat tag?

13 A I believe it was, because that was the substance of the conversation that I
14 would've had with them, but I don't know that for a fact.

15 BY [REDACTED]:

16 Q And you don't recall if there were any Guardian leads created pertaining to
17 bomb threats, do you?

18 A I don't recall one way or the other.

19 Q Okay.

20 [REDACTED]: We can go off the record.

21 [REDACTED]: Oh, no, no. I'm not done yet.

22 [REDACTED]: Oh, I'm sorry. Never mind.

23 [REDACTED]: Just kidding.

24 [REDACTED]: Just kidding.

25 [REDACTED]: Just kidding.

1 ██████████: Stay on the record.

2 BY ██████████:

3 Q In the prior hour -- just a couple of wrap-up questions.

4 A Sure.

5 Q -- you referred to threats initiatives. You said that, in the weekly meetings
6 with Brad Monaco, you would discuss threats initiatives, and you said "initiatives," plural.

7 So I just wanted to make sure that we're clear. What did you mean by "threats
8 initiatives"?

9 A Election officials threats, school administrator threats, threats taking place
10 on commercial aircraft. Those were the three that I was referring to.

11 I believe there was another, yet another, initiative that dealt with either Members
12 of Congress and judges, or Members of Congress or judges, or one or the other.

13 But those are the initiatives that I'm referring to.

14 Q So is it fair to say that in 2021 at the Department of Justice there was, kind
15 of, broad concern about threats in general?

16 A Yes.

17 Q So this was not a unique memo or a unique initiative; this was part of a
18 broader Department of Justice area of concern?

19 A Yes, it was part of a broader concern with respect to threats that may have
20 some Federal nexus.

21 Q Okay.

22 And then you said in the earlier hour that the memo served an important purpose.
23 Do you recall saying that?

24 A I do.

25 Q Can you elaborate a little bit? What was that purpose, from your

1 perspective?

2 A Sure.

3 The memo and the initiative related to school administrators and school boards,
4 like the memo and initiative related to election threats, like the memo related to violence
5 on commercial aircraft, all have in common that they're designed to address situations
6 where Americans or others in the country are victimized either by acts of violence or
7 threats of violence. That, to me, is a serious issue that everyone should be concerned
8 with.

9 The Department of Justice, when it has jurisdiction, has an obligation to do its part
10 to reduce those acts of violence, threats of violence, certainly to discourage them. And
11 this memo, like the election threats memo, like the incidents on commercial aircraft
12 memo, I believe served that purpose.

13 To the extent that anyone thought it was okay to commit an act of violence or
14 threaten violence for any reason, these memos, collectively and individually, should've
15 made clear that that's not the case.

16 So, to me, that's an important initiative, it's an important part of what the
17 Department does. And that's why I said I think it served an important purpose.

18 Q Thank you.

19 We can go off the record.

20 [Discussion off the record.]

21 [REDACTED]: We'll go back on the record.

22 [REDACTED]:

23 Q We just have a couple followup questions, [REDACTED].

24 A Sure.

25 Q On October 21, 2021, Attorney General Garland testified before this