PROCEEDING

MS. PELOSI: I am going to call to order this evening the interview of Christopher Wylie, former director of research for Cambridge Analytica.

I would now like to yield to the distinguished ranking member of the committee, Mr. Schiff.

MR. SCHIFF: Thank you, Madam Leader. We appreciate your conducting this hearing under your auspices here in your office.

Good afternoon, Mr. Wylie.

This is a transcribed interview of Christopher Wylie, a former employee of Cambridge Analytica, who has recently come to light as a whistleblower regarding the company's alleged improper acquisition and use of more than 50 million Facebook profiles.

Mr. Wylie, we are very grateful for your coming this distance to speak with us today.

MR. WYLIE: It's my pleasure.

MR. SCHIFF: As part of the ongoing criminal -- congressional investigation -- criminal, too, perhaps -- into Russia's interference in the 2016 U.S. election, House Democratic Leader Nancy Pelosi, who was
also an ex officio member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, has graciously offered to host us for your interview. We greatly appreciate her support in exploring the important allegations that stem from your whistleblowing and reporting by UK's Channel 4 News.

We have invited our colleagues from the Majority to participate today, and hope that they will join us, although as yet we think that is unlikely.

Before we begin, I want to say a few things for the record. Questioning today will be conducted by Members and staff. During the course of this interview, Members and staff may ask questions during their allotted time period. Some questions may seem basic, but that is because we need to clarify and establish certain facts and understand the full dimensions of the situation. Please don't assume that we know any facts you have not previously disclosed as part of any other investigation or review.

This interview will be conducted at an unclassified level. We ask that you give complete replies to questions based on your best recollection.
If a question is unclear, or you are uncertain in your response, please let us know. And if you do not know the answer to a question, or cannot remember, simply say so.

You are entitled to have counsel present during your interview. If at any time you need to take a break, just let us know. We appreciate your accommodation by traveling here to Washington, D.C. for the interview.

At this time, if counsel could please state your name for the record.

MS. ALLEN: My name is Tamsin Allen.

MS. PELOSI: Ranking Member, if I just may thank counsel and Mr. Wylie for being here today, thank you. And I am going to yield because I -- hopefully I will be able to come back.

MS. ALLEN: May I make a small preliminary observation, which is I understand that it is -- that today is being transcribed. There may be something -- some answers that Chris would like to give, but he's not able to give in public because there is an ongoing criminal investigation in the UK, and we don't want to
say anything that could prejudice that investigation in public.

So it may be that we are going to need to ask to -- for those things to be excised from the transcript in future. So I just wanted to give you that heads up.

MS. PELOSI: Thank you.

MR. SCHIFF: Okay, thank you. And this will be a closed interview, so down the road, should we decide to release the transcript, we will reach out to you first, and see if there are any particular sensitivities that we can try to work our way through.

MS. ALLEN: Thank you.

MR. SCHIFF: All right. Well, I'm going to start out with a few very basic introductory questions, and then we will pass it on to my colleagues.

MR. WYLIE: Sure.

MR. SCHIFF: If I could start at the very beginning, how did you come to work for SCL Group? Who was a part of SCL at the time that you joined?

And what can you tell us about the formation
MR. WYLIE: Sure. So I joined SCL Group as director of research in June 2015. That was after I was introduced to Alexander Nix and several other senior staff members at SCL through a mutual contact that I had when I previously was working for the coalition government in the United Kingdom for the liberal democrat side.

I got hired in part because the previous research director died in Kenya and they had an opening. And also, the firm was looking to expand its capacity in data analytics, cyber.

It's important to understand that, firstly, this was prior to Cambridge Analytica being formed. At the time the firm was predominantly a military contractor, so its clients included the UK Ministry of Defense and also the United States Department of Defense, as well as several other NATO countries' militaries or defense ministries.

At the time several countries -- so in the United States DARPA, which is the U.S. military research agency, and in the United Kingdom DSTL, which
is DARPA's equivalent, were looking at how to better understand the proliferation of ideas online and, more generally, studying influence in social networks.

So it was quite appealing for the firm to bring on somebody -- to bring on a research director who had much more experience in data science, analytics, and generally building profiles of people based on different data sets and predicting behavior.

Does that answer your question, or --

MR. SCHIFF: It does. Now, when you joined SCL, how many employees did SCL have?

How -- was it only in the UK?

Did it have a Canadian presence also, or --

MR. WYLIE: Yeah. So when I joined, it was -- most staff were based in London. So it's important to understand this is a British company, it's a British-registered company. There was a -- it wasn't, when I joined, a very large company. There was probably about, in total, amongst the entire group of companies -- because there is different divisions -- about 20 or so staff.

The company had a network of contacts around
the world. They had partnerships with local firms, or had offices around the world, or had consultants or contractors that were based in different countries, mostly for contract acquisition.

The Canadian office that I think you are referring to was set up after I joined.

MR. SCHIFF: So at the time you joined, was there only one office in the UK, but there were employees --

MR. WYLIE: There were --

MR. SCHIFF: -- in other parts of the world who were --

MR. WYLIE: Yeah, it was -- there was one office in London that was there, or -- let me correct myself.

There were several offices in London for each of the different divisions. In terms of offices around the world, they would have contractors or people that they would have on retainer who either would have a small office in that country if there was ongoing projects, or there would be a partner firm where one person would be on retainer at a local firm with
contacts in that country.

MR. SCHIFF: And when you started at SCL, how well capitalized was SCL? Where did the investors come from? What kind of revenues did it have at that time?

MR. WYLIE: I'm not privy to the exact figures at that time, so I can't give you a specific answer. But it wasn't, you know, a very -- it wasn't a very large -- it wasn't a large company. But I can't give you an exact figure of revenue.

MR. SCHIFF: And the Mercers, did they come along after you had joined?

MR. WYLIE: Yes. So if it's helpful, I can give you sort of a rough timeline.

MR. SCHIFF: Sure, that would be great.

MR. WYLIE: So I joined in June 2013. The -- and as I said before, the sort of purpose of me joining SCL Group was, essentially, to do research and development, to gain better capacity in data analytics and targeting and profiling online, because that's something that they knew that their clientele, particularly on the military side, would be interested in.
Several months after I joined -- so this would be around either the end of September or the beginning of October 2013 -- is -- I believe October -- is when I first met Steve Bannon. So at the -- when I joined -- and I can't give you an exact date as to when some of these meetings happened, but Alexander Nix went to the United States because he got introduced to Steve Bannon.

And Steve was, at the time, sort of setting up Breitbart UK, so he was going back and forth between the United States and the UK. So it was fortuitous timing for him. He was looking, essentially, to expand his ability to build what we would now call the alt-right --

MR. SCHIFF: I'm sorry, when you met Bannon, had he already had an affiliation with SCL?

MR. WYLIE: No. He had several meetings in the United States that I wasn't privy to.

MR. SCHIFF: So this was when Nix was trying to establish --

MR. WYLIE: Yeah, so Alexander Nix first started meeting with him after an introduction from a
When Steve Bannon first came over to the United States and met with me, it was -- he was -- I was just told to go and speak with him, and he just had lots of questions, namely about research into sort of culture, and what is culture, and has culture changed. The research that I was looking at was in whether we can take data sets from different sources and predict psychological disposition.

One of the things I spoke to him about was if you -- there is something called the psycholexical hypothesis, which is that there is meaning and information encoded in language. And so when you look at how different languages describe certain things, and the different kinds of adjectives that we use, there may be a latent construct there.

And so, just to translate that into something more tangible, the words that we use to describe ourselves as people, in terms of personality traits, are often the same words that we would use to describe cultures sort of more generally. So if you just indulge a stereotype for example, what are Italians
like? They might be more passionate, they might be
more extroverted. What are Germans like? They might
be more organized, more diligent, more rule-oriented,
right? And that there might be some kind of latent
construct there that could be measured and engaged in
some way.

Because I said to him, I said, "If you are
interested in culture change, you first have to define
what culture is, and -- because if you're -- if you
just have this sort of amorphous construct, you can't
actually do anything with it." So that was quite
appealing to him because the research that we were
doing in terms of profiling people in terms of
personality traits likely could extend to culture,
because culture is just an aggregation of people. If
you think about what are the units of culture, the
units of culture are people.

And so he continued having meetings with
Alexander Nix. He very much liked the idea of working
with a military contractor, because when he talks about
culture wars, I think he literally intends those words
in the sense that if you want to fight a war you need
to build an arsenal of weaponry. And who better to go
and contact than a military contractor?

So, after having sort of several months of
meetings, I got introduced -- I got flown over to New
York, and I got introduced to Robert Mercer, Rebekah
Mercer. Steve Bannon also was at this meeting. And --

MR. SCHIFF: So this would have been early
2014?

MR. WYLIE: This would have been -- we're now
the end of November. So by -- so the -- it happened
quite quickly. So there was -- October is when I first
met Steve Bannon. He -- we had several meetings and
conference calls. And then, sort of mid to the end of
November, that's when I went to New York to meet with
the Mercers.

So Alexander Nix joined me at that meeting,
Steve Bannon was there, Robert Mercer was there,
Rebekah Mercer was there. And that meeting --
essentially, we just spoke about the research that we
were doing.

One of the sort of impressions that I got was
MR. SCHIFF: Before you tell me your impression, if I could --

MR. WYLIE: Yeah?

MR. SCHIFF: -- what do you know of the financing of SCL before the Mercers entered the picture?

Did they have any patrons like the Mercers?

Did they have --

MR. WYLIE: No. At the -- they weren't -- it wasn't -- they didn't have any sort of patrons or sort of wealthy backers at that level, at that sort of billionaire level. So they were going -- they made money through just predominantly contracts with military clients.

MR. SCHIFF: You know, there has been speculation and sometimes reporting that SCL may have received Russian financial backing through oligarchs or otherwise. Did that ever come to your attention, either in the period before the Mercers came along --

MR. WYLIE: So --

MR. SCHIFF: -- or after?

MR. WYLIE: At the time I wasn't aware of
that. Although I have heard that, for example, Vincent Tchenguiz, who was one of the shareholders at the time, had quite a few Russian contacts, business partners, that sort of thing. Although when Cambridge Analytica was set up, he was removed as a shareholder, as I understand it. I don't know the particulars of that, but the impression that I got was that the lawyer -- the Mercer lawyers were concerned about some of his previous business dealings.

MR. SCHIFF: So he was an investor prior to the Mercers coming along?

MR. WYLIE: I don't know if I would -- I don't know if he was an investor or merely just a shareholder in some capacity.

MR. SCHIFF: And can you spell his name for us?

MR. WYLIE: I couldn't, sorry. I can get you the spelling of the name.

MR. SCHIFF: And was Dmitry Firtash one of his cohorts that -- you mentioned that he -- that you had heard there might be --

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.
MR. SCHIFF: -- business partners of his --

MR. WYLIE: Yeah. I -- so to be clear, I've never met Dmitry Firtash, but my understanding was that he was an associate of some -- in some way. But I wasn't involved in those meetings.

MR. SCHIFF: So, in terms of foreign investment prior to the Mercers, there is nothing that you have firsthand knowledge about?

MR. WYLIE: Not in terms of things that I saw directly, just simply what I was sort of generally told at the time.

MR. SCHIFF: Anything that you have heard indirectly that we might investigate further, in terms of Russian finance or --

MR. WYLIE: What I can do is I can make a note of that, and then speak to Tamsin and look through some of the documents. If that's something that you're interested in, I can come back with you with an answer on that.

MR. SCHIFF: Oh, very much so.

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

MR. SCHIFF: Thank you.
MR. WYLIE: I just don't want to misspeak whilst I'm --

MR. SCHIFF: No, I appreciate that.

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

MR. SCHIFF: So I cut you off when you were describing the meeting you had --

MR. WYLIE: Sure.

MR. SCHIFF: -- with the Mercers and Steve Bannon --

MR. WYLIE: So the impression that I got originally was that, you know, Robert Mercer, you know, he made his money in -- you know, he was quite technical as a guy. He has a Ph.D. in computational linguistics. So he understands algorithms; he made all this money in algorithms.

The impression that I got, or at least what Alexander Nix said, was -- sort of the carrot on the -- you know, on the stick, was if we were able to sort of predict behavior of each individual person in a particular country like the United States more accurately than anybody else, you know, for the financial sector, if you're looking at investments, if
you can predict consumer trends before anyone else
could, that would be quite useful. And so, it made
sense that Robert Mercer would be interested in that.

But it turns out that, you know, he's already
a billionaire, so he doesn't need to make more money,
and he was more interested in what Steve Bannon was
interested in, which is, you know, can you change a
culture, and how would you do that, and how would you
quantify a culture, how would you quantify people, and
what could you do -- what kind of interventions could
you do in order to, you know, shift a cohort of people
from here to here.

So we spoke about some of the research that we
were doing as a firm. Just to be clear, most of that
research wasn't at the time in the United States. But
because we were looking at fundamental human traits
that would be generally applicable anywhere, he decided
to invest.

So a decision was made that, rather than
setting up -- rather than acquiring SCL, a new company
would be set up, registered in Delaware. So Steve
Bannon picked the name Cambridge Analytica. That
company was set up in part because, as I understand it, there are restrictions on what a foreign company and foreign nationals are allowed to do with respect to elections and foreign agent restrictions.

So they -- the lawyers were fairly clear that they needed an American entity to operate in the United States. And also, from an optical perspective, a Republican billionaire acquiring a foreign military contractor to then work in American politics probably wouldn't -- someone would notice that.

So Cambridge Analytica was set up. The deal was essentially that Robert Mercer, through one of his investment vehicles, would put in $15 million US into that company as start-up capital. The elections division of SCL Group would become a minority shareholder of Cambridge Analytica. Robert Mercer would become the majority shareholder of Cambridge Analytica.

SCL would then assign its intellectual property to Cambridge Analytica. Cambridge Analytica, in return, would license back that intellectual property to SCL Group, and then also offer it an
exclusive service provision contract, so that any
clients of Cambridge Analytica would have to be
serviced by SCL Group using the intellectual property
that it sort of cycled through Cambridge Analytica.

So, to be clear, Cambridge Analytica, to the
best of my knowledge, never had any staff. The -- it
only had intellectual property rights and it was where
the money from Robert Mercer was originally deposited.
But the offices and staff were all based out of SCL
Group in London.

MR. SCHIFF: So what was the point -- I know
you were privy to some of the discussions about the
organization of all this.

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

MR. SCHIFF: What was the point of that rather
Byzantine structure, if it was designed to meet
American legal requirements in terms of not having
foreigners influence decision-making and campaigning?
That doesn't seem to overcome that problem, if then
those people are actually employed in the United
States. It's just where the IP is held and licensed
back.
MR. WYLIE: So it wasn't my decision to do that. It was a decision made between Alexander Nix, Steve Bannon, and Robert Mercer to set it up that way.

The problem I think that they encountered is that if you are going and acquiring the intellectual property of a company, a large part of servicing that is people who are experienced and know how that actually works, and how to use it. And all of those people, you know, were British or European or other foreign nationals.

And so, that, you know -- and one of the things that I published was some of the legal advice that Cambridge Analytica got. I'm not sure if you've seen that memo to Steve Bannon and Robert Mercer that -- even the fact that Alexander Nix was the CEO was questionable because he was a foreign national. So the whole thing was --

MR. SCHIFF: Was that legal memo written prior to the incorporation of Cambridge Analytica?

MR. WYLIE: No, it was written after. So --

MR. SCHIFF: Because I would -- then what drove the -- that rather odd structure?
MR. WYLIE: Right. So my understanding was that it was also in part a way -- so I think -- to be honest, I think it was because Robert Mercer wanted something that was his own, but it couldn't be SCL. The other advantage of having Cambridge Analytica in the United States was that, at least to my knowledge -- so I am not a U.S. elections law or finance expert, so you need to consult an expert on that, but my understanding was that an advantage of having a company that services campaigns is that if you are the shareholder of that company, when you invest money into that company, it does -- it's not counted in elections reporting as a campaign donation, because you are an owner of a company investing more resources or capital into that company.

So it created a vehicle whereby you could do a lot of research and development, ultimately for the benefit of your preferred campaigns, but it wasn't a reportable campaign donation because when you're investing in a company you're an investor.

MR. SCHIFF: I mean that, I imagine, would be true if you have more than one client. If you are
doing this all in the service of the same client, then
it would simply be probably an ineffectual effort at
circumvention.

But it sounds like, if that were the goal, you
could do that with a very different structure than
Cambridge Analytica. I mean any form of incorporation
of Cambridge Analytica you would be able to invest in,
and therefore subsidize the work that that firm is
doing.

I guess what I'm trying to figure out is
whether there was some -- what the rationale was for
that -- the license-back structure and that particular
form of holding of intellectual property.

MR. WYLIE: I -- to be honest, I found it
confusing, also. And it's something that -- that's
what Alexander Nix and Steve Bannon wanted, so that's
what the lawyers ended up setting up.

It -- I think one of the -- again, one of the
problems is that if you -- you could -- if you had only
set up Cambridge Analytica as an independent, separate,
American company with no license-back, you would then
have to staff it. And so the problem with that is that
the -- all the people who knew about it -- it's --
you're essentially buying the IP without any of the brains behind it.

And so that, I think, would have created a problem with actually creating a functional company, because normally, when you acquire a company or create a start-up, you know, the foundational team or the experts sort of are part and parcel of that company.

MR. SCHIFF: Right, I see.

MR. WYLIE: So it would have sort of created a -- there would have been no point in really doing it, because a lot of the value is actually in the people who had experience in the UK.

MR. SCHIFF: I see. Okay. I think my time is up.

Mr. Quigley?

MR. QUIGLEY: Thanks for being here. And for the record, you -- again, you left SCL when?

MR. WYLIE: In November of 2014. I sent in my notice in July, at the end of July 2014, and then I phased out my involvement until November.

MR. QUIGLEY: After you left, were you able to
continue to be aware of what was going on within the
company? Did you have --

MR. WYLIE: Yes.

MR. QUIGLEY: -- people there? Did you have --

MR. WYLIE: Yes.

MR. QUIGLEY: How did that work?

How much do you know of what was still going on, and how --

MR. WYLIE: Because when I -- when Cambridge Analytica was formed, I was responsible for building out the teams. I was responsible for building out all of the different teams.

MR. QUIGLEY: Okay.

MR. WYLIE: So I had very good working relationships with most people there, because I previously worked on projects.

MR. QUIGLEY: And we're talking about how many people?

MR. WYLIE: By the time I left, probably around 40 to 50, give or take. I can provide you with the exact number, if that's of interest.
MR. QUIGLEY: And approximately how many of those 40 to 50 did you stay in touch with?

MR. WYLIE: Give or take, 15, 15 or so. But they were the sort of the leadership tier of each of the teams.

MR. QUIGLEY: How many teams were there?

MR. WYLIE: You had data science, you had psychology, creative and messaging, operations. Around six or seven.

MR. QUIGLEY: How did you stay in touch with them? Email? Social media?

MR. WYLIE: I would just see -- I mean it was based in London and I was living in London, so I --

MR. QUIGLEY: You saw them.

MR. WYLIE: I see them all the time. Yeah, yeah.

And then they would send me updates, or forward me emails, or tell me what's happening.

MR. QUIGLEY: And that relationship, those relationships, that communication to this day continues in your --

MR. WYLIE: Continued until --
MR. QUIGLEY: Obviously, some of it got hampered --

MR. WYLIE: Until they all started leaving.

The problem for a lot of them was that when they joined the company -- after Steve Bannon took over, the company took a much more hard line on the types of research that we were going to do, particularly in the United States.

MR. QUIGLEY: Cambridge, or --

MR. WYLIE: Cambridge Analytica.

MR. QUIGLEY: Right.

MR. WYLIE: It's sort of difficult to --

MR. QUIGLEY: That's fine.

MR. WYLIE: So, to be clear, all the staff were technically SCL staff, because CA didn't have any staff, but operating under the brand or the name Cambridge Analytica.

MR. QUIGLEY: Well, I just -- I want to understand. So the staff were all getting paid by SCL.

MR. WYLIE: Yes.

MR. QUIGLEY: But they were -- how many -- what percentage were just doing Cambridge stuff?
MR. WYLIE: Most, if not all, because -- I mean it's very hard to distinguish between the two.

MR. QUIGLEY: Right.

MR. WYLIE: Because, you know, if you are speaking to an American client, it's -- you put on your Cambridge Analytica hat. You know, you use your Cambridge Analytica email. But if you're speaking to, you know, a Brit or foreign -- other foreign client, you might be speaking to them as SCL Group.

MR. QUIGLEY: So you've heard the expression "shell company," right?

MR. WYLIE: Yes.

MR. QUIGLEY: Would you refer to Cambridge as that?

MR. WYLIE: In a -- so I'm not sure if that word has a specifically legal meaning in the United States, but in the sort of general parlance sense --

MR. QUIGLEY: Right.

MR. WYLIE: -- yes, I think that would be a completely fair assessment.

MR. QUIGLEY: How many of the people that you are staying in touch with knew what was going on with
the Trump campaign?

MR. WYLIE: A couple of them.

MR. QUIGLEY: Okay.

MR. WYLIE: The company first started engaging what later became Donald Trump's campaign in the spring of 2015. So actually, very shortly after I left.

MR. QUIGLEY: Okay.

MR. WYLIE: And I have that confirmed in writing, actually, from SCL's lawyers.

So despite the fact that -- despite the Trump campaign saying that they -- the company, you know, only started engaging with them in August 2016, they actually started meeting with Corey Lewandowski, who then later became the campaign manager for Donald Trump, before Donald Trump had even announced that he was considering running for President.

MR. QUIGLEY: What date would that be, roughly?

MR. WYLIE: It would have -- it was the spring of 2015, and I can get you the exact date in writing.

MR. QUIGLEY: The spring of what, 2015?

MR. WYLIE: The -- 2015, yeah.
MR. QUIGLEY: And so you understood that the Cambridge staff was meeting with Corey Lewandowski.

MR. WYLIE: Yes, and I have it confirmed from SCL's own lawyers that they were.

MR. QUIGLEY: And when was there, to your understanding, a formal agreement that they would work together?

MR. WYLIE: That I don't have.

MR. QUIGLEY: And you say that there is a couple that you stayed in touch with that were, you know, working on the Trump -- or working with the Trump campaign?

MR. WYLIE: That --

MR. QUIGLEY: Or embedded? You tell me what the --

MR. WYLIE: Who were around during the beginnings of the work for the Trump campaign. They then left because they found that uncomfortable.

MR. QUIGLEY: How -- and do you know roughly when they left? You know, what time frame?

MR. WYLIE: I don't have that exact date. I can probably --
MR. QUIGLEY: Okay.

MR. WYLIE: -- get that for you.

MR. QUIGLEY: Sure, yeah. Did they tell you why they were uncomfortable?

Or I forgot the word. Is that right?

MR. WYLIE: Yeah, uncomfortable, yes, because the -- most of the staff who originally joined Cambridge Analytica were not conservatively-minded people.

MR. QUIGLEY: They didn't like the President's -- the candidate's policies.

MR. WYLIE: Not just his policies, because Donald Trump is a very particular kind of --

MR. QUIGLEY: Okay.

MR. WYLIE: -- candidate. So --

MR. QUIGLEY: He wasn't just a Republican --

MR. WYLIE: He wasn't just -- there is a big difference between working for, you know, a Jeb Bush type Republican and a Donald Trump type Republican.

MR. QUIGLEY: When we talk about this in reference to -- and my colleagues will get into more detail -- the issues as related to the Facebook data
and how that was used by Cambridge and the Trump --
were any of them making you aware of that before they
were involved in the Trump campaign?

Or was that prior to that information, or that
data being switched over?

MR. WYLIE: With respect -- so your -- if I
can just rephrase your question, your question is about
whether or not the Trump campaign was using
misappropriated Facebook data.

MR. QUIGLEY: Right. Did they know? Did you
know?

MR. WYLIE: They didn't -- I can't confirm
that, but I can explain how it would be technically
very difficult to achieve anything that they do without
that data, given the timeframe that they say they did
the work.

MR. QUIGLEY: Yes, can you walk us through
that?

MR. WYLIE: So the Facebook data -- so maybe I
will just quickly explain how that project got set up,
and then what the utility of it was.

So in the spring of 2014, after the investment
was made into Cambridge Analytica, the next step in the project was to figure out how to acquire a scaled data set on personally identifying Americans. So -- which means it's addressable data. It has their name, it has some kind of thing that I can match to the electoral register, and that is also useful for modeling very nuanced human constructs, which are very difficult to model. So it had to be sort of a high-quality type of data, and there had to be a lot of it.

When we started working with several of the professors at the Psychometrics Centre at the University of Cambridge, they had access to applications that were authorized by Facebook that allowed them to collect not just the data on the user of that app, but also the data of the friends of that app.

MR. QUIGLEY: And you approached them? They didn't approach you? The Cambridge folks.

MR. WYLIE: It was a mutual introduction. So it's difficult to say who approached whom, because --

MR. QUIGLEY: Okay.

MR. WYLIE: -- we had people who previously
were at Cambridge who did their psychology degrees there, and so it was just sort of a mutual introduction. But --

MR. SCHIFF: Can I interrupt you for just one second?

MR. WYLIE: Sure.

MR. SCHIFF: Just for clarification.

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

MR. SCHIFF: At the point that you're trying to get a data set to move forward on the culture-changing project of Bannon and Mercer's, this takes place after Cambridge Analytica is formed? So this is not being done by SCL, pre-Cambridge Analytica?

MR. WYLIE: There was some preliminary research that SCL did prior to Cambridge Analytica being formed in 2013, which was designed to be sort of a bit of an exploratory project in the United States, because the company hadn't, to my knowledge, hadn't worked in the United States before. And also, a validation or a sort of -- a proof of concept, or at least showing promise of methods. That was done in Virginia, in Fairfax County and Tidewater, the
Tidewater region of Virginia.

So there was data collected there, and various sort of pilots of different experiments that was done that Robert Mercer used to sort of base some of his -- because he wanted to see, you know, could you do this kind of -- you can -- you know, sure, you might be able to do this in country X or Y, but does it -- can you do it in the United States?

So -- but to my knowledge, that wasn't necessarily done for a -- any particular campaign, although I do recall meeting with various Republican affiliated campaigners who were interested in it, but they weren't the client, if that makes sense. It was sort of just a general R&D type project.

Just to get back to the Facebook data, so the benefit of the application that Kogan offered was that we could replicate existing peer-reviewed methods that the Psychometrics Centre had sort of validated in their research, and published that in journals. So, from a sort of best practice or scientific perspective, we are replicating what has already been validated in research and published in journals.
So that made sense, and also the fact that what he offered allowed a very rapid scaling of a data set because, rather than collecting data one by one, each time somebody would join that app the app would give you access to, you know, 200, 300 other people who were friends with them on Facebook. So then you can imagine how much quicker -- you know, it scales, you know, at 300 times faster than if you were to do it 1 by 1 by 1.

So SCL -- and it was SCL that technically paid for that project -- put in around 800 to $900,000 US, just on that data harvesting, which then -- and it then transferred the rights to that to Cambridge Analytica. That data then formed the basis of the algorithms for every single algorithm that was developed at the company.

So the reason why that's important is because they may say we didn't use Facebook data on the Trump campaign, but if the algorithms that you have built for your company were all built using Facebook data, it's -- it becomes a slightly semantic difference because you don't actually -- when it comes to targeting
people, you don't actually use the Facebook data
directly, you use it to build an algorithm that then
creates your target universe of people.

So, it's like saying I don't use petrol, I
just drive a car. Well, if the car is powered by
Facebook data, you are indirectly using petrol
gasoline. If that makes sense.

So the thing that I find difficult to believe,
without -- because, the thing is, the company has never
offered any evidence that they used any other data
sets, right? And it would have been very simple for
them to do. They've been asked by the British inquiry
to provide that information, but Alexander Nix decided
not to show up to his hearing.

When you look at the testimony of Brittney
Kaiser, who was at the testimony at the British inquiry
last week -- Brittney Kaiser was the business
development director -- she makes reference to seeing
emails about the use of Facebook data as recently as
last year. So someone you might want to actually speak
with is Brittney Kaiser. Does that --

MR. QUIGLEY: Yes. In the end, to the extent
that you know, were any of the people you followed embedded in the Trump campaign later on?

MR. WYLIE: They weren't embedded in the sense that they went to the United States. They were --

MR. QUIGLEY: The San Antonio operation we hear about.

MR. WYLIE: The -- yeah, Project Alamo, or whatever it was called. They were based in London.

MR. QUIGLEY: Okay.

MR. WYLIE: But I can follow up with you on that, because I can also -- I can give you a list of names of people who might be helpful with respect to that particular --

MR. QUIGLEY: It's hard for us -- you were there, and you know these folks, and so --

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

MR. QUIGLEY: In my short time that I have left, ultimately what is of interest to us is Cambridge Analytical people must have known that this information was inappropriately gained, and it was going to be used, and then that fact was going to be used for -- to help the Trump campaign.
Can we know, or do we know if the Trump campaign personnel were -- was aware of that fact?

MR. WYLIE: This is something that will be discoverable in the next few months, with the inquiries in Britain and the investigation in Britain. So I can't offer you a definitive answer specifically to the Trump campaign, with respect to the use of Facebook data.

But what I can tell you is how difficult it would be. They used -- and in their own words -- used the algorithms that were developed using that --

MR. QUIGLEY: Trump? You're referring to the Trump campaign?

MR. WYLIE: Sorry, I am referring to Cambridge Analytica.

MR. QUIGLEY: Okay.

MR. WYLIE: Cambridge Analytica used algorithms, the algorithms that I am talking about that were developed using the misappropriated Facebook data, up until the summer of 2016. They then claim that they stopped using it.

The problem with that claim is that, in order
to develop what they developed, it took several million
dollars and months and months and months and months and
months and months of work. And so it's like saying we
had a house that we built, and then we knocked it down
and the next day we rebuilt it in a day. It -- from a
technical perspective, their explanation does not make
sense.

It also doesn't make sense because the data
sets that they claim to have used on the Trump
campaign, the commercial data sets that they claimed to
use on the Trump campaign that replaced the Facebook
data, one of the things that I can provide is internal
assessments of those data sets that show that those
data sets weren't sufficient to accurately model the
concepts that they --

MR. QUIGLEY: So let me try to summarize real
quick. The Cambridge Analytical people had to know
what they were using was information at least derived
from the original --

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

MR. QUIGLEY: -- poisonous tree.

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.
MR. QUIGLEY: And it's virtually impossible that the information that was ultimately used in the Alamo operation, or whatever, wasn't derived from the same source.

MR. WYLIE: Well, the other point that I would make is that --

MR. QUIGLEY: Would you say that's correct?

MR. WYLIE: Yeah. Well, I would -- I find it -- they have not yet offered an explanation --

MR. QUIGLEY: Of where any of the other data could have come from.

MR. WYLIE: -- how they did that.

MR. QUIGLEY: Right.

MR. WYLIE: Because that is, in my view, pulling off a miracle. If they did that, they are the -- you know, that's very impressive.

MR. QUIGLEY: And they didn't have another source for the data.

MR. WYLIE: No. This is the problem with their explanation, is that -- one of the things that I can show you is that the data that they claim to use doesn't work for what they claimed they did for the
Trump campaign by -- so it doesn't make sense that you
replaced the Facebook-derived information with this
consumer data set, because I know that that consumer
data set doesn't work for what you claim it does.

MR. QUIGLEY: And finally, the people who are
embedded in Texas would have had to at least known
this, and that you're suggesting that in the coming
short period of time the inquiry in Great Britain will
detail this and let us know more.

MR. WYLIE: The parliamentary -- so the
parliamentary inquiry is going to demand Alexander
Nix's presence if he continues to refuse to -- if he
keeps skipping his hearings.

In addition, there is an ongoing investigation
led by the information commissioner's office in the UK.
There is also an element of that investigation with
the National Crime Agency, which is the British FBI.
And if there is relevant information for the American
authorities, my understanding is that the National
Crime Agency will be coordinating with the FBI and
Department of Justice on those.

MR. SCHIFF: Thank you, Mr. Quigley. I just
have a couple of follow-up questions and then I'm going to pass to my colleague, Mr. Himes.

MR. WYLIE: Sure.

MR. SCHIFF: You mentioned that Cambridge Analytica, or SCL, paid $800,000 or $900,000 to acquire one of the early data sets from Kogan. Is that correct?

MR. WYLIE: Those -- so what I can provide to you is the invoices and payment transactions that were made to the platforms that were recruiting participants to join the apps. So it details how many people joined the apps, and how much did that cost. And if you add up all the invoices, it's between 800 and $900,000.

MR. SCHIFF: So was Kogan the developer of the apps that --

MR. WYLIE: Facebook was the developer of the app.

MR. SCHIFF: And what was Kogan's role, then, vis a vis the apps and the --

MR. WYLIE: So all Facebook -- well, I should correct myself. Facebook provides what's called the API. That's like a bridge. And so it sort of is the
bridge that allows you to access the system. You have
to develop sort of the interface of the app, as it were. So in that respect, Kogan was the developer of
the app; Facebook was the authorizer of the app.

The role that Kogan offered was twofold.

Firstly, he had the rights to the app that had these permissions that Facebook rented. Secondly, he was an expert in psychometrics. And so he also developed a lot of the psychological surveys that were then used on the app to -- for people to answer, so that -- which became the -- what's called the training set for the algorithms.

So that data, the answers from the surveys would be related to that person's Facebook data, and then relationships between how they answered and what they liked on Facebook would then develop the algorithm to them profile all of their friends.

MR. SCHIFF: So what's the nature of the service that Kogan was providing to Cambridge SCL, in terms of the acquisition of the data from Facebook?

It --

MR. WYLIE: He sort of -- he had the app. So
he offered the use of the app.

MR. SCHIFF: So were there payments to him, essentially, like a consultant --

MR. WYLIE: So --

MR. SCHIFF: -- and then payments to the intermediary companies that actually did the physical harvesting of the data on Facebook?

MR. WYLIE: So, originally, Kogan said -- and I believed him at the time -- that he was interested in working on this data acquisition project because it would have given his team at Cambridge access to funding that he couldn't otherwise have got through an academic grant with almost no sort of strings attached or reporting rules, or all of that. And he wanted to take that data set that was then created and set up an academic institute with it to sort of explore this emerging field called computational psychology, or computational sociology, which is sort of blending computer science with psychology.

So, the original agreement that SCL/CA had with Kogan was that he wouldn't actually get -- he wouldn't make any profits. He would pass the invoices
from the recruitment platforms that were used -- so
that was Amazon, MTurk, and a company called Quatrics
-- and that SCL would then pay those invoices on his
behalf.

So what I can provide to the committee is the
-- some of the payment transactions that showed that
SCL was just paying for them directly. That made sense
to me at the time, because it -- his motivation seems
to be setting up this institute, so it wasn't setting
up a company, it wasn't, you know, going out and doing
anything with it, it was to do academic research.

One of the things that Facebook told me after
the fact was that they were informed by Kogan that his
activities were also for academic purposes. So that
was my understanding, and that's what Facebook told me
was also their understanding. You need to ask Facebook
about that.

However, after I left Cambridge Analytica,
Kogan went back to Alexander Nix and decided to
negotiate a more commercial contract. And it became
apparent that he was interested not just, I guess, in
this academic institute, but then also commercializing
that data and further deepening his relationship with Cambridge Analytica.

And so, the institute that he talked about -- and I can provide you with emails that talk about sort of conceptualization -- actually never got set up. So I'm not sure exactly what happened there, but he went down a path that was quite different than what originally in my understanding was.

MR. SCHIFF: Now, you're probably more familiar with this than I am; I think I've only seen a summary of what Aleksandr Kogan has had to say.

MR. WYLIE: Yes.

MR. SCHIFF: He takes issue with the idea that he provided this data to Cambridge Analytica SCL.

MR. WYLIE: Right.

MR. SCHIFF: Is he being hyper-technical about this, in the sense that it was -- the invoices went to other entities and he was just the facilitator, or --

MR. WYLIE: I --

MR. SCHIFF: How do you explain that?

MR. WYLIE: I take issue with a lot of his statements because, for me, I feel like he is being, as
you said, slightly overly technical with his interpretation of the situation.

You know, when you, for example, transform data -- so you squish some data together or you split some data apart, rename it, whatever, that is called a derivative. So if I take two columns, male and female, and I merge them into one column called gender, that is a derivative of those two columns. The information conveyed is the same.

So, one of the things that he provided is derivative information from Facebook data. And so he takes the position that that's not Facebook data, that's a derivative and, therefore, it's not prepped to say Facebook data.

But one of the things that I can provide to you is the explanation of the process, which is what he explained to the company at the time, which is -- makes very clear that this is Facebook-origin data and it's being processed in this way, and this is what you get after we've processed it in this particular way to make it easier for you to use.

MR. SCHIFF: And last question. At the time
that Cambridge is working with Kogan, does this -- does
it predate Bannon, or is it all post-dating Bannon?

Basically, is the relationship either done or
solidified with Kogan for the very purpose of meeting
the kind of Mercer-Bannon idea of --

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

MR. SCHIFF: -- gathering this data and being
able to apply it in their culture war?

MR. WYLIE: Yeah. So we started the project
with Kogan after the Mercers invested in Cambridge
Analytica and after Steve Bannon took over. So it --
and the point of the project was because after they set
up Cambridge Analytica, the Mercers and Steve Bannon,
they then came to us and said we need to have
everything ready, essentially, by September 2014,
which, to me, seemed sort of outrageously ambitious.

And then -- but it was actually because Steve
wanted to actually try it out in the 2014 mid-terms.
So he wanted to be able to pass on this to campaigns to
use, which meant that the deadline was essentially
September. And so, the benefit of Kogan's process was
that it scaled -- I mean we were able to acquire that
data set in sort of two-and-a-half months. So that's how quick it was.

And so, from Steve Bannon's perspective, that was ideal because he got what he wanted. He got this massive data set in the time frame that would allow him to then apply these algorithms targeting for the 2014 mid-terms.

MR. SCHIFF: Thank you.

Mr. Himes?

MR. HIMES: Thank you. Just one question, but it's a big question. And I'm going to ask you to step away from the chronology, which is important. But it would be helpful to me and, I suspect, to the committee if you could tell us a little bit more about the concepts that we're talking about here.

MR. WYLIE: Sure.

MR. HIMES: Psychometrics, computational psychology, micro-targeting -- I have been swimming in those terms for a long time and I am not sure I fully understand them. So a three-part question.

One is I've got a personal Facebook page, I follow my college roommates around, I like a piece of
music and a pair of shoes every once in a while.

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

MR. HIMES: In terms that that a guy can understand, what is the aspiration here, in terms of what the Trump campaign was trying to do?

Can you just walk us through an example about how you take my data, use micro-targeting psychometrics, et cetera, to achieve some end? Can you just walk us through that example? That's question -- part one of the question.

Part two is what do you think was actually done? In other words, you made an interesting comment earlier, which was that there was a different set of data which could not be used to actually achieve the goal that was --

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

MR. HIMES: That's part two.

Then part three is Dr. Kogan has questioned the effectiveness of any of this. In part three is this, in the context of elections, not burning down a new restaurant in Sri Lanka --

MR. WYLIE: Yeah, yeah.
MR. HIMES: -- which we read about, but in the context of elections, is there evidence that this is effective?

In other words, are we actually looking into whether election law was violated, or are we actually looking into whether the election was altered through this mechanism?

MR. WYLIE: Sure. So I will start with your first question. So let me just quickly define some of the things that I've talked about, just so that you -- so psychometrics is the measurement of psychological constructs. The reason why it's an area of research is because human psychology is not directly measurable, like different chemicals in your blood or in your nervous system, where you can literally measure the exact amounts of something. So psychometrics is the study of the best way to measure discrete constructs like personality traits, for example.

Micro-targeting is where you take data, a baseline data set on voters -- whether that's consumer data, social data, et cetera -- and look for relationships between that data and what's called a
target variable.

A target variable is anything that you want to predict for. So --

MR. HIMES: On the --

MR. WYLIE: I mean, yes, it's a -- yeah.

MR. HIMES: Okay.

MR. WYLIE: So -- and then, to your question about how is Facebook data useful, when you look particularly at human psychological constructs like personality traits, right, certain kinds of information give you better insight or information.

So when you look at consumer data sets, knowing that somebody shops at Wal-Mart, for example, isn't very indicative of who they are as a person, because it might be that they are close to a Wal-Mart, or it might be that their socio-economic status, you know, dictates that they shop at, you know, a discount store. So it doesn't mean that, you know, you shop at Wal-Mart because you're this type of person, psychologically.

So the advantage of social data -- so Facebook data or Twitter data, for example, or Instagram data,
or what's called click stream data, which is sort of your browsing history -- is that you are curating your identity in a way that is much more insightful for the constructs, for the psychological constructs that we want to measure.

So, if you just take a step back and just imagine that you're on a date, for example, a first date, the questions that you ask -- you know, what kind of music do you listen to, what kind of movies do you watch, you know, what do you like to do for fun -- the reasons you ask those questions is because you are developing, you know, an intuition as to who is this person.

And when you think about the things that you're liking on Facebook, even though they sort of seem innocuous when you're liking them individually -- you're liking this particular brand of clothing, or you're liking this particular music band -- when you look at it collectively, actually you're creating a profile of who you are, as a person.

And so the advantage of Facebook data is that the types of information that you're revealing about
yourself is indeed strongly related to personality traits. And secondly, you're putting it all in one place, which makes it really easy to acquire, because I just need to look at your likes page, and it's all in one place. And then I can learn a lot about you from just looking at that.

Does that --

MR. HIMES: Yes, thank you.

MR. WYLIE: -- answer your question?

MR. HIMES: I think part two, which is what I hope you're getting to, is what is the objective, therefore, and the promise to somebody like the Trump campaign? That I can identify who you are, or is it that I can change your behavior, or both?

MR. WYLIE: Both, because in order to change your behavior, you first have to identify how that person thinks and engages.

So if I'm going -- so, for example, if you look at different traits like openness, for example. So higher degrees of openness -- that's things like curiosity, novelty-seeking, tolerance for ambiguity, these types of things -- correlated to liberal views,
which makes sense, because if you're open to new ideas, that generally means that you're more liberal. The inverse, where you're not, you're less curious, you don't like new things, you're more likely to be a conservative.

Knowing the level of that trait helps me be able to speak to you, because, on one hand, somebody who is higher on openness might be enticed by something new, so I might use language about how this is new, or this is changing, or this is revolutionary. If somebody is lower in openness, I wouldn't use that language.

So it helps you identify how a person engages with information and then, secondly, if you can identify how they engage with information, you can better curate your message to that person.

Perhaps a more tangible example in politics is when you think about something, sort of the most generic political message, jobs in the economy -- you hear a lot of politicians talk about jobs in the economy. And when you look at polling, lots of people say it's important. But one of the things that we
found is that, actually, it's a socially rehearsed answer. So people say that jobs and the economy is important because they think it should be, but that doesn't mean that they actually care, because they already have a job.

And so, when we start to sort of unpack what a job is, one of the things that we found was that actually, if we cite jobs don't matter, you know, achievement matters, it's -- the feeling that achievement that I get matters, or the sense of security matters, or the respect that I get from my children when I come home matters, that resonated a lot more with people, particularly when we matched it to particular traits that meant that, you know, you were higher in achievements driving, or you were more anxiety-prone, so you liked things about feeling safe and secure. If that -- does that kind of make sense?

So it's about translating abstract constructs or concepts like jobs and the economy, which sort of -- people kind -- which sort of goes over people's heads, into something that actually resonates with who you are. But who you are is different from this person and
this person and this person.

So I might translate why a job is important to you differently than to this person than to that person. Does that --

MR. HIMES: It does, yeah. And if you could just sort of move on to --

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

MR. HIMES: That was quite helpful. So what was -- what's your understanding of what was actually done by the campaign?

MR. WYLIE: Right.

MR. HIMES: And my last question was do you -- is there a reason to believe that this was effective and actually changed --

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

MR. HIMES: -- people's voting behavior?

MR. WYLIE: So I very strongly disagree with Kogan's assessment of the effectiveness of profiling. And the reason I do is because, first of all, I've seen it work, myself. Secondly, you don't have to take my word for it, I can provide you with copious amounts of peer-reviewed academic research in top psychology
journals and top data science journals that show that this works. If it didn't work, Facebook wouldn't have value. If you could not target people effectively using Facebook data, Facebook data would, therefore, be useless, and the company would have no value.

MR. HIMES: Does that statement apply to the electoral context?

I mean I got it when I'm buying shoes and that sort of thing, but the electoral context?

MR. WYLIE: Sure. But it is -- yes. Yes, it does.

MS. SPEIER: Proof?

MR. WYLIE: Sorry?

MS. SPEIER: What kind of proof do you have?

MR. WYLIE: I can send you papers, if you would like. I can explain more about it, or I can follow up with documentation if that is -- if you prefer.

MR. HIMES: I think that would -- we have limited time, so --

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

MR. HIMES: And I really appreciate the
I asked a group of experts who happened to be present as to -- the same question, and they all sort of said, well, this is scary stuff. In the electoral context there is not a lot of peer-reviewed data that -- peer-reviewed conclusions that suggest that it actually does affect the -- and I asked U.S. electoral.

But I guess, again, I don't want to -- we need to get back to the chronology.

MR. WYLIE: Sure.

MR. HIMES: The last piece -- so yes, the answer is please do, if you wouldn't mind sending us --

MR. WYLIE: I am happy to.

MR. HIMES: -- whatever you have that is about the electoral context.

But I don't want to lose this piece of -- you said something very interesting, which was that the data that they had didn't allow them to do what they said they would do for the campaign.

MR. WYLIE: Right. So the data -- the commercial data sets that they had -- so, first of all,
when Alexander Nix says 4,000 to 5,000 "data points," what he is actually referring to is actually the feature set.

Feature set, if you just think about it simply as, like, column titles -- so what he's saying is there is there is 4,000 to 5,000 column titles. That doesn't mean that those are filled with data.

So when you look at what's called the coverage rate, so that's, in this column, how much -- how many records are filled with an observation for that column. You have some features that have 2 percent, 5 percent, you know, 10 percent, which means that you actually have something called a highly sparse matrix, which means that it's -- you have a lot of possible features, but it's mostly empty.

And what that means is that it actually isn't very helpful, because if you only have information on two percent here, two percent here, two percent here, what it means is that when you look at an actual individual record, there might be 5,000 columns, but there is only two observations, three observations of the information about them, which is not sufficient to
profile those people.

And also, when you look at the correlation
values of those features against things like Democrat
or Republican Party affiliation, the highest
correlation that I can recall -- and I can provide you
guys with this -- was around .2, which is not reliable,
as a value.

So, the problem that I have with their
narrative is that, unless they somehow did something in
the couple of weeks in between leaving Ted Cruz's
campaign and beginning Donald Trump's campaign that
somehow magically fixed this problem, I don't see how
they could have done it.

If that -- does that -- and they haven't
actually provided an answer to that.

MR. HIMES: Okay, thank you. I will yield
back.

MR. SCHIFF: Ms. Speier, just one last
question along the lines Mr. Himes was asking.

You know, one of the talking points, one of
the alternate narratives is the data we got from
Cambridge Analytica wasn't really that valuable. We
actually relied far more on the Republican National Committee for their data.

Now, the RNC, I don't think, has any kind of data sets like we're describing, or --

MR. WYLIE: Not to my knowledge.

MR. SCHIFF: -- you're describing.

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

MR. SCHIFF: I don't think the Democratic Party does, either. But I wanted to ask you what you make of that argument.

Is that just an effort to minimize the significance of the work that was done?

MR. WYLIE: So one of the observations that I had whilst I was there -- because I -- during the latter end of my time at Cambridge Analytica they started introducing me to a lot of Republican consultants. That was one of the things that prompted me eventually to leave the company.

But one of the things that I observed was the tribalism that existed within the various sort of consulting class of the Republican Party. And one of the things that they didn't like sort of internally was
newcomers, particularly foreign newcomers, coming in and telling them what to do.

So with respect to Ted Cruz's campaign and some of the various other campaigns that they worked on early on, there was a lot of tension there because, you know, you have a new company essentially encroaching on their turf. That was one of the observations that I made.

The other thing to keep in mind also is that the company doesn't necessarily always do its work for clients, per se. So one of the things that I saw whilst I was there was work that Mercer or Bannon wanted to fund, but didn't necessarily have an overt client.

And that, I think, is in part, when you're looking at the broader perspective of what this company ultimately was for, in terms of changing culture, you don't need a candidate to do that. You don't need a PAC to do that. If you just want to go out and do research and put stuff out onto the Internet, you can go and do that.

And so, one of the things to just remember is
that it's not necessarily true that all of their work happened officially for the client, and that some of the work would happen sort of in parallel to the client -- also in part because if you do stuff in parallel you don't have to ask permission of the client to go and do it.

MR. SCHIFF: Ms. Speier?

MS. SPEIER: You have said over and over that Cambridge Analytica did this and Cambridge Analytica did that.

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

MS. SPEIER: But if I understand correctly, there is no office for Cambridge Analytica in the United States, and no employees.

MR. WYLIE: They might -- they have an address.

MS. SPEIER: Okay, but there is -- the functionality of Cambridge Analytica took place in London.

MR. WYLIE: Yeah, yeah. The -- so the overwhelming majority -- there were some U.S.-based staff who were American. But they were in a very --
that was a very small minority of the people. And
their job was mostly sort of, like, organizing travel
and arrangements when people were coming to the United
States. So they weren't necessarily in senior
positions, with the exception of Steve Bannon, who is
American and was also working in a senior capacity.

But the overwhelming majority of staff members
were based in London or -- all of them were paid by
SCL. And they were at the SCL office, which also
converted into the Cambridge Analytica office whenever
you wanted to change the letterhead. Like there were
two sets of letterhead.

MS. SPEIER: Got it.

MR. WYLIE: Two sets of email, two sets of
letterhead, two sets of everything. There were -- as I
recall, there were -- you had different numbers, so one
card would say this and the answering machine would be
Cambridge Analytica --

MS. SPEIER: The vast majority of persons that
worked at SCL were foreign nationals.

MR. WYLIE: At least 90 percent.

MS. SPEIER: At least 90 percent.
MR. WYLIE: At least 90 percent.

MS. SPEIER: Were any of them embedded in the Trump campaign, that you know of? Because this was after you left, correct?

MR. WYLIE: Yeah. My understanding was that there were data scientists -- and I've seen photographs of this -- who were at the Alamo site, the site in Texas, who were not American citizens, but were working for Cambridge Analytica.

And if -- I can try to get you some of those photos, if --

MS. SPEIER: Okay, that would be great.

Alexander Nix, after the expose in England, was, I guess, fired or terminated from --

MR. WYLIE: Suspended.

MS. SPEIER: Suspended from Cambridge Analytica. But since it's really just a shell, is he still at SCL?

MR. WYLIE: That I do not know. What I do know is that he wasn't terminated, he was suspended. And I've been approached by their internal investigator, so I know that they're doing some kind of
internal investigation.

But my understanding is that he hasn't actually left the company, he's merely on leave.

MS. SPEIER: Who is the biggest shareholder of SCL?

MR. WYLIE: Of SCL? I can't say definitively, but I can actually get you that information.

MS. SPEIER: Could you get it?

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

MS. SPEIER: I mean if you can get us any of the names of those --

MR. WYLIE: Oh, for -- yes, yes. In fact, it's -- we can just get it from -- yeah. Yeah, that's fine, yeah.

MS. SPEIER: The Internet Research Agency had -- are you familiar with it?

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

MS. SPEIER: And they bought lots of Facebook ads.

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

MS. SPEIER: They were peculiar, for many of us that looked at them, because they didn't seem to be
necessarily promoting one candidate or another. They were trying to create universes of people who were supporters of Black Lives Matters or gun rights supporters. Is that a typical technique that's used in this kind of data mining to then be able to --

MR. WYLIE: Yeah. So one of the things that's important to remember is that the origin of Cambridge Analytica came from SCL Group, which was -- is a military contractor. And so, when you look at information operations for military projects or counter-extremism projects, you -- there are certain techniques and approaches that you would use that you wouldn't necessarily use normally in any other context.

So, for example, if I am the U.S. military, I can't send a marketing campaign to ISIS, because if it says sponsored by the U.S. Army or Uncle Sam says no, right, that's not a credible message. So I can't use a standard marketing or advertising approach to interfere with the operations of ISIS.

So, instead, there is something called informational dominance, which is a sort of a -- one of the -- a key concept, which is that in your opponent's
universe you want to gain access to as many channels of information that affect the decision-making of your target as possible so that you can inject information into those channels, and then exploit mistakes or altered perceptions of that target.

When you look at, for example, the Internet Research Agency or, more generally, some of the things that Cambridge Analytica was doing, the goal was to change a person's perception of what's happening.

So the difference between that approach and a standard political ad is that when you send out an ad from your campaign or from your PAC, it is very overt in the sense that I am trying to convince you of something, this is what my message is. And often you have to even label it as a political act. But the source of it is apparent.

The reason that is important is because when somebody looks at it they know that they're seeing an ad.

If you want to change someone's perception of something, you will send them information that looks -- that is not branded in that way, and that may look like
a blob, that may look like a news source, that may look
like just a chat room with regular people talking.

And if you take this notion of gaining
informational dominance, and you take your target and
you put -- you inject sort of ads, or blogs, or various
digital context everywhere where they travel through
the Internet, whether you're clicking or -- whether
they're on a search engine, whether they're on
Facebook, they start to see all of this information,
and it starts to change how they think about a
particular issue, or what is real and what is not real.

And so that is something that is quite
problematic with the approach that the company uses,
because that is a fundamental denial of someone's
agency, because if they start to think that something
is real when it's not, then they aren't making a free
choice when they're going and voting, because they're
basing it on a warped perception.

And so, fundamentally, what I have a real
problem with ethically about how the company operates
is that warping someone's perception may be appropriate
if you're trying to interfere with an extremist
organization's recruitment ability, or that -- you know, if you're in a conflict situation.

But when you take that same approach and apply it to an election, you know, it -- on one hand, agency doesn't matter because you're -- this is the enemy. On the other hand, you're treating every single voter in the same way that you would treat the enemy, and you're warping their perception, which is -- does that --

MS. SPEIER: Yes. We've been told that professional --

MR. SCHIFF: One -- I just wanted to let you know we have a series of three votes.

MR. WYLIE: Okay.

MR. SCHIFF: We're going to continue to go through the votes, unless you wanted a break.

MR. WYLIE: Sure.

MR. SCHIFF: And -- but Members will be rotating in and out.

MR. WYLIE: Okay, sure, sure.

MS. SPEIER: Okay. So Professor Kogan in Russia.

MR. WYLIE: Yes.
MS. SPEIER: Do you know anything about his work there?

MR. WYLIE: Yes.

MS. SPEIER: Could you tell us about it?

MR. WYLIE: Sure. So he was based -- so, with respect to his Russian work, he was based at St. Petersburg University. And the research focused on online trolling and something called dark triad traits, which is Machiavellianism, psychopathy, and Narcissism. I can go -- explain more about what that is, if you would like, or does that --

MS. SPEIER: So in St. Petersburg as well, was he at the Internet Research Agency?

MR. WYLIE: He was --

MS. SPEIER: Was he in contract with them at all, or engaged with them at all?

MR. WYLIE: The Internet Research Agency?

That I don't know.

What I do know is that he was flying back and forth between London and Russia at the time that he was managing the data harvesting operation. He was meeting with various people in Russia about the project that he
was doing.

I was told at the time that he was giving sort of academic talks, or academic meetings about it, about the processes and the size of the data and what they're doing with it.

MS. SPEIER: This is what year?

MR. WYLIE: This was 2014.

MS. SPEIER: And how often would he go to Russia?

MR. WYLIE: When I was there it was several times. I couldn't give you an exact number, but I can go back into my email and count the number of times that he said he was in Russia if that's helpful.

MS. SPEIER: Okay, that would be helpful. So -- but you have no reason to know that there was any relationship that existed either with SCL or Mr. -- or Professor Kogan and the Internet Research Agency, but they were in the same city.

MR. WYLIE: Not the Internet Research Agency in particular. But I can explain more broadly what my concerns are --

MS. SPEIER: Okay, go ahead.
MR. WYLIE: -- with respect to Russia.

So first, the -- we have --

MS. SPEIER: Figure out how much time we have left in the vote.

We've just got to make sure we get in for the vote.

MR. WYLIE: Oh, no worries. Voting is important.

MR. SCHIFF: Just pause one second --

MS. SPEIER: Okay, all right. Let's -- we will go vote and come back, all right?

MR. WYLIE: Sure.

MS. SPEIER: Just hold your thought.

MR. WYLIE: Sure.

MR. SCHIFF: We will be back in about --

MR. WYLIE: Yeah, no worries.

(At 4:16 p.m., a brief recess was taken.)

REP. SCHIFF: Ms. Speier?

REP. SPEIER: So you were telling us the Russia connection.

MR. WYLIE: Sure. So just to recap, we had --

we have -- at the time that -- sorry.
MS. ALLEN: I was just reminding you where you were, my concerns.

MR. WYLIE: Oh, right. Sorry. So at the time of the Facebook harvesting project, Dr. Kogan was also working back and forth between London and St. Petersburg -- he was also going to Moscow frequently -- on these Russian research projects.

So those projects focused on researching online trolling. So trolling is sort of vindictive or nasty sort of bullying-type comments that -- in an online environment, and looking at the underlying psychology of that, and, more generally, behavior on the internet of people, in particular in relation to an area of research called the Dark Triad.

Dark Triad are three particular personality traits -- Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and Psychopathy. So his research in Russia was on online trolling and the Dark Triad traits and profiling literally the worst traits in people.

So SCL Group was aware of this research and went around and spoke about it to different clients that they had around the world.
So I can provide you with, for example, one email to the Minister of National Security of Trinidad talks about the quote “very interesting work” that Aleksandr Kogan is doing for the Russians in relation to profiling of particular targets or the Trinidadian government.

As that was -- as -- so as Dr. Kogan was going back and forth to Russia, at the same time we got approached -- and I don’t know -- unfortunately, I don’t know why we got approached, but we got approached by a company called LUKOIL. So LUKOIL is the second-largest oil company in Russia.

We got approached by fairly senior executives at the company. And Aleksandr put together a presentation to them, which I can -- I can pass on to you -- the British committee already has it -- where he talks about rumor campaigns, voter inoculation or attitudinal inoculation, so changing people’s minds in a way that they don’t quite understand that they’re being manipulated, for lack of a better word, and, more generally, undermining confidence in civic institutions, with reference to projects that they had
worked on in Africa.

Alexander Nix said that the LUKOIL pitch was for a consumer loyalty project in Turkey, but to me I have, you know, no recollection of that. And also, I don’t know why he would give a presentation about rumor campaigns and undermining faith in civic institutions in Africa for a consumer loyalty project in Turkey.

One of the other things that I can provide to you is emails that reference sending white papers that I had written on the internal capacity of our American data assets and the algorithms and profiling that we were doing and sending that to senior executives at LUKOIL, including a reference to the CEO of LUKOIL.

One of the concerns that I have is that LUKOIL has fairly well-known relationships with the FSB, has an information-sharing agreement with the FSB. I know that in Europe it often operates in places that are difficult to get FSB agents in or going around collecting information under the auspices of being a company.

The other thing that I should mention is that on the -- on the defense side of the company, SCL does
a lot of work in Eastern Europe, in particular in the Baltics. That research and -- or, rather, operations often involve counter-propaganda efforts. So Russian counter-propaganda for NATO clients.

And so my other concern is that given that the company was working in Eastern Europe on the military side for NATO clients that we probably would have been some kind of intelligence target, given that we were already operating on their turf, and that Alexander Nix told the company, in no uncertain terms, about the assets that we were building in the United States, what our capacity was, how it could be used, makes reference to rumor campaigns and, you know, disinformation and undermining civic -- confidence in specific institutions, and then informs the company that, in fact, the -- the leader manager of that data harvesting is actually going to Russia.

And that -- the concern that I have is not that Cambridge Analytica somehow cut a deal with the Russians and there is a grand conspiracy. The concern that I have is that they made a lot of noise for a long time. It is -- you know, from 2014 to -- you know,
essentially from the spring of 2014 to the spring of
2015, so almost a year, with LUKOIL, and that if --

REP. SPEIER: “They” being?

MR. WYLIE: Cambridge Analytica. And that if

that information was passed on to any number of
agencies in Russia, given that the data that was being
acquired through the Facebook harvesting scheme was
often not encrypted, that even if it was encrypted
could have been acquired through something as simple as
a key logger.

So key logger is either a device or a piece of
software that is uploaded to a computer that then logs
what you’re typing, which then you can use to get, you
know, username, password, all of that.

And that given that Dr. Kogan was going back
and forth to Russia, as we’re making it known to --
rather, as Cambridge Analytica is making it known to
LUKOIL that these projects are going on, the concern is
that it would have been extremely easy to get access to
this data. Extremely easy. As simple as a key logger
on Dr. Kogan’s computer in Russia.

As easy as sending -- the data science teams
at SCL, when I was there, the majority of them were Eastern European, and they did not do background checks on any of them. Not to say that if you’re Eastern European you are somehow, you know, in -- working for -- but that the security practices at the time were incredibly poor.

I can give you examples of where the company would be emailing data sets on hundreds of thousands of American citizens in unencrypted emails, which would have been incredibly easy to access.

The other sort of --

REP. SPEIER: And that would be to a contract that they had with a company where, in the United States or somewhere else?

MR. WYLIE: With -- a contract with --

REP. SPEIER: A company they had -- you said they would be sending all this --

MR. WYLIE: So the Kogan project, so, for example, between Aleksandr Kogan or some of his researchers and Cambridge Analytica. So if we said, “Hey, can I get” --

REP. SPEIER: Got it. Okay.
MR. WYLIE: -- "a data set," rather than sending it through a secure FTP site, for example, it would just be emailed as just an open, unencrypted file.

REP. SPEIER: Professor Kogan was a contractor with SCL or CA or --

MR. WYLIE: He operated through a company called Global Science Research. So he, as an individual, wasn’t contracted. It was his company, GSR. GSR was made up of Dr. Kogan and then another gentleman, Joseph Chancellor, who now works at Facebook.

REP. SPEIER: What’s the name?

MR. WYLIE: Joseph Chancellor. I can send you -- I can send you the name. So in addition to all of that happening, one of the other things that I just find slightly bizarre about what Cambridge Analytica -- some of the research streams that got set up after Bannon took over, the only tested foreign leader in the research that was being done in the United States was on Vladimir Putin.

And also, the -- one of the primary focuses of
the research in relation to Americans’ perspectives on
foreign issues was Russian expansion into Eastern
Europe and whether Vladimir Putin was justified in
taking over parts of Ukraine.

REP. SPEIER: Okay.

MR. WYLIE: And so I can provide you with, for
example, transcripts of focus groups on that. And so
the thing -- the thing that I just find --

REP. SPEIER: Hold that thought.

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

REP. SPEIER: We’re down to 50 votes. We’ll
go off the record just for a minute.

(Recess taken from 4:34 p.m. until 4:47 p.m.)

REP. SCHIFF: Ms. Speier.

REP. SPEIER: Where did we leave off?

MR. WYLIE: Oh, right. I was talking about --

I can’t read your writing. I’m sorry. Oh, right.

Sorry.

So the -- so I’ll just back up a little bit.

So one of the -- the only foreign leader that was
tested --

REP. SPEIER: Oh, right.
MR. WYLIE: -- in the research that we were doing was Vladimir Putin.

REP. SPEIER: And who was requesting that?

MR. WYLIE: I -- I don’t know who requested it. I know that I didn’t, and so I would rather not speculate.

REP. SPEIER: But it was also Vladimir Putin and --

MR. WYLIE: And --

REP. SPEIER: -- people’s feelings about the annexation of Crimea?

MR. WYLIE: Yeah. So -- so we -- being Cambridge Analytica, in focus groups and in message testing -- and I believe that one of the models that Dr. Kogan provided to Cambridge Analytica actually modeled views on Russia, in terms of foreign relations, because that was one of the message testing --

REP. SPEIER: You just said focus groups. Were you doing focus groups --

MR. WYLIE: There were --

REP. SPEIER: -- in the U.S.? 

MR. WYLIE: Yes. There was both a qualitative
and quantitative stream of research happening in parallel. So --

REP. SPEIER: All of that information is now housed within SCL, right?

MR. WYLIE: Yes. I can provide you some of the transcripts because I still -- I still have some of the transcripts from the -- from the focus groups, for example, if you’d like that.

The focus groups were used -- so qualitative research is not usually generalizable, so -- because your sample size is, you know, 12 people in a room talking. So there’s all kinds of things that could affect what -- the output of that.

But one of the reasons that focus groups and in-depth interviews were used was essentially to come up with better -- essentially asking people, what is it that I don’t know about you that I should know about you? And then coming up with theories or hypotheses from that to then test quantitatively in a way that you can actually validate through control groups and --

REP. SPEIER: In your conversations with Mr. Bannon --
MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

REP. SPEIER: -- did he indicate to you any interest in wanting to suppress the vote in the United States on some level?

MR. WYLIE: So if by “suppression” you mean discourage particular groups of people or discouraging the likelihood of particular groups of people from voting, is that what you mean by “suppress”?

REP. SPEIER: Yes.

MR. WYLIE: Then yes. So one of the things that I could provide to you is a memo that references voter disengagements in bold as an objective for some of the American operations.

My understanding of that was that that quote “voter disengagement” would be focused on particular groups of people who are more prone to vote Democrat. So it wasn’t -- it wasn’t general. It was specific to -- to that. So yes.

And with respect to your question about Steve Bannon in particular, that was something that came up in conference calls with him.

REP. SPEIER: How about efforts to influence
voters on race?

MR. WYLIE: So one of the things that emerged from some of the research was that there was sort of an undercurrent of certain -- certain types of Americans, typically white men who -- but there were also groups of women, though -- who -- are you familiar with the concept of race realism? No.

So race realism is a movement within the alt right, which is the idea that you can call something -- you can call someone racist for having prejudicial views towards particular ethnicities or races.

But a defense to that -- and so just to be clear, I’m not personally defending it, I’m just -- to explain it -- would be that it’s simply being quote “realistic about the realities of race,” and that there are certain natural hierarchies to people.

And this is something that I know Steve Bannon was -- found interesting, as something that he wanted to explore.

REP. SPEIER: So at the time that you were engaged with him, he didn’t have a candidate in the U.S. election, or did he?
MR. WYLIE: There were -- there were lots of candidates that Robert Mercer or Rebekah Mercer wanted to help or support. But the underlying research was irrespective of the candidate, because the first step to creating the company’s assets would be to create insights, models, targeting, message testing, that would be applicable anywhere in the United States for whichever candidates, you know, the Mercers wanted.

So, but to answer your question, there were candidates that Robert Mercer wanted from the very beginning to support, or various PACs or various sort of movements and things like that.

REP. SPEIER: And did he -- were those articulated to you?

MR. WYLIE: Yeah. I can provide you with a list of --

REP. SPEIER: Okay. That would be great.

MR. WYLIE: -- the -- and, I mean, some of them are currently still in Congress, for example.

REP. SPEIER: What is the most important thing you want us to know?

MR. WYLIE: I want you to -- so what’s --
what’s really important for me to speak with you as representatives of the United States is that a lot of -- a lot of the wrongdoing that this company has done was in the United States.

So, you know, the bulk of the misappropriated Facebook data was on American citizens. The bulk of the research was on American citizens. The -- I want to inform you collectively about -- that this company, and more broadly the backers of this company, so whether it’s, you know, the Mercers or Steve Bannon, are willing to manipulate and work the perceptions of American voters, simply to exploit -- exploit that warped view in an election.

And the problem that I have with that is that that is fundamentally incongruent with a free election. If you are trying to trick people, for lack -- to really simplify it, trick people into voting for you, by changing what they think is real, that is wrong, and I would like people in the United States to know that.

I also think that there may be grounds to investigate the company, not just in the UK but also in the United States, with respect to electoral law
infractions and potentially Foreign Corrupt Practices Act and other sort of laws specific to the United States, which I’d like to inform you about.

And then also what is particularly concerning to me is the interactions that I witnessed between the company and LUKOIL, and also the work that Dr. Kogan was doing in Russia, and that given that this company was harvesting a massive amount of very sensitive data on a lot -- you know, tens of millions of Americans, and they were doing it whilst they were telling very senior executives of the second-largest oil company in Russia about it, as the -- the lead researcher who is in charge of that harvesting was going back and forth to Russia.

You know, as some of his colleagues -- one of the things that I can provide to you is some of his colleagues were also going to Russia, talking to politicians in Russia about some of the work that the psychometric center was doing. So I am just generally concerned that something -- that this hasn’t been investigated, and that it really should be.

And given that, you know, this is -- that this
is a company that also, you know, has a long history of
working with the American military, from an American
perspective, you know, is this an appropriate company
that your government should be engaging on those kinds
of projects? So if that answers your question.

REP. SPEIER: Thank you.

REP. SCHIFF: We’d be very interested in any
documentation you have on the presentations to LUKOIL,
on the --

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

REP. SCHIFF: -- other Kogan employees who
were -- also interacted with Russia.

MR. WYLIE: So, for example, one of -- one of
his colleagues -- and I have the screen cap of it --
posted that he was going to meet senior politicians in
Russia to talk about the research that they were doing,
and he mentions the Prime Minister of Russia as
somebody that he was going to give a talk to.

REP. SCHIFF: If I could, and then I’ll turn
to Mr. Swalwell. Have you seen any connections between
the work that Cambridge Analytica was doing to analyze
American attitudes towards Putin and to the annexation
of Ukraine --

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

REP. SCHIFF: -- and the Trump campaign and LUKOIL? In other words, anything that crosscuts between the Trump campaign, that particular -- the particular interest in that research as well as the interactions with LUKOIL with Russia generally?

MR. WYLIE: Not with LUKOIL in particular. More broadly, when you look at a lot of the narratives that the Trump campaign was -- was putting out. These were a lot of the messages and general sort of concepts or imagery that were being tested at Cambridge Analytica. So --

REP. SCHIFF: And were those being tested in 2014?

MR. WYLIE: Yeah. So, for example, drain the swamp, images of walls, you know, the -- you know, my -- one of the -- the wall is really interesting because I don’t actually think that their intention is really to build a wall, actually.

I think that part of -- so there is -- in post-reunification Germany, there was some research
done on something called -- and my German isn’t -- I don’t speak German, but something to the effect of Mauer im Kopf, which means the wall in the head. So Germans overestimate the distance east to west compared to north to south of the country. So they imagine their country more stretched out than it actually is. And part of that had to do with the imagery of walls, which was, you know, essentially actually only in Berlin. It wasn’t the entire country that had a giant concrete wall.

But that -- that image created a psychological distancing between the two sides of the country. And that even after that physical wall came down, that mental wall remained and is enduring even to this day. People still imagine the country as wider than it actually is.

And that if you are Steve Bannon, and you are looking to close off the United States so that it can quote/unquote “find its purpose again,” it is -- that’s a direct quote. So if that is one of your objectives, creating this psychological distance thing from, you know, the rest of the world is really important.
And so this notion of building a wall isn’t necessarily just to actually build a physical wall. It’s -- and I don’t think it has anything to do with immigration. It’s to do with distancing Americans from the rest of the world and creating a very strong, enduring symbol of that.

Sorry, that was a bit of a tangent, but --

REP. SCHIFF: No, no. That’s very interesting.

Mr. Swalwell.

REP. SWALWELL: Thank you.

And, Mr. Wylie, thank you for coming in with us. Can we I guess go back to your last day at SCL or working with Cambridge Analytica. Why did you leave?

MR. WYLIE: After Steve Bannon took over, the sort of internal company culture became quite toxic. When I first met Steve Bannon, I actually really liked him. He is very interesting -- he’s a very interesting guy to talk to, and you can have conversations like, what is culture, or talk about intersectional feminism and fractured identities in the nature of self, and he will fully engage you in that conversation. So he’s a
very interesting guy to actually talk to.

But when you become his subordinate, you are then treated as such. So the culture of the company, you know, it was -- became very difficult to work in. And then, also, being instructed to -- to apply some of the research that we were doing originally to the United States not only just applied to the United States, but then being introduced to, you know, his associates, who had, in my view, extremely warped political views that I was genuinely uncomfortable with.

Sitting, for example, in a meeting with my colleagues, and essentially talking about, you know, to a group that we were introduced to, about essentially how to exacerbate or reactivate homophobia in the United States when many of my colleagues were gay themselves, and it just became clear that this is not something that I can do.

I don’t -- you know, and I never ended up signing the final contracts and intellectual property agreement that the company wanted me to sign, which would have locked me in to the company, because I just
couldn’t imagine spending 10 years doing that. I
couldn’t imagine like my career doing that.

REP. SWALWELL: What was the total amount of
time you worked there?

MR. WYLIE: About a year and a half.

REP. SWALWELL: How did you leave? Did you
give them a letter? Did you tell someone? How did
that play out?

MR. WYLIE: I sent an email to Alexander Nix,
and I -- I didn’t fully go into the reasons why I
wanted to leave. I just said, in July 2014, that I’m
going to leave. But the agreement that I had was that
I would phase out my work until November, which is the
-- when the midterm was happening; and then after that
point, no more.

REP. SWALWELL: Did he respond to you?

MR. WYLIE: He was -- in person he did, and he
took me to -- to lunch and tried to convince -- so he
just -- for Alexander Nix and for Steve Bannon, I think
they found it really difficult to understand -- like if
we just pay you more, why won’t you stay? Why won’t --

REP. SWALWELL: Did they offer to pay you
more?

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

REP. SWALWELL: Okay.

MR. WYLIE: I got offered to pay -- be paid a lot more. And, you know, I just -- I said, “Literally, I can’t imagine myself doing this anymore.” This is not -- when I -- when I signed up originally, we weren’t doing anything with the alt right.

We weren’t -- I didn’t even know who Steve Bannon was, and, you know, the thing that was appealing to me is that I could work on projects that, you know, if it related to counter-extremism, or behavior change in Africa with respect to HIV-prone behaviors, or things like that, to me that was morally acceptable.

What they were doing I didn’t find acceptable, and I really didn’t like that I was playing a foundational role in it. And I essentially understood that I either leave now or I’m going to be locked in, and I just said, “Don’t want to” --

REP. SWALWELL: Were you ever under a nondisclosure agreement with --

MR. WYLIE: Yes. I --
REP. SWALWELL: Which company?

MR. WYLIE: I have a nondisclosure agreement, a mutual nondisclosure agreement with SCL, and then after I left they then threatened various legal actions and made all kinds of accusations, which were actually just completely untrue, and chased me for months.

REP. SWALWELL: When did you sign the nondisclosure agreement with SCL?

MR. WYLIE: I signed the nondisclosure agreement with SCL in 2013, and then after receiving legal threats in 2015 after I left, I then signed something called an undertaking of confidentiality, which I believe is signed as a deed. So there is -- it’s a slightly higher tier of duty of confidence, as it were.

REP. SWALWELL: Why did you sign that?

MR. WYLIE: Well, they just wouldn’t stop sending letters to my lawyers, and then they threatened to take me to court over --

REP. SWALWELL: Who is “they”? Who was sending the letters?

MR. WYLIE: SCL.
REP. SWALWELL: And was it -- were any employees of SCL personally contacting you?

MR. WYLIE: Oh, lots. Yeah, everybody was talking to me.

REP. SWALWELL: About signing an agreement?

MR. WYLIE: Oh, no. About -- not signing the agreement, no. Just about what was happening in the company.

REP. SWALWELL: Okay. Who was pressuring you at SCL to sign the agreement?

MR. WYLIE: Alexander Nix and Steve Bannon.

REP. SWALWELL: And were they doing that in person, on the phone, electronically?

MR. WYLIE: All of the above. And it was because -- the problem was that Robert Mercer put in money, and Alexander Nix sort of sold intellectual property to -- or, rather, SCL sold intellectual property to Cambridge Analytica, but they didn’t fully finalize or execute agreements with myself about the intellectual property that I was generating.

The mutual nondisclosure agreement that I have with the company very clearly states that any
intellectual property that I develop I retain, unless I specifically license it to the company. When Bannon found out, he obviously was concerned about that, because their primary concern at the time was that they thought that I might go and take this and go and like work on the Hillary campaign or something and try to replicate.

This is -- this is --

REP. SWALWELL: Did they tell you that?

MR. WYLIE: It came out in conversations between my lawyers and their lawyers that that was one of the concerns that they had. But -- and this is, in part, why they have this narrative that I was a disgruntled employee and that I was trying to set up a rival firm.

I never set up a rival firm. I’m the only party in this entire, you know, saga that never commercialized the data. I never sold the data. I didn’t set up a rival firm.

REP. SWALWELL: Can we go back to the undertaking?

REP. SWALWELL: Is there anything about that undertaking deed that you signed, or the mutual nondisclosure agreement that you signed --

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

REP. SWALWELL: -- that is limiting your testimony to us today?

MR. WYLIE: No. I am -- my entire conversation with you is breaking in. But in the UK at least, there is a defense to breach of confidence, which is if you are revealing potential criminality or grossly unethical behavior, you have a defense to breach of confidence.

REP. SWALWELL: Have you been interviewed by the Special Counsel here in the United States?

MR. WYLIE: No, I haven’t. Next week I am being interviewed by the FBI, Department of Justice, and the New York Attorney General.

REP. SWALWELL: Is that with respect to the Russia investigation?

MR. WYLIE: It is with respect to what questions they want to ask me.

REP. SWALWELL: I’m sorry. Counsel?
MR. WYLIE: Yeah. They haven’t -- we haven’t -- they don’t give you the questions in advance when they interview you. So it --

REP. SWALWELL: Do you know if it’s -- the FBI interview is from the Special Counsel team, or is that separate?

MR. WYLIE: It is being coordinated by the National Crime Agency in the UK. So I have reported various crimes, or at least from my perspective what are possible crimes to investigate, to the NCA, which is the equivalent of the FBI in the UK.

The NCA has special relationships with the FBI. They have invited who they as appropriate from the FBI, given what I have handed over to them, to then interview me.

REP. SWALWELL: Where will that interview be?

MR. WYLIE: It will happen, I believe, on a military base in the UK.

REP. SWALWELL: And did you say that it would be a joint interview, or is it separate interviews, New York Attorney General, and then FBI, DOJ?

MR. WYLIE: My understanding -- and correct me
if I’m wrong, Tamsin -- is that each respective agency
or authority will have an opportunity to ask me
questions. But the other authorities will be watching
the interview also. Is that --

MS. ALLEN: We -- I don’t know -- I don’t
think we can give a complete answer to that yet, though
we’ve asked questions about how the interviews are to
be structured and we don’t yet know completely.

REP. SWALWELL: What did you do once you left
Cambridge Analytica? What you done since? It sounds
like you’ve gone to school.

MR. WYLIE: Yeah. I’ve done -- so I know this
is going to sound ridiculous. So I’ve done projects in
fashion, I have done projects in politics, working as a
consultant mostly in data science. So I’ve done
projects, for example, for the Canadian government
after Justin Trudeau got elected.

REP. SWALWELL: Have you done any work in --
that was with a rival of Cambridge Analytica or a rival
campaign of a campaign that they were working on?

MR. WYLIE: No. I have not -- I am -- so this
is -- I find this entire narrative very frustrating
because after I -- the reason I left Cambridge Analytica is because I did not want to continue working on Steve Bannon’s vision for the alt right.

I, therefore, cannot be a rival to this company that works for Republicans because I have -- and I will be super clear -- I have never worked for a Republican since. I have never worked for a conservative candidate since, and I will not. And so I have not -- I am not setting up a rival -- I don’t know where this rival firm is that apparently I have set up and managed.

REP. SWALWELL: Can you tell me, how was it that you stayed in contact with employees at Cambridge Analytica? Because it sounds like you had a pretty good window into what was going on all the way up to the Trump data operation, Project Alibi.

MR. WYLIE: So it’s because I -- the people that I brought on when I was at SCL, and then later when the CA was expanding, were people who I had worked extensively on projects in the past in other contexts.

Most of the people who got brought on early on were not conservatives. You know, we had -- you know,
not to be flippant about it, but we had a lot of vegans working on the project. We had a lot of gap people work on the project. You know, we -- you know, there weren’t -- it wasn’t -- it wasn’t a conservative team that got set up.

And when I left, people would continue talking to me, in part because I had a just really positive — you know, I was friends with some of them — positive relationship with them, and then also they started getting more and more frustrated with what was happening.

I left. A lot of people started leaving after -- after I left.

REP. SWALWELL: Have you had any threats made on your life?

MR. WYLIE: Not on my life, no.

REP. SWALWELL: What kind of -- any physical threats?

MR. WYLIE: Not -- not physical.

REP. SWALWELL: How about like financial ruin or personal ruin threats?

MR. WYLIE: I’ve had -- I think it would be
more appropriate if we spoke about that off record. Is
that possible? I’ve --

REP. SWALWELL: Actually, I just want to make
sure, Mr. Schiff, if that’s all right? He has had
threats made, and he doesn’t feel comfortable stating
them on the record.

REP. SCHIFF: That’s fine.

REP. SWALWELL: Okay. If the stenographer
could -- we’ll go off the record momentarily.

(REcess taken from 5:15 p.m. until 5:17 p.m.)

REP. SWALWELL: Were there any Russians
working at Cambridge Analytica, or Russian nationals?

MR. WYLIE: My understanding is Dr. Kogan was,
if not Russian -- I believe he was either Russian or
Maldovan. His family is Russian-speaking, and he then
naturalized as an American citizen.

REP. SWALWELL: While he was working there,
did you observe him traveling back and forth from
Russia or any --

MR. WYLIE: Yes.

REP. SWALWELL: -- of the Soviet bloc
countries? You did.
MR. WYLIE: Yeah. Oh, yeah.

REP. SWALWELL: And you did do that.

MR. WYLIE: Oh, yeah, yeah. I have email records of that.

REP. SWALWELL: Anyone else?

MR. WYLIE: There -- I mean, most of the data science team were Eastern European. A lot of them spoke Russian, so it wasn’t unusual to -- to hear Russian in the office.

At the time, though, that’s not -- you know, for me, it’s not suspicious that somebody comes from a certain part of the world, or if their colleague also speaks that language, they will speak to them in that language.

REP. SWALWELL: Can we go back to the polling or the focus groups --

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

REP. SWALWELL: -- about how Putin was viewed --

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

REP. SWALWELL: -- in the United States? Who commissioned that?
MR. WYLIE: Cambridge Analytica did.

REP. SWALWELL: Was there a client that asked Cambridge Analytica to do that?

MR. WYLIE: No. No. We --

REP. SWALWELL: Do you know why they wanted to do that?

MR. WYLIE: Honestly, no.

REP. SWALWELL: Is it possible I guess, just based on how you understood Cambridge Analytica to work, that Mr. Nix or Mr. Kogan or somebody who had a relationship with Russia could have been asked by someone in Russia to do that type of research; is that something that would not have been out of the ordinary?

MR. WYLIE: Yeah. Yes. My intuition, and so I’m just going to be super clear, this is not me stating a fact. I’m just stating a suspicion -- is that Dr. Kogan added some of these research areas, because he was quite involved in the actual testing of messages and figuring out ways to test those messages, to test those constructs.

And, you know, his -- it was him that actually went out and organized the actual surveys, testing, et
cetera. So he had -- he played a very influential role in deciding what kinds of constructs we would look at. But I can’t tell you for sure who did it.

I can tell you that having gone and asked several former staff members, none of them -- none of the people that I have spoken to commissioned that, or at least told me that they commissioned that area --

REP. SWALWELL: Let me ask it this way I guess. Was this something that was out of the ordinary, meaning that your firm was doing, at least ostensibly to you and other employees, research in the United States about how Americans viewed Russia, and there was no known client attached to it?

MR. WYLIE: There was that -- that -- as I understand it, at least when I was there, that stream of research was never actually applied to a specific client. It was -- it was just research that was done.

REP. SWALWELL: And were there other instances, though, like that where research would be done that didn’t have any known application? Or is that sort of an outlier?

MR. WYLIE: Not that -- it’s an outlier. Not
that I can remember because, you know, if you’re -- so
I don’t know how it would be useful to a campaign, an
American campaign, to know about people’s views on
Vladimir Putin. It’s not like you’re running against
Vladimir Putin. It’s not like you’re -- it’s not like
a major topical issue is Russian expansionism in
Ukraine.

So whereas if you are testing other, you know
-- your perspective on feminism, for example, that
could be used in all kinds of different -- you know,
your -- your perspective on gun rights, your
perspective on different things, that can be applied.

I do not remember any -- at least when I was
there, any example of the Russian research being
deployed in any way.

REP. SCHIFF: On that point, that focus
grouping and qualitative and quantitative analysis on
the Putin-Ukraine issue --

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

REP. SCHIFF: -- is that something requested
by Bannon specifically, or do you know how that got
into the mix?
MR. WYLIE: This is something that I have been trying to figure out, because I know that no one on the message testing team commissioned that area of research. So I can -- through a process of elimination, at least -- and I -- I feel like they would be honest to me. So I don’t have any reason to think that they would be blind to me.

There is sort of two people left. You’ve either got Steve or you’ve got Kogan. But I can’t -- I can’t tell you for sure who would have --

REP. SCHIFF: Because this was 2014, right?

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

REP. SCHIFF: So this is well before the Trump campaign.

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

REP. SCHIFF: And if this is done by either Bannon or Kogan or Nix --

MR. WYLIE: I don’t think it would have -- well, I don’t think it would have been Nix.

REP. SCHIFF: Well, the reason I ask is, for the very reason you mention, because it’s well before the Trump campaign, yeah --
MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

REP. SCHIFF: -- and Bannon would not have known necessarily that there would be a U.S. Presidential campaign advocating a close relationship with Russia, or mitigating the negative views on Putin and Ukraine, it would make much more sense if it was in connection with a Russian-interested client.

MR. WYLIE: Yeah. Something just to say to that is that Steve Bannon has an admiration for sort of strong man-type leadership. So I know that, at least when I was there and he was talking about sort of the kind of leader that he likes, sort of at the time, in my head, I imagined Mussolini, but I could have also very easily imagined Putin. Just it wasn’t in my head at the time. But I kind of imagined Mussolini as sort of the Steve Bannon archetype of a very loud but strong kind of leader that he liked.

But if I were to -- if I were to -- if I were to -- if I had to bet on who it was, I suspect that because Dr. Kogan was more involved directly in the actual management and commissioning of research, and the actual execution of developing surveys and putting
them out and collecting that data, that he may have had
a role in that.

REP. SCHIFF: And that might have been of
interest to the people he was talking to in Russia?

MR. WYLIE: It could -- I mean, it could be.

This is -- this is, again, partly why -- I mean, I
don’t have every answer, but partly -- one of the
reasons why, you know, I want to speak to you and
others is to kind of put that question to the
authorities and look at finding an answer to that.

REP. SCHIFF: And you’ve probably seen the
indictment that Mueller returned on the 13 Russians
that lays out in detail what the Internet Research
Agency was doing in terms of their use of social media.

From what you have -- what you see in the
indictment, and from what you’ve seen more generally in
the open source --

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

REP. SCHIFF: -- how the Russians deployed,
advertising organic content, paid content, does
anything about it strike you as suggestive of the use
of the modeling that Cambridge Analytica did?
MR. WYLIE: The thing that -- and so I’m not an -- like an expert on the -- you know, what the Internet Research Agency was doing, but just generally from what I’ve seen, the kinds of -- when you look at sort of the style of message or sort of just -- even the general sort of aesthetic of it, how it’s slightly bizarre, it feels slightly bizarre, but it’s sort of leading -- it’s quite divisive. And that, to me, felt -- it felt familiar.

But I don’t know if the IRA in particular used -- used CA modeling or not, so I can’t answer that as a definitive. But what I can say is that if -- if you have an agency, whether it was the IRA or some other agency that had access to this data, it would have been extremely helpful in either developing narratives and understanding what kinds of narratives could become divisive, if that was your goal, or, secondly, where or how to target it.

So I can’t -- I can’t answer that one way or the other, but one of the concerns that I have is that that’s a possibility. And I -- I would hope that somebody could go and take that and look into it in
some way.

REP. SCHIFF: Mr. Swalwell.

REP. SWALWELL: You talked to members from Cambridge Analytica throughout, you said, the Trump campaign, and you mentioned earlier that foreign nationals had gone to San Antonio. Do you know what kind of foreign nationals they were?

MR. WYLIE: I don’t want to -- I don’t want to misspeak, so I -- I believe that they were -- what I -- how about if I go back and --

REP. SWALWELL: Sure.

MR. WYLIE: -- I get the photos that I’m referencing, and then I send them to you and you will have the definitive answer on the citizenship and who they were.

REP. SWALWELL: Okay. But did anyone ever tell you what the citizenship was?

MR. WYLIE: I believe I know, but I just -- I’m not 100 percent sure. So I don’t want to misspeak.

REP. SWALWELL: Okay.

MR. WYLIE: But I believe they were Eastern European.
REP. SWALWELL: Have you ever been to Russia?

MR. WYLIE: Have I -- no, I have never been to Russia. I’ve been to the Baltics and Eastern Europe, but I have never been to Russia proper.

REP. SWALWELL: Did you ever go to the Baltics or Eastern Europe while you were working for Cambridge Analytica?

MR. WYLIE: Yes.

REP. SWALWELL: Did you ever receive any -- or were you ever subject to any unusual approaches or anything that kind of just seemed unusual? Did someone contact you that struck up conversation and just seemed out of place?

MR. WYLIE: I could -- if I answered yes, if I can just explain, that, yes, there were lots of various approaches from people, you know, for example in Lithuania about, you know, wanting to do business or wanting to explore what it was that CA was doing or what I was doing. So, first of all, just to be super clear, I have never actually engaged in business there personally or on behalf of Cambridge Analytica.

REP. SWALWELL: You’re saying this was by a
MR. WYLIE: But part of -- part of it might just simply be a cultural difference in how people approach things. But, yes, I have been to the Baltic Region, and I have been approached by people who are aware of the work that we were doing and were interested in it.

REP. SWALWELL: And when these individuals made these approaches, did you have any reason to believe that -- or had you made them aware of the work you were doing, or were they just completely random approaches and they told --

MR. WYLIE: Well, I was --

REP. SWALWELL: -- you that there --

MR. WYLIE: -- I was visiting -- because several of the other staff members at CA were from Baltic Region or Eastern Europe, my understanding was that they had spoken to people back in their respective home countries about some of the work that we were doing.

So whether people know it through just, you know, completely innocent conversation or know it -- in
other words, I don’t -- I don’t know.

REP. SWALWELL: Going back to Mr. Bannon and the -- as you described it, discouragement of voters or voting, you said you heard it on conference calls, what exactly do you remember him saying as it related to discouraging voter participation?

MR. WYLIE: Finding -- finding ways -- so my recollection of it was that Steve Bannon was particularly focused more -- just generally on African American in terms of voter disengagement.

So my recollection of those calls was that he -- he wanted to understand not just how to motivate his base or his supporters, but how to demotivate his opponents and discourage them from participating in an election, because, in his mind, that’s the most -- like that’s a key piece of winning. You push your people up. You push them down. It makes it easier to win.

REP. SWALWELL: Was Mr. Bannon ever involved in developing tests or models for this type of --

MR. WYLIE: He’s not a technical --

REP. SWALWELL: -- engagement?

MR. WYLIE: He’s not a technical person. He
has a good general understanding of technology, but he is not a developer. So he didn’t directly model or handle data, but he was aware of what we were doing for sure. And because he and Rebecca Mercer were the ones who authorized spending. Anytime the company wanted to start a new project or a new research stream, they had to authorize it so that there was appropriate funds to spend on it.

REP. SWALWELL: Who is Robert Murtfield?

MR. WYLIE: Robert Murtfield was an associate of a barrister, a lawyer in the UK named John Jones. John Jones was Julian Assange’s lawyer.

After -- John Jones had some kind of psychological breakdown, after the Hillary Clinton emails were released, he then walked in front of a train and killed himself. And his assistant, I -- yes, his assistant was Robert Murtfield, who then -- or his clerk. Sorry. I’ve been corrected, his clerk, which is technically different from his assistant, then was hired by Cambridge Analytica and now -- and still works for Cambridge Analytica.

REP. SWALWELL: Did you know -- do you know
Mr. Murttfield?

MR. WYLIE: I don’t -- I don’t know him personally, no.

REP. SWALWELL: Did you ever communicate with him?

MR. WYLIE: I believe I’ve met him, but I -- I didn’t have any -- I knew who he was and -- but I didn’t have any like direct working relationship with him.

REP. SWALWELL: To your knowledge, did Julian Assange have any relationship with Cambridge Analytica, or do you suspect, based on some of the circumstantial evidence you’ve pieced together, that Mr. Assange had a relationship with Cambridge Analytica?

MR. WYLIE: So this is where working with the British inquiry would be very helpful. There are tapes from various Cambridge Analytica employees talking about the relationship with Julian Assange, that that relationship happened -- was -- that that relationship happened over a year before the American election started, well over a year before the American election. So it wasn’t just the email in June, or
whatever the official -- and I’ve also seen emails that
John -- before he died, that John Jones was -- because
John Jones also, in addition to being Julian Assange’s
lawyer, also did work for Cambridge Analytica in
various ways.

He wrote -- I think he even went and lobbied
in the United States for some of their clients, I
believe, or wrote articles and things like that. And
so I have seen, although I don’t possess, but I know
where they are, emails that allude to WikiLeaks.

REP. SWALWELL: And so just based on what
you’ve laid out for us, you know of Russians working
for Cambridge Analytica who traveled to Russia. You
know of individuals working for Cambridge Analytica who
traveled to Russia. You know of Cambridge Analytica
doing work on how Russia is viewed in the United
States. And you know that individuals at Cambridge
Analytica, a year before the hacking of Democratic
emails, were in contact with Julian Assange. Is that
all accurate?

MR. WYLIE: Yes. And in addition to that, I
also know that Cambridge Analytica was advertising the
projects that they were working on in the United States to LUKOIL and the senior executives at LUKOIL.

REP. SWALWELL: Were you aware of, once you left Cambridge Analytica, but in your continuous contacts with friends there, of any effort to obtain Hillary Clinton’s quote/unquote “deleted emails”?

MR. WYLIE: Yes. So some of the tape recordings reference that. Something else to just point out is that the firm SCL has a history of making use of hacked material. So, for example, in Nigeria, the company utilized medical records and private emails of the current president of Nigeria in trying to create Kompromat.

The person who organized that project in Nigeria, Brittney Kaiser, also had a very significant relationship with John Jones before he did. As I believe he was supervising her -- her master’s degree, or something like that, and then she then went on and worked at his firm before she went to Cambridge Analytica.

REP. SWALWELL: So what were you hearing from colleagues of yours at Cambridge Analytica? What
personal knowledge do you have of discussions about obtaining Hillary Clinton’s deleted emails?

MR. WYLIE: I don’t have personal knowledge because I never discussed access using hacked material in the United States, or anywhere, actually, for that matter. That’s a line that I wouldn’t -- that’s illegal, that’s a crime.

But I have seen email documentation, tape recordings, and also have spoken to various employees who also, you know, reference relationships with WikiLeaks and, in particular, acquiring Kompromat in the same way that they would attempt to obtain Kompromat in an African country.

REP. SWALWELL: Who were they trying to obtain Kompromat on?

MR. WYLIE: The Democrats. So Hillary Clinton, in particular.

REP. SWALWELL: And is this publicly available information, or is this something that you are --

MR. WYLIE: Some is and some isn’t. Some is in the possession of the inquiry in Britain. It’s --

REP. SWALWELL: And who are the individuals
1 seeking the deleted emails? Are these Cambridge
2 Analytica employees?
3
4 MR. WYLIE: Yeah. Alexander Nix and I -- and
5 then I believe Nigel Oakes. Nigel Oakes, for example,
6 is on tape talking about it.
7
8 REP. SWALWELL: Now, have you seen the
9 publicly released email where I believe Mr. Nix is
10 talking with an individual about a conversation or an
11 approach he had made to Julian Assange?
12
13 MR. WYLIE: Yeah.
14
15 REP. SCHIFF: Rebekah Mercer.
16
17 REP. SWALWELL: Yeah. Rebekah Mercer. Are
18 you saying that, aside from this, there were other
19 efforts that you’re aware of to obtain --
20
21 MR. WYLIE: That’s my understanding. So I
22 think if you -- I can -- if you don’t already have a
23 relationship with Damian Collins, who is the chair of
24 the DCMS Committee at the UK Parliament, I am happy to
25 -- I know him very well, so I can introduce you,
26 because this is something that they are looking at.
27 And then I can also speak to others who have
28 documentation around this area.
REP. SWALWELL: I’ll yield back to you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. SCHIFF: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Swalwell.

Just to follow up on that, in the public email or public reported email, Rebecca Mercer suggests that Cambridge Analytica reach out to Julian Assange and try to basically house the -- and archive the emails. And Nix, I think, reportedly responds that he tried that.

So you’re aware of emails and tape recordings that indicate that it was more than Nix simply asking his assistant to reach out and being rebuffed?

MR. WYLIE: Yes.

REP. SCHIFF: Do you know whether Cambridge Analytica had any success in getting information for WikiLeaks?

MR. WYLIE: That I don’t -- I’m not definitive on. What I can help you get access to is various pieces of evidence that -- that show a wider relationship with -- or association with Julian Assange and WikiLeaks that go back much further than just that brief moment that -- or at least the narrative that it
was only just an email or just a random cold call to WikiLeaks.

REP. SCHIFF: So when Mr. Nix purportedly asked his assistant to reach out to Julian Assange, it wouldn’t have been a cold call. There were relationships there.

MR. WYLIE: Can I tell you why that doesn’t make sense?

REP. SCHIFF: Yeah.

MR. WYLIE: So Brittney Kaiser, who after the stories came out she left the company but was there until a couple of weeks ago -- she was the business development director -- she had worked for John Jones, so Julian Assange’s lawyer. And so in addition to Robert Murtfield coming on, she also came on.

And the reason why I think that it doesn’t make sense to just cold call is that she would have had very easy access to WikiLeaks and to Julian Assange because she worked for his now-deceased lawyer, who had a relatively close relationship with Julian Assange.

And so for me to go -- and it doesn’t make sense that he would just cold call when he had a very -
- when he would have had a much warmer reception using a network.

REP. SCHIFF: So the Julian Assange lawyer left WikiLeaks and came to work at Cambridge Analytica.

MR. WYLIE: He was working -- he didn’t leave WikiLeaks. He was also working for Cambridge Analytica and --

REP. SCHIFF: The same --

MR. WYLIE: -- and then he committed suicide.

REP. SCHIFF: So the same lawyer worked for both Julian Assange and Cambridge Analytica.

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

MS. ALLEN: Is it helpful to explain the split profession, the barrister -- the role of a barrister as opposed to what he was doing --

MR. WYLIE: If you think it’s relevant.

MS. ALLEN: Well, I’m not sure that it is, but the -- as a barrister --

REP. SCHIFF: Well, they were both clients of the lawyer.

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

REP. SCHIFF: So the lawyer wasn’t in-house
with WikiLeaks or in-house with Cambridge Analytica.

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

REP. SCHIFF: He had both of these clients.

MR. WYLIE: Yes. Barristers are always -- barristers are never employed. They are always independent. It’s just --

REP. SCHIFF: Oh, I see.

MR. WYLIE: -- a function -- it’s just how the -- there’s two types of lawyers in the UK. There’s solicitors --

REP. SCHIFF: And the barristers --

MR. WYLIE: -- who can be employed, and barristers are -- do you want -- you’re the lawyer. You can explain it.

REP. SCHIFF: No, I think I understand.

MS. ALLEN: Yes. So this is how the client relationship -- the main -- the primary client relationship, and they then instruct the barrister.

John Jones was a barrister. So there would have been a lawyer who had instructed John Jones, unless he was working outside his normal chambers to give informal advice.
REP. SCHIFF: So they were two different clients of the same barrister as --

MR. WYLIE: Yes.

REP. SCHIFF: -- who ended up taking his life. And that barrister’s clerk also --

MR. WYLIE: Robert Murtfield, who --

MS. ALLEN: And as a clerk, the clerk is attached to the chambers, which is the place which houses a group of barristers. It’s not a -- it’s not a law firm as such. It’s a group of self-employed people, and they have a -- gather together onto the banner of a chambers, and the chambers employs the clerk. So the clerk would have --

MR. WYLIE: But he was the clerk that worked for --

MS. ALLEN: Yeah. And they’re assigned some barristers, but he would have worked for others as well.

MR. WYLIE: Yeah. And so he -- so to put it in just simple terms, we have a lawyer who was working for WikiLeaks and working for Cambridge Analytica. When he died, his clerk, assistant, person, then went
over to Cambridge Analytica and -- and then also

Brittney Kaiser, who wasn’t a direct employee of his,

but she was supervised by him for her academic research

and then she went on and worked at the same chambers,

which is kind of like a law firm.

She then also went to Cambridge Analytica, and

she was the one who, for example, introduced the

Cambridge Analytica to a firm in Nigeria or a foreign

firm that accessed somehow the private medical records

of the now-president of Nigeria.

She was the one who organized that

relationship and that project, which likely involved

hacking. So she is probably somebody that you might be

interested in speaking to.

REP. SCHIFF: And tell me her name again.

MR. WYLIE: Brittney Kaiser.

REP. SCHIFF: So Brittany Kaiser --

MR. WYLIE: She is an American citizen.

REP. SCHIFF: -- worked at one project for

Cambridge Analytica in which they had records for use

in a political campaign in Nigeria. Is that --

MR. WYLIE: So projects that involved -- I’m
just conscious of that this might be published on
record and it doesn’t have privilege. So
misappropriated private or personal information of
opposition politicians in Nigeria and several Caribbean
countries where she was involved in managing the
relationships of the contractors who, through various
means, were able to acquire that information.

REP. SCHIFF: So that was part of her
responsibility at Cambridge Analytica, or was it --

MR. WYLIE: I don’t know if it was a formal
job -- I don’t think she would have put it on her
LinkedIn, that that’s something that was her formal job
role. But it is something that she was involved in,
and there are several instances of her involving in
that kind of work.

REP. SCHIFF: And she was working for the
clerk for the barrister who had --

MR. WYLIE: She was working for the chambers
of the barrister. She was working with the barrister
who was -- who represented Julian Assange at the
chambers, and then also he supervised her master’s
degree.
REP. SCHIFF: Okay. And then she leaves that chambers to go to work at --

MR. WYLIE: For Cambridge Analytica.

REP. SCHIFF: Okay. Okay. So you have someone with experience in using misappropriated materials through Cambridge Analytica to influence an election, who has a relationship with people who have a relationship with Julian Assange.

MR. WYLIE: Yes.

REP. SCHIFF: And there are documents, recordings about an approach to try to obtain those materials from Julian Assange, but you don’t know whether they were actually acquired or used by Cambridge Analytica.

MR. WYLIE: That’s the one thing that I can’t confirm to you.

REP. SCHIFF: Okay. Do you know whether -- and we would love to speak to our counterpart in Britain. Do you know whether they have evidence of that?

MR. WYLIE: So they have a lot of the recordings that I’m referring to. I actually helped
them get the recordings, so I wasn’t in possession, but
I facilitated them acquiring them. And then I also
know the individuals who have some of the emails and
documents in relation to that.

I also know that there are several journalists
who have some material who may, in some way, be willing
to show them.

REP. SCHIFF: And you mentioned that Nigel
Oakes was involved in this effort. What was his role
at SCL? I know he was one of the original --

MR. WYLIE: He is -- yeah, he goes way back in
the firm. So he is one of the shareholders, directors.
He is -- there are recordings of him talking about
WikiLeaks. So he knows about the situation.

REP. SCHIFF: And he is still an investor in
2016?

MR. WYLIE: He is, I believe, currently still
a major shareholder in SCL, not Cambridge Analytica
proper, but in SCL Group.

REP. SCHIFF: Did you ever come across Roger
Stone while you were at Cambridge Analytica or learn of
any interaction that he had with any of the principals
MR. WYLIE: No, not while -- no.

REP. SCHIFF: Okay. I have some other questions, but I’m going to go to Mr. Castro.

REP. CASTRO: Sure. Thank you for your testimony today. You’re American?

MR. WYLIE: I’m Canadian, actually.

REP. CASTRO: Oh, Canadian.

MR. WYLIE: But I have residency in the UK. I’ve lived in the UK since 2010.

REP. CASTRO: Okay. Do you know whether any other Americans were involved with Cambridge Analytica in the activities that you’ve been describing here in this interview?

MR. WYLIE: So Brittney Kaiser is an American citizen. She lives in New York.

REP. CASTRO: And what was her role again?

MR. WYLIE: She was director of business development, I believe was her title.

REP. CASTRO: Is she the one that had a role in Nigeria and the Caribbean nation?

MR. WYLIE: And Caribbean, yeah. And also,
she is the one that worked with John Jones, the Assange lawyer.

Other Americans who were involved -- Steve Bannon.

REP. SCHIFF: Mike Flynn was as well.

MR. WYLIE: Yes.

REP. SCHIFF: Can you tell us about his involvement?

MR. WYLIE: I don’t know that much about what exactly he was doing, but I know that he was an advisor, and one of the roles that he had was to go and solicit clients. I know that after Trump got elected, the firm made a very concerted effort to make it known that they had these connections with the Trump administration, that they got Trump elected, and they were looking to, you know, solicit clients through -- because of that.

I know that Alexander Nix, after Trump got elected, made a concerted effort to try to meet as many people as he could. I know that he had a meeting with the foreign commonwealth office, for example, in the UK.
I believe he met with Boris Johnson, so he --

so he and the firm went around essentially advertising this relationship, and I think with the view of trying to profit off of it. My understanding of what Michael Flynn’s role was was: a) as an advisor to the firm, but b) to use his network of contacts and then also this sort of Trump brand to solicit clients for the company.

REP. CASTRO: And do you know, who did the company share data with? Were there data partners groups that you all were swapping data with at all or coordinating with?

MR. WYLIE: So in terms of acquiring data, there were several partner companies. Just -- some of them were just very ordinary, so not that interesting, but I know that they used Experian data, another company called Info Group. All of this is sort of very standard. Some of your own companies might use Info Group data.

I know that after Brittney Kaiser came onto the company, they started exploring relationships with the Ergen family, so Chase Ergen, who my understanding
is that they -- that this family is, if not
shareholders, exert some sort of significant influence
over Dish Network in the United States.

    REP. CASTRO: Do you know what kind of
information or data was being shared with them or --

    MR. WYLIE: I don’t know in particular. I
know that this was something that they were quite
interested in. I know that the company’s relationship
with a lot of the various companies in, for example,
Mexico, like Pig.gi, which is a data harvesting app --

    REP. CASTRO: What is it called?

    MR. WYLIE: Pig.gi, P-i-g dot g-i. Or

Mowasat, which is also in Mexico.

    REP. CASTRO: How do you spell that one?

    MR. WYLIE: M-o-w-a-s-a-t. Both of those
companies, the Ergens are involved in. The Ergens were
also involved in, I believe, Nigeria and several other
countries. The various sort of projects -- my
understanding is that the projects that they were doing
-- that they are doing in Mexico are sort of research
and development projects with different means of data
harvesting, where oversight is not necessarily robust,
to see what they can do and what they can get away with, to then export that to other parts of the world that they -- that they operate in.

Perhaps what I can do is I can give you -- I can come back to you guys and give you just a complete list of every company or organization or individual that I’m aware of where they had some sort of data transaction.

REP. CASTRO: That would be helpful.

MR. WYLIE: If that -- if that’s helpful.

REP. CASTRO: That would be great.

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

REP. CASTRO: Yeah. Thank you. What about with any -- any Russians or anyone in Russia?

MR. WYLIE: So I’m not sure if you were here when I was speaking about Russia before. So I’ll just maybe --

REP. CASTRO: If you’ve covered it, then that’s fine.

MR. WYLIE: Okay. Just very quickly, Dr. Kogan was working in Russia at the time. His research at St. Petersburg University was on online trolling and
something called Dark Triad Traits, which is
Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and Psychopathy.

He was doing that at the same time that he was
managing the Facebook harvesting project, and in
addition to that happening, which, by the way, SCL was
advertising to other clients that it had the
applications of this Russian work.

It was also interfacing with LUKOIL, so
advertising. I can perhaps, if it’s --

REP. SCHIFF: We’ll go back to --

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

REP. CASTRO: We covered Brad Parscale also?

REP. SCHIFF: We didn’t really get into Brad
Parscale.

REP. CASTRO: What was the relationship, if
any, or your interfacing with Brad Parscale?

MR. WYLIE: I didn’t -- that was after I had
left, so I didn’t --

REP. CASTRO: So did you hear anything about
it, or it was coming, it was on the horizon, or
anything?

MR. WYLIE: No, not with respect to him. No.
REP. CASTRO: Okay.

REP. SCHIFF: So I have kind of a lightning round, a number of questions.

MR. WYLIE: Sure.

REP. SCHIFF: So there will be no particular order.

MR. WYLIE: Okay.

REP. SCHIFF: We had an interview with Mr. Nix. If he testified that Cambridge Analytica received no data through Facebook, would that be an inaccurate or misleading statement?

MR. WYLIE: So he also said that to the British Parliament. And as I said at the British Parliament, I will say the exact same thing to you. Facebook data -- the company’s foundational models were based on Facebook data.

I think it’s incredibly misleading to say that no Facebook data was used to develop the algorithms or the targeting or the -- or to conduct the message testing of the company.

The firm -- and I can provide you with these documents. It has Alexander’s signature on it. The
firm engaged Dr. Kogan specifically because his
application harvested Facebook data, and specifically
because it harvested not only the Facebook data of the
user but also their friend network. That is in
contracts. That is in project documentation. The
contracts have Alexander’s signature on it.

So I don’t understand why he would tell you
that they didn’t use Facebook data.

REP. SCHIFF: Is that what they teach you at
Eton?

MR. WYLIE: I --

REP. SCHIFF: That’s a rhetorical question.

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

REP. SCHIFF: You mentioned that one of the
things that we should be considered about is potential
violations of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act. What
were you referring to there?

MR. WYLIE: Yes. So one -- so I am -- I am --
so can I -- sorry. Can I ask a question? So --

REP. SCHIFF: Yes.

MR. WYLIE: -- if I speak about certain
things, I -- so I understand that this will be made
public at some point.

REP. SCHIFF: Yes. And I want to -- I was going to wait until the end of the interview to ask you. The Judiciary Committee that you interviewed with yesterday released a summary of key parts of your testimony.

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

REP. SCHIFF: Including some excerpts. I don’t know if they discussed that with you in advance or not.

MR. WYLIE: I don’t believe they -- they didn’t discuss the excerpts. I knew that they were going to publish. I treated it as entirely on the record.

REP. SCHIFF: Okay. So --

MR. WYLIE: So we didn’t go nearly as in-depth on certain topics.

REP. SCHIFF: What I thought we would do when we finish is normally our interviews are in closed session.

MR. WYLIE: Right.

REP. SCHIFF: Subject to our releasing the
transcript at a point when we decide to release it.

MR. WYLIE: Okay.

REP. SCHIFF: Now, as the majority is not participating, we are not operating under the normal rubric.

MR. WYLIE: Right.

REP. SCHIFF: So we have more flexibility than we would otherwise.

MR. WYLIE: Right.

REP. SCHIFF: I don’t want to release something that is going to create an issue for you.

MR. WYLIE: Sure. Sure.

REP. SCHIFF: Without there being a good for it, without giving you a heads-up, and anything along those lines.

There were a couple of things that I wanted to ask you about at the end whether you had any reservation with our discussing publicly generally what you had said without releasing the transcript. I mean, I think --

MR. WYLIE: Okay.

REP. SCHIFF: -- I think, for example, it will
be of great interest to people that there were more
connections to WikiLeaks than is publicly known.

MR. WYLIE: Right.

REP. SCHIFF: But I would want to ask you
about a couple of different areas and whether you are
comfortable with our sharing at least a
characterization, if not exact comments that you made.

MR. WYLIE: Sure.

REP. SCHIFF: But on this particular topic
that I asked about FCPA, if there is something that
concerns you, then, obviously, that will be something
we will discuss after the interview.

And down the road, if we’re at a point of
releasing the transcripts of interviews, we would want
to work with you and try to address any concerns you
have of timing, over any redactions that we need to
make.

MR. WYLIE: Sure.

REP. SCHIFF: And that type of thing.

MR. WYLIE: Sure. So if we could have that
correspondence perhaps off record for --

REP. SCHIFF: Yeah.
MR. WYLIE: -- for now, and then --

REP. SCHIFF: Sure.

MR. WYLIE: -- simply because -- for two reasons.

REP. SCHIFF: Can we go off the record?
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Rep. Schiff: If you could make your answers very short to these.

Mr. Wylie: I will try to be succinct.

Rep. Schiff: If there are areas where I need to know more, I will then ask follow-up.

Mr. Wylie: Okay.

Rep. Schiff: Tell me, Michael Kosinski, he worked with Kogan or --

Mr. Wylie: He worked with Kogan initially. He helped prepare some of the planning and he did some of the preparatory work for the data harvesting project.

He did not continue on that particular data harvesting project -- I'm referencing the Facebook project -- because he demanded half a million dollars and 50 percent royalties, whereas Kogan said that he wanted to do it for this academic institution and, therefore, would do it at cost.

Rep. Schiff: Did Kosinski have any relationship with any Russian institutions?
MR. WYLIE: Yeah, and also to be clear, he was the deputy. Kogan -- sorry -- Kosinski was the Deputy Director at the time of the Cambridge Psychometric Center. So he also had his own applications that did the equivalent type of harvesting. So he had the identical capacity that Kogan had.

He had already amassed a very large data set, mostly on Americans. That originally was harvested for academic use. One of the things that I can provide you is a screen shot of Kosinski saying that -- it's him boarding a plane, and he says -- he makes reference to the fact he's going to Russia, meeting with senior politicians, including the Prime Minister of Russia, where he was going to present some of the work that he was doing, which was identical to what Kogan was doing. Because originally, they were working together, and --

REP. SCHIFF: And do you know whether he had formed any relationship with the Russians?

MR. WYLIE: I don't know in terms of any employment or any sort of that kind of relationship. I know that he did presentations in Russia to politicians
about this work.

REP. SCHIFF: Do you know whether he shared his data?

MR. WYLIE: I don't know if he -- I don't know if he shared data, but I do know that he did presentations on that data where that data may have been used.

REP. SCHIFF: And how voluminous was the data compared to what Kogan got?

MR. WYLIE: My understanding was it was in the millions, was my understanding, but the point that I'd make is he had the same capacity to harvest data. So I'm not sure if he went and harvested more data or if - - but the data set that he had, he had already built algorithms, providing algorithms with, and had already validated those algorithms. Indeed, some of his research that was published presented that.

Some of it may be of interest to you. Some of that research was funded by DARPA. So I'm not sure. I can't answer that question, you know, directly.

REP. SCHIFF: Well, in those papers, he would not have presented the algorithms.
MR. WYLIE: No, no, no. He just would have presented results.

REP. SCHIFF: I see. Anything else about Kosinski we should know?

MR. WYLIE: Not -- not -- no, I don't think there's anything in particular.

REP. SCHIFF: There's a New York Times article that said two former company insiders, I assume referring to Cambridge Analytica, said LUKOIL was interested in data targeting American voters. Do you know who the other of these two insiders refers to?

MR. WYLIE: I have an idea, but I can't say definitively one way or the other, but there were several. There were -- I wasn't the only one who was aware of the LUKOIL project.

REP. SCHIFF: Okay.

MR. WYLIE: Although I was the one that had the actual documentation on it.

REP. SCHIFF: What role, if any, did Dr. Kogan in LUKOIL?

MR. WYLIE: I don't think that Kogan actually met with LUKOIL, but I do know that Alexander made it
REP. SCHIFF: That Kogan was --

MR. WYLIE: -- that Kogan was one of -- that we had a Russian in Russia who was working on it, and you're a Russian company, and this is something that you would like.

And so I don't know if Kogan actually met with LUKOIL, but I do know that Alexander Nix mentions and referred to.

REP. SCHIFF: What do you know about John Bolton's PAC?

MR. WYLIE: Yeah, John Bolton's PAC was a client. They were one of the first clients of Cambridge Analytica actually. They used -- the project that they funded made use of models that were built with the Facebook data.

My understanding of the project was that John Bolton wanted to explore ways of, for lack of a better term, increasing sort of militaristic views in Americans; that they had their sort of hypothesis or theory, was that Americans are becoming too weak on a sort of military intervention, and that they wanted to
explore ways of making people more supportive of robust military intervention around the world.

REP. SCHIFF: And did the Bolton PAC retain Cambridge Analytica? Were they a paying customer?

MR. WYLIE: Yeah, yeah, and I can actually provide you with -- I believe I can provide you with the contracting and the project specification.

REP. SCHIFF: And there were specific races that Bolton's PAC targeted that --

MR. WYLIE: I believe there was a combination of states and districts of interest, but also more generally research on this sort of strength, this sort of militarism. How can we just generally make Americans more militaristic?

REP. SCHIFF: Okay. What was Palantir's relationship to Cambridge Analytica?

MR. WYLIE: So one of the -- so before I joined the company, and by "the company," I mean SCL Group, Sophie Schmidt works for SCL Group. Sophie Schmidt is the daughter of Eric Schmidt, the Chairman of either Google or Alphabet.

She encouraged Alexander Nix to get in touch
with Palantir. I believe that she facilitated the first introductions to Palantir.

When I joined, one of the first emails that I got was asking about my views on Palantir and whether we should engage. One of the first meetings I had with Alexander Nix, he wanted to know what we should -- that he had met people at Palantir, and he wanted to pursue a relationship with them.

I told him, I said, "Well, that might make sense for some of the, you know, military or counter-extremism projects that, you know, that the company works on, but they didn't" -- I literally, and I think I even put this in an email -- that they didn't make sense for a campaign, any political projects.

Nonetheless he pursued that relationship. He had several meetings at Palantir. I got invited to meetings at Palantir in their European office. So that's based in London, in Soho.

So after Cambridge Analytica got set up, so in the spring of 2014, Palantir staff started showing up in the office. One staff member in particular came in very regularly. I was told that they were helping
advise on some difficult -- I don't recall the specifics of it, but some kind of difficult problem that the data science team was experiencing with algorithms or some kind of complex algorithmic structure that they were looking at, and that also the staff members were just generally interested, in particular, as to what kinds of projects were we working on and to see what could be done with the data that we were acquiring, including the Facebook data. So I have emails from some of these staff members talking about Facebook data acquisition, ideas for modeling it, ideas for acquiring it.

One of the things that I found slightly disconcerting about that, which is why it sticks in my head, was that we were all instructed that when we were dealing with anybody from Palantir on the staff list, they had pseudonyms. So they had fake names, and that there was at least one time where I saw a staff member being paid in cash. I'm not sure exactly what that was.

It was slightly unusual as to why they kept coming in. Palantir says that they were doing it in a
personal capacity. The only thing that I would say
that is unusual about that is that it was during
business hours, and it was regular. So it wasn't like
somebody coming in for an hour in the evening or on the
weekend just to give some casual advice. Like there
were regular intervals of meetings and actual work that
was being done.

But I don't know exactly what happened with
that or what kind of data might have been taken, if
there was any data taken, but I know that there was one
Palantir staff member in particular who had access to
the Facebook data and was quite interested in it.

But I can't say exactly --

REP. SCHIFF: So it wasn't clear why they were
there or what they were doing, and they had these
pseudonyms?

MR. WYLIE: Yes. So some of the emails I have
are from the personal accounts, personal email
accounts, of staff members, and then some of the emails
I have come from pseudonyms, but some of the emails
they signed off on their actual name and forgot that
they were using a pseudonym.
It might be that they were there in a personal capacity, and that -- I don't know -- Palantir just has very loose requirements as to coming into the office and taking personal days regularly, but the thing that I would say is that if you're doing something in a personal capacity during the week and actually doing some fairly complex work, it doesn't seem like a personal project.

REP. SCHIFF: But any guess as to what the deal was? Was this an effort to avoid foreign nationals working on a British campaign or any reason? I mean, is there any rational expression for why all of the skullduggery?

MR. WYLIE: So I don't -- I shouldn't speculate. I don't think I should speculate. So I'll tell you sort of what I observed and what I know.

REP. SCHIFF: Okay.

MR. WYLIE: Without speculating.

REP. SCHIFF: What's your thought in terms of how much Facebook knew about what was being done with its data in real time?

MR. WYLIE: So Facebook has said that they
didn't know what was going on, but I remember at least one instance where there was a delay in the next tranche of data being acquired by Kogan and remember talking to Kogan and just asking him what the delay was about.

And he said something about he was having some problem with the app, that Facebook either temporarily shut it down or throttled the amounts of data he was being to pull per minute from the app, but that he had a conversation with somebody at Facebook. I think it was like an engineer at Facebook, and that then they sort of turned the permissions back on or did something that --

REP. SCHIFF: That would indicate though that they were concerned about the volume of data being acquired, but any indication that they knew that the data was not being used for academic purposes, that, in fact, it was being used by a commercial entity?

MR. WYLIE: That I don't know specifically, but one of the other things that I should point out is that Kogan's business partner, Joseph Chancellor, then went and worked at Facebook. He still works at
Facebook.

And I believe they actually went and presented the project to Facebook or learning from the project or something. I think there was something that they went to Facebook and actually presented something about the projects.

This is something that I remember. I don't know the exact details of it, but my recollection is that they were relatively open or at least that Facebook knew that there was this data that was being acquired.

I don't know if Facebook knew specifically whether it was commercialized or not. They told me that they weren't aware that it was commercialized; that Facebook told me that they were told by Kogan that it was for academic purposes.

REP. SCHIFF: In Brittney Kaiser's testimony before Parliament, she suggested that there were additional Facebook-linked questionnaires and data sets used by Cambridge Analytica.

MR. WYLIE: Yes.

REP. SCHIFF: And that the quantity of data
might be far greater.

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

REP. SCHIFF: Is that a reference to Kosinski's work and the data he was acquiring or what do you think it refers to?

MR. WYLIE: No. So the purpose of Kogan was -- so if you recall, after the money was deposited into Cambridge Analytica, Steve Bannon then set this deadline for September or around September to finish data acquisition models, message testing, everything. So that there was some time in between that and the midterms that they could then play with it on some campaigns.

So the original purpose of Kogan was sort of this stopgap measure, which was we need to get lots of data really quickly because Steve Bannon is demanding it, and this scales really quickly.

But there was a decision made at the company that essentially it's not smart business practice to -- if data is the foundation of your company, it's not good business practice to rely on an external vendor solely to provide you that, and that internal capacity
should be built to create data acquisition in a sense.

So while Kogan was doing his harvesting project, there were staff members at Cambridge Analytica who were then exploring what kinds of apps or browser extensions or various widgets or things to put on people's computers that could replicate some of the functionality that Kogan had, but it would be in-house so they wouldn't have to rely on him. Even when I was there, that was a project.

So what Brittney Kaiser is referring to is the finished product of that exercise.

REP. SCHIFF: And do we know how much data that was able to scrape?

MR. WYLIE: I don't know for certain, but if they used applications that were developed outside of Facebook, I mean, theoretically they could get tens of millions of records that way.

REP. SCHIFF: Did you ever see any connection between Cambridge Analytica and Paul Manafort?

MR. WYLIE: Yes and no. So I know that Mark Block -- so Mark Block -- are you familiar with Mark Block?
Okay. So Mark Block was one of the people who originally introduced Alexander Nix to Steve Bannon. So he used to work for Americans for Prosperity. He was quite senior in that. Then he went to go and work with the Mercers and Steve Bannon.

He joined Cambridge Analytica after it got set up, and one of his roles was to essentially just sort of culturally validate this foreign firm with his contacts in his particular wing of the Republican Party.

So he didn't necessarily do anything in particular aside from go and meet people and say, "These guys are great and they're on our side, and you know, I'm just like you. They're just like us."

But I know that he has or at least had a relationship with Paul Manafort, and I believe that he had meetings with Paul Manafort around the time that Alexander Nix was also having meetings with Cory Lewandowski.

But I don't believe that Mark Block still works for Cambridge Analytica, but I know that he had some relationship with Paul Manafort because I actually
knew who Paul Manafort was and who Roger Stone was

before they kind of became public figures after sort of
the Trump campaign, and it was because they -- I've
never met them, but their names would pop up on
occasion.

REP. SCHIFF: Did Steve Bannon ever talk about
WikiLeaks or Julian Assange?

MR. WYLIE: Not to my recollection. To me
personally.

REP. SCHIFF: Yeah.

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

REP. SCHIFF: Did you ever hear of him
discussing that with anyone else?

MR. WYLIE: Not to my recollection, but he may
be referenced on some of these tapes that Damian
Collins has, but I don't -- I'm not sure on that.

REP. SCHIFF: I think you testified before the
Parliament about the ProtonMail accounts that Mr. Nix
utilized or others.

MR. WYLIE: Un-huh.

REP. SCHIFF: Did you ever have any reason to
believe that that was used to hide the various work
being done at Cambridge Analytica?

MR. WYLIE: So I'll just start by qualifying my response, which is that there are many legitimate reasons why you may use ProtonMail or self-destructing emails. In particular, if you are operating in a country where you are being surveilled, which is a lot of countries that SCL works in, or where evidence not necessarily on your side, but on the client's side may be discoverable and that would put them in jeopardy.

That's not a reason why you would use it, but there were instances where I think that Alexander may have had relationships with people or conducted business dealings or authorized something that could have been unlawful and, therefore, it would have -- that using technologies like that may have been useful.

REP. SCHIFF: Any specific occasions though where you know it was used for that purpose?

MR. WYLIE: If I'm -- I'm on record accusing somebody of a crime. Is that --

(Counsel conferred with the witness.)

MR. WYLIE: Yeah, so if it's okay with you, I perhaps can provide you with some of the documentation
on some of the things that I have sent to the authorities.

REP. SCHIFF: Yes.

MR. WYLIE: Because there are certain things that may be potentially unlawful, but haven't been yet -- haven't actually gone to court yet. So for me to say that they are unlawful potentially is --

REP. SCHIFF: Well, let me ask it this way then. Are you aware of use of Proton accounts to hide things that were unethical and potentially unlawful?

MR. WYLIE: I'm aware of people at Cambridge Analytica or SCL Group using technologies like ProtonMail or simply going and deleting things that may have been potential evidence that would have been relevant to an investigation.

REP. SCHIFF: Would you rather provide that to us in documentary form?

MR. WYLIE: Yes.

REP. SCHIFF: Okay. My staff may have a few more questions for you, but is there anything I haven't asked you about that you think that I should be aware of?
MR. WYLIE: (Pause.) Sorry. I'm just -- I'm just kind of going through our conversation just to make sure.

REP. SCHIFF: Yes, sure.

MR. WYLIE: Not off the top of my head, but I know five minutes after I leave there's going to be something that I --

REP. SCHIFF: We’ll follow up with you on the documents that you've offered to help with as well.

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

REP. SCHIFF: So let me ask you this. I think in terms of all of this is of great interest to us, and very, very helpful. Really grateful.

I think what is probably of most immediate interest, apart from the things that we won't talk about, are the fact that there were a number of connections between Cambridge Analytica and WikiLeaks.

MR. WYLIE: Un-huh.

REP. SCHIFF: And the other is some of the detail on LUKOIL.

MR. WYLIE: Okay.

REP. SCHIFF: And the fact that LUKOIL was
showing an interest in these data sets involving U.S. voters, and that LUKOIL operates sometimes as an extension of Russian intelligence in places where the Russian government can't operate, and the fact that there were a number of people, including Dr. Kogan, who were making frequent trips to Russia and were promoting the work they were doing in terms of data analytics and the type of modeling that Cambridge Analytica was using in the United States.

I think those two areas would be of great interest.

MR. WYLIE: Okay.

REP. SCHIFF: Do you have any reservations about my saying that we discussed this and --

MR. WYLIE: No. I think one of the things that I'd love to facilitate is connecting you with Damian Collins and the investigation, the parliamentary investigation that's happening because they have certain documents or recordings or things that I think might be interesting to you.

And also, given that a lot of the people involved in this are actually in the U.K., he might be
in a position if he is made aware or I know of

something, he might be in a position to compel some of
that evidence and then pass it to you. So --

MS. ALLEN: He might be a source here

potentially.

MR. WYLIE: Yes. I'm already doing it with

the Canadian Parliament because of Aggregate IQ, which

is the Canadian entity that was set up, which received

40 percent of all pro-Brexit spending.

But because they've been hiding from or not

necessarily hiding; because they've been not

forthcoming with information to the British

authorities, I connected the British committee and the

Canadian committee. The Canadian committee went and

compelled the evidence that the British committee

wanted.

REP. SCHIFF: Super.

MR. WYLIE: So potentially that could be --

REP. SCHIFF: That would be very helpful.

Thank you.

And just, you know, so I'm clear, those two

areas in terms of your testimony, you're okay with our
MR. WYLIE: If you're publishing transcripts, would it be all right with you if we just have a chat about what those transcripts look like?

REP. SCHIFF: Certainly.

MR. WYLIE: Summary is totally fine, absolutely.

REP. SCHIFF: Yes.

MR. WYLIE: Just to make sure that everything -- I want to make sure that things that are published are absolutely solidly correct, and so if I realize that I -- I don't think I have. I haven't intended to, but I just want to make sure --

REP. SCHIFF: Sure.

MR. WYLIE: -- given the potential import. I just want to make sure that everything is --

REP. SCHIFF: We would be happy to.

MR. WYLIE: -- as accurate as possible.

REP. SCHIFF: We would be happy to.

MR. WYLIE: Okay.

REP. SCHIFF: Thank you very much.
I'm going to leave you with my staff.

MR. WYLIE: Sure.

REP. SCHIFF: I think they only have a small number of questions to go over. So we're almost at the end of the road.

MR. WYLIE: Sure.

REP. SCHIFF: But thank you so much for speaking out and agreeing to sit down with us, and this has been enormously helpful.

MR. WYLIE: Sure.

REP. SCHIFF: I really appreciate you doing it.

MR. WYLIE: Well, it's my pleasure. It's why I came. I want as many authorities or legislators to start looking at it, and if there's information that's helpful, I want to provide it.

REP. SCHIFF: Thank you.

MR. WYLIE: Sure.

(A brief recess was taken.)

I'm really looking forward to connecting with your folks in the U.K. --

MR. WYLIE: Sure.
-- that are doing the investigation.

MR. WYLIE: Sure.

I appreciate how long you've been here today, and --

MR. WYLIE: Oh, no worries.

I know you've had a long couple of days here, but we just have a few questions.

MR. WYLIE: Yeah, sure.

And then you can go on your way.

MR. WYLIE: Sure.

I'm curious if any of your other colleagues from SCL or Cambridge Analytica have also come forward as a whistleblower as you have, other than Brittany Kaiser, I believe.

MR. WYLIE: There are numerous people who have provided either myself or journalists or the parliamentary inquiry with information, documents, or testimony. Most of those people have done it off the record.

Even after I've come out, they still are extremely wary of this company, but there are many
people who have information and have provided it either to myself or to others.

Just a point on Brittney Kaiser. I take slight issue with the term "whistleblower." This is just my personal perspective. She worked at the company until very recently and only came forward after it was apparent that that relationship was no longer fruitful.

When you actually look carefully at her testimony to the British Parliament, she actually is very particular in only revealing information about what other people have done and, in particular, only revealing information or focusing that information not only what other people have done, but people outside of the company.

The other piece of information that I would provide to you, just to add context to Brittney Kaiser's testimony, is that I was told, and I actually have this screen "shotted" from the investigation's editor of Chanel 4 News, so who commissioned the undercover.

They interviewed Brittney Kaiser right after
her testimony, and they saw that Alexander Nix was
texting her, and one of those texts was at the end of
her testimony and said, "Good job. Well done."

So just to add some context to that, the other
thing I would also add context to is that her sudden
switch from working for Cambridge Analytica to becoming
a data privacy advocate in the span of a week I find
interesting, and the other --

Can I ask: did you hire her?

MR. WYLIE: No. She came on -- it was
Alexander Nix who decided to bring her on.

I mean, she used to work in Libya. A lot of
her connections are Libyans, and she's done all kinds
of interesting projects around the world, which I'll
let you look at.

One of the other things that I would just
point out also is that these various cryptocurrency
companies that she's now promoting actually will
benefit from the legislative -- financially benefit
from the legislative changes that she's proposing. So
she is proposing changes to Facebook and then also
privacy policies in the United States that would
actually create a data market that her cryptocurrency companies would financially profit from.

So I just -- sorry. I don't mean to go on a long rant about it. I just -- the other thing that I'd point out is that she hasn't actually been cooperative with the British authorities who have consistently requested information, and she continues to not provide information to British authorities.

She took an opportunity to go to the parliamentary inquiry because it was televised, and less than 24 hours later, she launched her new cryptocurrency. She flew to London, did the testimony, flew back to Manhattan, and then launched her cryptocurrency the next day.

So just -- I'm just providing you with some context as to, you know, Brittnay Kaiser because she continuously presents herself as a whistleblower, and I really take issue.

The process that I went through was months and months and months of work, including first going to the authorities, making sure they had plenty of time to investigate the matter; doing a lot of the boring,
long, technical stuff that involves reporting stuff to the authorities, working with regulators that she refuses to do.

And she just -- anyway, sorry. I am going to stop myself.

The work you've done with Channel 4 and that whole undercover story is phenomenal.

MR. WYLIE: Yeah. I helped them set up the whole thing. So even coming up with that issue, Sri Lanka, because --

It was brilliant.

MR. WYLIE: -- because they -- we had to pick a country, and so they have eight offices in India or rather eight sort of partner offices in India. So they do work in India.

But Sri Lanka, the politics of Sri Lanka are so convoluted that it's actually really hard to like -- it's convoluted enough that a quick Google search before a meeting, you can't parse out is this a set-up or not, but it's close enough to their Indian partners that they could actually deliver the work relatively easily.
So we eventually even figured out what company and how to approach it and all of that. Like it was bizarre. We had like these strategy planning meetings, and yeah. Anyway, sorry.

Shifting gears just a little bit -- a Columbia University technology expert --

MR. WYLIE: Yeah, yeah.

-- last fall wrote an article on the Website Medium about an intern at Cambridge Analytica who reportedly left source code on GitHub.

MR. WYLIE: Un-huh.

Are you familiar with that article?

MR. WYLIE: I am, yeah, and I'm not sure if you've seen that that's happened several times. So UpGuard, which is a data security firm, also revealed several misconfigurations on GitLab where some of this happened, I think, two or three weeks ago, where some of the source code for Ripon, which was one of the technology platforms that was developed to deploy some
of the data, was also revealed in GitLab.

Sorry. I just --

The intern who reportedly --

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

-- this was a gentleman named Michael Phillip.

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

Did you happen to know him?

MR. WYLIE: I didn't, no. I'm not sure if he was there when I was there or not, but I didn't actually engage with the interns that much. So, no, I didn't have a relationship with him.

And were you familiar with the data that was left on GitHub?

MR. WYLIE: I'm not familiar. I know that there was some kind of information that was left, but I don't recall which.

Okay. I was just curious if you knew him and knew about that data.

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

There were some questions that arose about whether that was possibly left purposefully
for others to access or if potentially Russians could

have

MR. WYLIE: Yes. Something to -- one of the

things that I remember being told about was -- and it

never occurred to me that you would do -- and this is

why I remember it, because I was just like, "Oh, that's

quite clever" -- was that if you do -- so, for example,

if you have a PAC that's supporting a particular or

that's not -- because a PAC can't technically support a

candidate. No, sometimes they can.

Anyway, if they want footage of a candidate

but can't film it directly, that you post it on like

YouTube, for example, and call it something very

random, and then they just happen to find it, and then

ey can use it.

And so I remember something to the effect of

like not with respect to data, but with respect to like

content and various things to avoid actually

transferring something, to just sort of leave it

somewhere and then somebody can find it.

With respect to leaving data around for people

to find, that wasn't something that I was aware of, and
frankly, if I knew about it, I would have stopped it because at least in U.K. that's potentially unlawful under the Data Protection Act.

Can I ask on this point? Because I know in Parliament I think you had said that, and you were very clear on this, you don't have any evidence of actual collusion between Mr. Nix or Kogan and Russian interfering in the election.

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

But your concern is that because of perhaps insecurity, things aren't protected, Mr. Kogan is going back and forth; Dr. Kogan is going back and forth.

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

The Russians maybe knew what he was doing and maybe sought opportunity to do something about it.

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

Just sort of baseline level, how technically savvy does one have to be? Say you, you know, hacked or steal the algorithms that you were talking about that CA developed.
MR. WYLIE: Un-huh.

How technically savvy do you have to be to actually deploy those if your intention was to interfere or weaponize it in some way, you know, baseline level?

MR. WYLIE: Sure.

You know, perhaps a nation-state actor has these capabilities, but I'm just curious. Like what do you if you come across this data?

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

And, you know, acquire it illegally, putting aside like leaving it in the open.

MR. WYLIE: So I think there's a difference between the data and the algorithm.

I hear you on that.

MR. WYLIE: And also the actual acquisition.

Sure.

MR. WYLIE: Because the security practices -- let me give you an example of how poor the security practices were.

That would be very helpful.

MR. WYLIE: I got emails, unencrypted emails,
all of the access credentials for the shared servers
for the entire company. The passwords, which I can
send you, so it's not this exact password, but it was
something to the effect of SCL --

One, two, three, four.


Brute force attack, it would have taken --
which you don't need to be -- to do a brute force
attack, it's like, I mean, you don't have to be very
technical. You have to be slightly technical, but
that's not a complicated way of hacking.

Sure.

MR. WYLIE: It's like baby hacking.

Sure.

MR. WYLIE: If you have just a combination of
letters and numbers and it's that long and also even a
dictionary attack, you'd start with dictionary attack.
The first thing you do is start with like common names
and the year or 123. That probably would take a couple
of minutes, and you would have then had access to the
servers.

Right.
MR. WYLIE: And also that was emailed to me, unencrypted, just all of it just right there.

Just sort of basically lax of security.

MR. WYLIE: Yes.

The access possibilities are there.

MR. WYLIE: Atrocious.

Okay. That's step one.

MR. WYLIE: So first, in terms of the security practices were so poor that you wouldn't even have to be a very good hacker to do it. You probably could Google how to hack something and probably figure it out if you kind of know that code.

So that's the first point.

Right.

MR. WYLIE: The second point is then there's two things that you could possibly acquire. You could acquire data. So that would be either, for example, the electoral register, consumer data or Facebook data.

Right.

MR. WYLIE: If you just simply acquired the
Facebook data and you acquired the electoral register and you acquired commercial data, you could just use that to create a custom universe in Facebook if you wanted to.

MR. WYLIE: Like that wouldn't be hard to do. You would just like make a list, and you could do it in a very rudimentary way. I want to target like white men over 40 who are registered as a Republican. Upload this custom list, right?

MR. WYLIE: Like so you wouldn't need to be very technically savvy.

On the other hand, if you were to pull algorithms, that's where you're getting into like you need to know -- that's where it would be more complicated because you have to actually understand like machine learning and what it is that you're looking at.

MR. WYLIE: And how things -- all the inputs and the rationale of all the code. So that would be
more technically complex.

But at the same time, if you just get somebody who -- I mean, it's not hard to find somebody who like understands statistics.

MR. WYLIE: Right.

MR. WYLIE: You know, data finds, you know, and so my concern is that because the data was, you know, not that secure and that even if it wasn't an offensive hack, if a hack happened, you know, you could have key logged Kogan's computer in Russia. You know, you initially need a USB, --

Sure, sure.

MR. WYLIE: -- stick it in, leave it for 30 seconds, and then pull it out, and you key logged it, right?

Understood.

MR. WYLIE: So in terms of deploying the algorithms, that would be more complicated, but like, again, imagine you have access to 87 million records, the bulk of which are American citizens, and you're
Russia or any kind of foreign user. Like if you have that asset and you also have the intention of misusing it --

Opportunity, intention, and capability.

MR. WYLIE: Yeah. You know, you have ready access to.

Right.

MR. WYLIE: And also I don't know. Are you familiar with the Garrison Law doctrine?

Yes.

MR. WYLIE: Right. So when you actually look at how Russian military policy, and this is partly why DARPA and DSTL and various military research agencies were shifting gears into non-kinetic warfare or asymmetric warfare, you know, not -- because you've got kinetic warfare is blowing stuff up, and then non-kinetic, which is like cyber information.

Because Russia and several other countries and also ISIS and various other -- because the thing about non-kinetic warfare is that it's so much cheaper, and the dirty secret about Russia is that it's super poor.
Their GDP is like Australia, but they have a --

Right.

MR. WYLIE: -- nuclear arsenal that they can't afford to maintain.

Right.

MR. WYLIE: And so if you look at the expense that it is, you know, how expensive it is to, you know, buy a series of missiles or a nuclear weapon, right, and then, you know, Eastern European data scientists aren't that expensive.

Right. That all makes sense, and I get that just goes to sort of to decide whether Cambridge was willingly trying to help someone but just by what you already know, already the opportunity was there. That's something someone could have maliciously

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

-- done something and done something with it.

I think I've only got one other question actually.

Go ahead.

And hopefully it's quick. Talked
on that.

Oh, so I don't know if you saw that, but Alexander Nix spoke at a Lisbon Web Summit late last year, and the Wall Street Journal reported that Nix apparently said that he found it, frankly, absurd that Russia interfered in the election.

Any insight as to why Mr. Nix would have that specific an opinion that the fact that Russians interfering in the U.S. election is an absurd concept? I realize that you can't get into his head, of course, but it just seems --

MR. WYLIE: Okay.

It caught our attention. So inasmuch as you have a thought on it, I think that's just curious.

MR. WYLIE: I don't have any particular -- I probably shouldn't spec --

Right.

MR. WYLIE: I shouldn't speculate on his motives for saying that other than just saying that that is the line of his particular clientele, and so it makes sense that he would say that.
Because if he says, "Yeah, Russians interfered with my and helped my client, who I still want to work with," that probably would be --

Thanks.

Mr. Wylie, you may know that Dr. Kogan testified yesterday.

MR. WYLIE: Yes. I haven't actually seen his testimony yet, although I had the tidbits of highlights, yes.

As you might imagine, he disputes some of your claims.

MR. WYLIE: Un-huh.

Did you set up a company when you left SCL?

MR. WYLIE: Not when I left. When I was at Cambridge Analytica, I set up a company because the majority of people -- while Cambridge Analytica was being set up, the majority of people were engaged as consultants rather than employees because, again, they were still working out how to actually set up the company.

And also, in the U.K., I don't know that it's
the thing here, but in the U.K., you have to pay additional taxes per employee. So it was cheaper. So I wasn't the only person at CIA who had a consulting company.

Sure. When you left SCL, did you engage in any type of transaction with Dr. Kogan, any type of data sharing arrangement?

MR. WYLIE: Yeah. So I had access, and I've been super clear on this. I had access to data or, rather, I had access to a portion of the data.

I also agreed with Kogan that I would also help him acquire new data sets, and I'll be super clear on this, to help his institute. He told me, and I have this well documented in writing, that he was going to be setting up an academic institute.

I thought that this was a very good idea, and several professors at Cambridge were very excited about the notion of having a very large data set where you could explore social construct in a quantitative way, and that it would have been sort of the first sort of test case for a new field of or an emerging field of research in computational sociology or computational
He did not tell me, and I then found out, that he went back after I had left to meet with Alexander Nix where he proposed a commercial contract, and he was going to -- because he told me that he was intending on finalizing or completing his relationship with Cambridge Analytica, and that he was then going to set up this institute, which I was actually very excited about.

And when I found out that he went back and didn't tell me about it to Alexander Nix and pitched a commercial project with the data, I told him to go away.

That's actually very helpful. That helps me fill in the picture.

MR. WYLIE: And can I just be super clear on something? I am the only person that was involved in any way with this Facebook data set who has never sold the data. Okay? Cambridge Analytica has been involved in using that data or derivatives of that data for client projects. Dr. Kogan has been involved in selling that data or derivatives of that data.
I am the only person who had access to that data who has never sold it, just to be super clear on that. Because there is this narrative that Cambridge Analytica has how set up a Website on how I'm not a whistleblower.

You know, I believe you.

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

And I just want to give you an opportunity.

MR. WYLIE: Oh, no, no, no, that's fine.

To resolve that.

MR. WYLIE: Yeah, that's fine. It's just I find it very -- the thing that I find frustrating is that like I have gone out of my way to accept my share of responsibility in this project. I don't deny I had access to the data. I played a -- and I deeply regret it, which is why I'm talking about it -- you know, played a fundamental role in facilitating that project and, more generally, setting up Cambridge Analytica.

And, you know, I'm disappointed that, you know, Aleksandr Kogan tried to obfuscate his responsibility of Facebook, tried to obfuscate the
responsibility of Cambridge Analytica. Everyone is
starting to just blame everyone else, and it would just
be so much simpler if he just said, "Yes, I did
something stupid. I screwed up." And I just find it
frustrating.

Well, hopefully some of these
committees will get to the bottom of these activities.

MR. WYLIE: Yeah.

But again, on behalf of the
Ranking Member, we appreciate your patience.

And Speaker Pelosi for --
And Speaker Pelosi. So that
completes --

MR. WYLIE: Because I felt really cool to like
meet Nancy Pelosi, and she's just sitting there. It
was, "oh, my God, you're great. Love you."

(Laughter.)

We can go off the record.

(Whereupon, at 7:37 p.m., the interview was
completed.)