

A decorative graphic featuring a large orange circle with a glowing effect, a light blue circle inside it, and several small blue squares and orange squares scattered around. A vertical blue and white striped bar is on the right side.

NewsGuard

The political elite's tool for censorship.

**READ THE FULL EMAIL CORRESPONDENCE
BETWEEN PRAGERU AND NEWSGUARD**

MAY 26: PRAGERU REACHES OUT TO NEWSGUARD

From: Adrienne Johnson <[REDACTED]> /PragerU Chief of Staff/

Date: Wednesday, May 26, 2021 at 4:16 PM

To: Steven Brill <[REDACTED]>, Gordon Crovitz <[REDACTED]>

Subject: **[URGENT]** Newsguard score of PragerU is a mistake

Dear Mr. Brill and Mr. Crovitz,

I am writing today to bring your attention to an urgent matter that I assume is a mistake by Newsguard. Sadly, this mistake is damaging PragerU's reputation and costing our nonprofit millions of dollars.

Your company claims to vet news websites in an unbiased and honest way, but this claim seems false considering the low score (57/100) given to PragerU.

Newsguard's ratings claim that PragerU gathers and presents information irresponsibly and that PragerU does not regularly correct or clarify errors. In reality, our content routinely links to facts and sources and does not contain errors. Our content is presented by illustrious subject matter experts, including Pulitzer Prize winners, former Prime Ministers, celebrated scientists, and best-selling authors.

Newsguard says our website does not disclose PragerU's ownership and financing. PragerU is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit that consistently reports back to its donors via annual reports and donor video updates. We, of course, don't publicly reveal private donor information. We file a lengthy 990 with the IRS every year that's available to the general public to look at any time. We also hire a third-party accounting firm to annually audit our finances. We have an immaculate track record of full transparency.

To date, PragerU has surpassed 5B+ lifetime video views. 12M+ people follow us across all social media platforms and over 250K donors support us. PragerU wouldn't have this track record of success without the trust of our viewers and donors.

Additionally, and perhaps most importantly, PragerU doesn't claim to be a news source at all. PragerU is a source of conservative education on topics through an ideological perspective that your Newsguard team (and the mainstream media) may simply disagree with.

This low score is causing PragerU significant financial damages from companies like JW Player, Facebook, and other Big Tech companies that rely on your claim of being an unbiased arbiter of news sources. Because of your scores, they censor and blacklist PragerU.

We invite you to research PragerU more thoroughly. In the meantime, we urge you to remove the libelous labels against us as soon as possible. Both our organizations have a personal interest in retaining our very important reputations.

Again, we sincerely hope this inaccurate scoring system is just one giant mistake that can be reversed as soon as possible.

We look forward to reporting back to our audience that this error has been corrected.

Sincerely,
Adrienne Johnson
Chief of Staff

p.s. Formal letter from Marissa Streit, CEO of PragerU, is attached.

--
Adrienne Johnson
Chief of Staff
[REDACTED]



MAY 26: PRAGERU REACHES OUT TO NEWSGUARD

From: Steven Brill <[REDACTED]>
Date: Wed, May 26, 2021 at 1:40 PM
Subject: Re: ****[URGENT]**** NewsGuard score of PragerU is a mistake
To: Adrienne Johnson <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, Marissa Streit
<[REDACTED]>
Cc: Eric Efron <[REDACTED]>

Dear Ms. Johnson and Ms. Streit

Thanks for your emails. We'll be glad to take another look at our Nutrition Label, but I urge you to do the same, too. For example, our standard for disclosure of ownership and financing has nothing to do with whether an entity files a 990 or whether the IRS requires disclosure of donors. It has to do with what is disclosed on the website. Our standards in that regard are completely transparent. Similarly, it seems hard to argue that your (never corrected) one-sided claims related to COVID or hydroxy represent gathering and presenting news responsibly, or that you have a corrections policy that meets our articulated standard (which is the standard shared by journalism organizations worldwide).

That said, I am copying our editorial director, Eric Efron, who will be in touch with you to go over any complaints you have. I should add that he would have been glad to do that a year ago had you responded to any of our three explicit requests for comment before we published our rating.

Best regards,

Steve Brill

Steven Brill
Co-CEO
NewsGuard Technologies, Inc.
25 West 52nd Street, 15th Floor
New York, NY 10019

NEWSGUARD RESPONDED TO PRAGERU WITH THESE QUESTIONS:

1. Is there a reason why PragerU.com does not provide any information on the major donors to the Prager University Foundation?
2. Is there a reason why PragerU.com does not identify the people in charge of the website's content?
3. What is the site's approach to correcting errors?
4. NewsGuard unable to find examples of PragerU.com correcting any factual errors that appeared in its content. Could you point us to instances where PragerU.com corrected an error in its content and published a correction that explained the mistake to readers?
5. In reviewing PragerU.com's content, we found instances where the site's content promoted false, misleading, or unsubstantiated claims, including about the COVID-19 pandemic. In July 2020, the site shared a [series of videos](#) on an event hosted by a group called America's Frontline Doctors that promoted false claims about the anti-malaria drug hydroxychloroquine. In a video titled "[Dr. Stella Immanuel: We Don't Need to Die. There Is a Treatment for COVID.](#)" a Texas doctor falsely claimed that hydroxychloroquine was a proven cure for COVID-19, stating, "This virus has a cure, it's called hydroxychloroquine, zinc, and Zithromax," Immanuel said in the video. "You don't need masks, there is a cure."

Why did PragerU.com's coverage of these doctors' claim not include that multiple randomized clinical trials published before these videos had found that hydroxychloroquine did not provide benefits to COVID-19 patients? These include a June 2020 [study](#) in the UK involving 4,600 patients which ended the use of HCQ after concluding "that there is no beneficial effect of hydroxychloroquine in patients hospitalised with COVID-19" and a July 2020 [study](#) involving 400 patients published in the Annals of Internal Medicine that found that hydroxychloroquine did not decrease the severity of COVID-19 symptoms over 14 days any better than a placebo in patients who were not hospitalized.

NEWSGUARD RESPONDED TO PRAGERU WITH THESE QUESTIONS:

6. Why did the site remove the aforementioned Stella Immanuel video without publishing a correction? <https://www.prageru.com/video/dr-stella-immanuel-we-dont-need-to-die-there-is-a-treatment-for-covid/>
7. Why did Dennis Prager falsely claim in an August 2020 video that “people are dying” because of recommendations against hydroxychloroquine to treat COVID-19, despite the clinical trials published at that point that demonstrated no benefit? <https://www.prageru.com/video/the-hysteria-mockery-and-censorship-around-hydroxychloroquine/>
8. In a [May 2020 video](#), presenter Will Wilt falsely claimed that children have not died from COVID-19, stating, “children aren’t actually dying from this virus. He cited a study -- for which he did not provide a source -- that he said involved “150,000 people who had the virus and only 1.7 percent of them were between the ages of 0 and 18, and of that 1.7 percent, none of them died.”

While children do make up a small percentage of confirmed COVID-19 deaths, children have died from the disease. According to a [report](#) from the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, there were 13 COVID-19 deaths reported in the U.S. between Jan. 22 and May 30, 2020, of patients aged 9 and under, and another 33 deaths of patients between the ages of 10 and 19. Does PragerU stand by the claims made in this video or does it believe that a correction or retracted is warranted?

NEWSGUARD RESPONDED TO PRAGERU WITH THESE QUESTIONS:

9. A [Feb. 2018 video](#) on Planned Parenthood included two false claims. First, video host Lila Rose said the organization “talk[s] about providing ultrasounds but the last thing they want to do is show a pregnant woman an image of her growing child. So they don’t. The ultrasound is only for Planned Parenthood’s use to better facilitate patients’ abortions.” According to Planned Parenthood’s website, [ultrasounds](#) are one of the non-abortion services offered at its health clinics.

Rose also claimed that Planned Parenthood “provides very little healthcare.” Annual reports published by Planned Parenthood detailing the organization’s health care services show that the vast majority of the organization’s work involves medical services besides abortion. The organization’s 2019 [annual report](#), which provided data from fiscal year 2018, showed that Planned Parenthood’s health centers served 2.4 million patients and conducted 345,672 abortions. Using these numbers, only 14 percent of patients received abortions. Planned Parenthood’s other services, including breast exams, pap tests, contraception, and STI testing and treatment treatment, account for the vast majority of its services provided to patients. Does PragerU stand by the claims made in this video or does it believe that a correction or retracted is warranted?

HERE ARE PRAGERU'S RESPONSES TO EACH QUESTION:

On Jun 23, 2021, at 2:22 PM, Marissa Streit <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Eric,

I hope this email finds you well. Here are the answers to your questions. We look forward to hearing back from you with a notification that the PragerU website is no longer labeled "a misinformation site". We also hope that your team will apply honest and unbiased judgement when reviewing the answers to your questions. Surly, Newsquad's intent is not to label anyone who disagrees with any of its ideological views as unreliable. I look forward to hearing back from you.

Marissa

1. Is there a reason why [PragerU.com](https://www.prageru.com) does not provide any information on the major donors to the Prager University Foundation?


PragerU complies with all donor disclosure requirements per the IRS, and our 990's are all publicly searchable and list any major donor in our Schedule B as required. Over 95% of our donation volume comes in online, and we are funded by hundreds of thousands of donors, not just a small group of individuals like other organizations may be, including NewsGuard. Per NewsGuard's request, we have attached the most recent 990 including the list of major donors on [PragerU.com](https://www.prageru.com) [here](#).

2. Is there a reason why [PragerU.com](https://www.prageru.com) does not identify the people in charge of the website's content?

PragerU leadership and founding story is listed clearly in our bi-annual report found [here](#). Dennis Prager, the founder of PragerU and Marissa Streit, the company's CEO appear in multiple places on the website. Here is the link to PragerU's [donor updates](#) where we provide information about our key staff and the multiple educational programs we provide.

3. What is the site's approach to correcting errors?

As the website is issue-driven, you will find facts and sources quoted for much of our content. For our weekly 5-Minute Videos, you will find a separate section for Facts and Sources for each video you can click on, as shown in the example below for our most recent video released on 6/7/21 here: <https://www.prageru.com/video/are-fathers-necessary/>



These will be found towards the bottom of the screen in the middle as shown on the circled and highlighted area. As each video is cited with sources, we usually do not have issues with regards to corrections.

HERE ARE PRAGERU'S RESPONSES TO EACH QUESTION:

4. NewsGuard was unable to find examples of [PragerU.com](https://www.prageru.com) correcting any factual errors that appeared in its content. Could you point us to instances where [PragerU.com](https://www.prageru.com) corrected an error in its content and published a correction that explained the mistake to readers?

We are a nonprofit with our program focused on producing and marketing well-researched, issue-driven educational content. We are not a news site which finds itself needing to do constant corrections. Our videos are presented by experts including professors, researchers and multiple Pulitzer prize winners. Healthy debate often involves experts across arenas providing different perspectives, and we pride ourselves on bringing diverse ideas to viewers. Mainstream news and educational outlets on the Left have consistently been making false /incorrect assertions, often for political bias, and for some reason have not been penalized by NewsGuard in doing so.

5. In reviewing [PragerU.com](https://www.prageru.com)'s content, we found instances where the site's content promoted false, misleading, or unsubstantiated claims, including about the COVID-19 pandemic. In July 2020, the site shared a [series of videos](#) on an event hosted by a group called America's Frontline Doctors that promoted false claims about the anti-malaria drug hydroxychloroquine. In a video titled "[Dr. Stella Immanuel: We Don't Need to Die. There Is a Treatment for COVID.](#)" a Texas doctor falsely claimed that hydroxychloroquine was a proven cure for COVID-19, stating, "This virus has a cure, it's called hydroxychloroquine, zinc, and Zithromax," Immanuel said in the video. "You don't need masks, there is a cure."

Why did [PragerU.com](https://www.prageru.com)'s coverage of these doctors' claim not include that multiple randomized clinical trials published before these videos had found that hydroxychloroquine did not provide benefits to COVID-19 patients? These include a June 2020 [study](#) in the UK involving 4,600 patients which ended the use of HCQ after concluding "that there is no beneficial effect of hydroxychloroquine in patients hospitalised with COVID-19" and a July 2020 [study](#) involving 400 patients published in the Annals of Internal Medicine that found that hydroxychloroquine did not decrease the severity of COVID-19 symptoms over 14 days any better than a placebo in patients who were not hospitalized.

The alleged problematic videos in question have been removed. If there are specific links to other videos, and the removal of such will put PragerU back in the 'Green' category as a trusted source with NewsGuard, please identify those to us specifically.

Please note that our Appendix at the end will clearly show the basis of why the videos were created in the first place. We disagree with your assertion above, but had removed the videos regardless due to overall social media censorship regarding the topic.

HERE ARE PRAGERU'S RESPONSES TO EACH QUESTION:

6. Why did the site remove the aforementioned Stella Immanuel video without publishing a correction? <https://www.prageru.com/video/dr-stella-immanuel-we-dont-need-to-die-there-is-a-treatment-for-covid/>

We don't issue corrections, as we are not a news site. In the rare event we get something wrong, we will remove it. In the case of some videos, as explained above and below in our appendix, the coordinated campaign against HCQ and the social media censoring of the content created a ROI analysis on our end and we removed it rather than face penalties of censorship.

7. Why did Dennis Prager falsely claim in an August 2020 video that "people are dying" because of recommendations against hydroxychloroquine to treat COVID-19, despite the clinical trials published at that point that demonstrated no benefit? <https://www.prageru.com/video/the-hysteria-mockery-and-censorship-around-hydroxychloroquine/>

See the answers to questions 5, 6, and appendix below. Also please confirm that removal of this one video and the others mentioned in questions 5 and 6 will bring PragerU back to "green" trusted status with NewsGuard.

HERE ARE PRAGERU'S RESPONSES TO EACH QUESTION:

8. In a [May 2020 video](#), presenter Will Witt falsely claimed that children have not died from COVID-19, stating, "children aren't actually dying from this virus. He cited a study -- for which he did not provide a source -- that he said involved "150,000 people who had the virus and only 1.7 percent of them were between the ages of 0 and 18, and of that 1.7 percent, none of them died."

While children do make up a small percentage of confirmed COVID-19 deaths, children have died from the disease. According to a [report](#) from the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, there were 13 COVID-19 deaths reported in the U.S. between Jan. 22 and May 30, 2020, of patients aged 9 and under, and another 33 deaths of patients between the ages of 10 and 19. Does PragerU stand by the claims made in this video or does it believe that a correction or retracted is warranted?

Again, PragerU will be flexible and work with you on potentially removing certain content if you can certify this will remove any negative marks on our ratings, and provide us with "Green" status.

However, we do not agree with your assertion. Will Witt was almost certainly citing [this study](#): "Data from 149,760 laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 cases in the United States occurring during February 12-April 2, 2020 were analyzed. Among 149,082 (99.6%) reported cases for which age was known, 2,572 (1.7%) were among children aged <18 years. Among the 295 pediatric cases for which information on both hospitalization status and underlying medical conditions was available, 28 of 37 (77%) hospitalized patients, including all six patients admitted to an ICU, had one or more underlying medical condition; among 258 patients who were not hospitalized, 30 (12%) patients had underlying conditions. Three deaths were reported among the pediatric cases included in this analysis; however, review of these cases is ongoing to confirm COVID-19 as the likely cause of death." Given the fact that many of these children had underlying health conditions, some of them severe ("The most common underlying conditions were chronic lung disease (including asthma) (40), cardiovascular disease (25), and immunosuppression (10).") we don't know conclusively from this study that the 3 under-age-18 deaths were due to the virus (as even the authors note). So, yes, PragerU stands by the information Will Witt cited at the time as he was generalizing numbers to state that marginally almost no children are dying from the disease while speaking casually. You will admit that in regards to childhood mortality causes, Covid-19 was not a significant statistical issue.

HERE ARE PRAGERU'S RESPONSES TO EACH QUESTION:

9. A [Feb. 2018 video](#) on Planned Parenthood included two false claims. First, video host Lila Rose said the organization “talk[s] about providing ultrasounds but the last thing they want to do is show a pregnant woman an image of her growing child. So they don’t. The ultrasound is only for Planned Parenthood’s use to better facilitate patients’ abortions.” According to Planned Parenthood’s website, [ultrasounds](#) are one of the non-abortion services offered at its health clinics.

Rose also claimed that Planned Parenthood “provides very little healthcare.” Annual reports published by Planned Parenthood detailing the organization’s health care services show that the vast majority of the organization’s work involves medical services besides abortion. The organization’s 2019 [annual report](#), which provided data from fiscal year 2018, showed that Planned Parenthood’s health centers served 2.4 million patients and conducted 345,672 abortions. Using these numbers, only 14 percent of patients received abortions. Planned Parenthood’s other services, including breast exams, pap tests, contraception, and STI testing and treatment treatment, account for the vast majority of its services provided to patients. Does PragerU stand by the claims made in this video or does it believe that a correction or retracted is warranted?

There have been multiple sources cited arguing both for and against the position of Planned Parenthood in regards to their services as outlined above, and much like the bias issues in Covid-19 scientific studies, often it can be difficult to tell the truth from the narrative. We rely on people like Lila Rose to present ideas. She has spent her career focused on the abortion topic, and has the credentials to speak about these issues.

No one should blindly rely on Planned Parenthood’s website to hold itself accountable. We think that you would agree that it is more likely that outsiders would be questioning Planned Parenthood and pressing on them to be accountable. Much of our taxpayers dollars are given to government agencies that have free reign. Are you suggesting that any organization that even questions Planned Parenthood would immediately be deemed “inappropriate” and therefore subjected to censorship? Are you saying that organizations that are reporting anything different from what Planned Parenthood self-reports will be labeled “dangerous” by your team?

Finally, this video, and the videos above referenced, represent a miniscule portion of PragerU’s content. Is it Newsguard’s staff’s intention to label PragerU a “dangerous organization” because they disagree with a fraction of its content? This comes across like Soviet tactics for thought control and censorship. How is Newsguard weighting the categories for deduction of points? For example, does Newsguard rate any conservative leaning website negatively simply because they disagree with them? How many conservative leaning websites are rated red Vs. how many left wing websites are rated green? Are you able to prove that your staff has no intentional bias in favor of left wing ideas? What is the ideological composition of those reviewing content?

HERE ARE PRAGERU'S RESPONSES TO EACH QUESTION:

APPENDIX

Regarding questions 5, 6, 7, 8:

We can agree that there are examples of studies that can be used to either show the effectiveness of hydroxychloroquine in regards to a Covid-19 treatment, and there are studies that can be used to show lack of effectiveness. No less than the former editor of the New England Journal of Medicine, Marcia Angell, was quoted as saying:

It is simply no longer possible to believe much of the clinical research that is published, or to rely on the judgment of trusted physicians or authoritative medical guidelines. I take no pleasure in this conclusion, which I reached slowly and reluctantly over my two decades as an editor of The New England Journal of Medicine.

Currently, you are also aware that the 'lab-leak' theory for Covid-19, which was leading to many being discredited last year, is now a credible theory. Information often changes, and PragerU often brings about a diverse category of experts to engage ideas for discussion. We do not provide official medical advice, nor have ever claimed to.

There has been a concerted effort that has been underway to discredit any effective therapies against Covid-19 since the beginning of the pandemic. Are you aware, for example, of the hasty hit job against hydroxychloroquine published by [The Lancet](#), which had to be retracted when its authors could not prove it was based on valid data?

Fraud has been committed in order to undermine use of HCQ per these articles:

<https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2021/01/many-scientists-citing-two-scandalous-covid-19-papers-ignore-their-retractions>

<https://ahrp.org/the-lancet-published-a-fraudulent-study-editor-calls-it-department-of-error/>

Ironically, back in 2003, before the politicization of covid-19, *The Lancet* published a [study](#) indicating HCQ might very well be effective against SARS and coronaviruses generally.

And our own *NIH* published a study in 2005 that indicated chloroquine might well be effective against SARS coronavirus, as evidenced by its inhibition of the virus in monkey cells in the lab: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16115318/>.

There were many studies aside from the few you cited here that demonstrated the effectiveness of HCQ in patients, especially when given early and in combination with zinc and, if indicated depending on patient risk, an antibiotic like azithromycin. Here is a collection of many, if not all of them, with outcomes:

<https://c19hcq.com/>

Note that one of the trials you cited as evidence using HCQ is the Recovery trial, which was flawed due to inappropriately high dosages and late administration, well after the disease had taken hold and required hospitalization. It's much more effective as an early treatment, which is what the frontline doctors were advocating. It's not valid to use a study of a medication used in late-stage disease to argue the medication is not effective if used early. And yet, that became our policy, which is what the frontline doctors were arguing against. We don't think they were wrong to argue for early treatment with HCQ. Many frontline doctors were using it and reporting success. When in the history of medicine has health care policy ever been to refuse early treatment (or, at least, the attempt to provide treatment) of patients infected or sick with a potentially deadly disease in favor of waiting until they're sick enough to require hospitalization? Why weren't we attempting the use of an extremely safe, long-standing FDA-approved medication that showed the possibility of preventing serious illness and hospitalization? What was the downside?

HERE ARE PRAGERU'S RESPONSES TO EACH QUESTION:

The other trial you cited, <https://www.acpjournals.org/doi/10.7326/M20-4207>, is also marred by a number of flaws (the age cohort studied was under 50, so was already the group which does better with covid even with no medical intervention; it did not include zinc; the study's endpoint was changed midway through, etc.)

Dr. Vladimir Zelenko developed a protocol for successfully treating 1,500 patients in his NY community, many of them in the high-risk age and comorbidity categories. [Here's an article](#) explaining what he did and why, and particularly the role of zinc, which has been almost universally ignored. Here is a link to Dr. Zelenko's peer-reviewed study: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0924857920304258>

Henry Ford Health Care System found that [HCQ was effective in saving lives](#):

Dr. Harvey Risch, a highly-respected Yale epidemiologist, is one of many doctors who have noted that a [number of these early HCQ studies were flawed](#)—seemingly deliberately (“designed to fail” was the commonly-used phrase). You can disagree with Dr. Risch's opinion, but you cannot say there is no credible evidence for HCQ and no scientific debate on this issue. Such a claim would be false.

All the negative claims about HCQ was that it was either ineffective against the coronavirus or it was dangerous, or both. On the former, if it truly is ineffective, so what—given its safety record, what's the harm in trying it? On the latter, here's what WHO said about the drug in 2016, before it was politicized:

[2016 WHO study-](#)

Among its conclusions - *Despite hundreds of millions of doses administered in the treatment of malaria, there have been no reports of sudden unexplained death associated with quinine, chloroquine or amodiaquine.*

We remain baffled at the concerted efforts early last spring and summer (which have continued into 2021) to discredit a drug that showed promise as an effective therapeutic, especially when combined with zinc and an antibiotic when appropriate, when people were dying in large numbers and there was no other available effective treatment or vaccine.

From: Eric Effron [REDACTED]
Date: Wed, Jun 23, 2021 at 11:30 AM
Subject: Re: NewsGuard's review
To: Marissa Streit [REDACTED]
Cc: Adrienne Johnson [REDACTED]

Hi Marissa,

Many thanks for your detailed reply. We will review carefully and update the label accordingly, but will be back in touch with you before we publish anything.

All the best, Eric

Eric Effron
Editorial Director, NewsGuard

Follow me on Twitter: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

212.332.6317

<https://newsguardtechnologies.com/>

JULY 28: HOW NEWSGUARD ADDRESSED THE RESPONSES

From: John Gregory [REDACTED] >
Date: Wed, Jul 28, 2021 at 11:54 AM
Subject: NewsGuard questions on PragerU.com
To: [REDACTED] >
Cc: [REDACTED] >

To Marissa Streit:

This is John Gregory, the health editor at NewsGuard and the one who wrote the original NewsGuard review of PragerU.com. We very much appreciate your cooperation and interest on with working with us.

In the course of updating that review, we had additional questions about the site's editorial and transparency practices.

1) When we asked about how the site identifies who is in charge of the content, your response was that you are named as CEO and Dennis Prager mentioned as founder in the biannual report. We're trying to distinguish between who is in charge of the site's content versus who is in charge of the Prager University Foundation, since in the case of nonprofits as large as yours, they are not always one and the same. Are you and/or Mr. Prager in charge of the site's content?

2) Is there a reason why the person in charge of the site's content is not clearly identified as such on the site's About Us page, rather than in the biannual report which appears to be targeted towards donors rather than the typical visitor to PragerU.com?

3) Regarding the videos that promoted hydroxychloroquine as a proven treatment for COVID-19 -- despite multiple clinical trials finding it was ineffective -- is there a reason why the site removed only videos that NewsGuard had flagged in its previous email, and did not remove or correct false claims made in other videos or a petition that similarly promoted the drug as a proven COVID-19 treatment?

These are some examples:

<https://www.prageru.com/video/the-hysteria-mockery-and-censorship-around-hydroxychloroquine/>
<https://www.prageru.com/video/there-is-an-orchestrated-attack-against-hydroxychloroquine>
<https://www.prageru.com/petition/doctors/>

4) As late as January 2021, the site published content promoting hydroxychloroquine as a proven COVID-19 treatment. In a [Jan. 8 video](#), Mr. Prager stated, "There is a doctor named Vladimir Zelenko. The man has saved hundreds of lives in New York City, where he practices medicine. He has used what he has called the Zelenko protocol, which is basically hydroxychloroquine and zinc. He has saved a vast number of people's lives. He is not allowed to tweet. Twitter will not allow him — they say he's giving scientific misinformation, how the hell do they know? Twitter is all of a sudden a master of all scientific knowledge? No, they just know that the CDC doesn't recommend it and that's enough for them."

Dr. Zelenko's claims are not supported by any published clinical trial, and as previously mentioned, multiple trials have found hydroxychloroquine to be ineffective in treating COVID-19. A separate trial published in Nov. 2020 found that zinc supplements "did not enhance the clinical efficacy" of hydroxychloroquine in treating COVID-19."

Does the site stand by the claims in this video, or does it believe a correction or retraction is warranted?

5) In a [July 2021 video](#), Mr. Prager said of secondhand smoke, "It's pretty much a gigantic lie that kills 50,000 Americans a year. It's pretty much a lie, and that's when I started to understand that medical authorities don't tell the truth. They tell what they think works."

What evidence did Mr. Prager base this assertion upon, and how does it negate reports from the [World Health Organization](#), the [U.S. Institute of Medicine](#), and the [U.S. Surgeon General](#) which have causally linked secondhand smoke to deaths from stroke, lung cancer, heart disease, and sudden infant death syndrome?

JULY 28: HOW NEWSGUARD ADDRESSED THE RESPONSES

6) In an April 2021 [video](#) about the verdict in the Derek Chauvin trial, Mr. Prager made a false claim when raising questions about the cause of death of George Floyd. Prager speculated that if other men in police custody had not been killed due to an officer kneeling on their neck, "does that move you in any direction to thinking, well, maybe that isn't the cause of George Floyd's death? Maybe having three times the amount of fentanyl that can kill you and already a pre-existing heart condition and terrible breathing, all of that prior to the knee on the side of the neck, maybe that contributed? I don't know, but I think that's a pretty valid question to ask."

Dr. Daniel Isenschmid, a toxicologist at NMS Labs in Horsham, Pennsylvania, [testified](#) at Chauvin's trial that the amount of fentanyl present in Floyd's autopsy blood tests was 11 nanograms per milliliter. This was lower than the average amount of 16.8 nanograms per milliliter in blood samples of people who taken fentanyl and died that had been tested by NMS Labs in 2020, Isenschmid said, refuting Prager's assertion that Floyd had "three times the amount of fentanyl that can kill you" in his body when he died. Moreover, [two autopsies](#) ruled that Floyd's death was a homicide, despite the fact that he had fentanyl in his system.

Does the site stand by the claims in this video, or does it believe a correction or retraction is warranted?

Thank you for taking the time to answer these questions.

John Gregory

Office: [REDACTED]

More about NewsGuard criteria [here](#).

Get the desktop browser extension [here](#).

AUGUST 2: PRAGERU RESPONSE TO NEWSGUARD

From: **Marissa Streit** [REDACTED]
Date: Mon, Aug 2, 2021 at 3:48 PM
Subject: Re: NewsGuard questions on PragerU.com
To: John Gregory [REDACTED]
Cc: Eric Efron [REDACTED]

Hi John,

It has taken your team close to four weeks and multiple reminders to come back to us with some of the same questions we have responded to in your original email.

Additionally, your questions make no sense. What large media organization, for example, would have only one person reviewing all content? Obviously, we have multiple people reviewing and approving our footage as with millions of minutes of content produced, it is not one person's job.

Your new questions center around particular issues that are featured in less than 0.001% of our overall content. We understand that you do not agree with what we are sharing philosophically, but how does that make our site "dangerous"? Clearly, you are using NewsGuard as a way to eliminate opinions you simply do not agree with. Your team ignored the substantiation we provided in response to your queries and asked us to again answer essentially the same questions, demonstrating you have no real interest in resolving our initial inquiry. Are there even any large organizations, right-of-center, which you haven't attempted to advocate censoring? NewsGuard is using its power and connections to squash freedom of speech online. You claim to be a third-party fact checker for big tech. In reality, you are a third-party tool for suppression of differing views and the facts that support those views. The chain of emails we've exchanged with you and your team has exposed your organization for what it is – an online media bully run by wealthy left-wing activists pushing their agenda.

The public and your clients deserve better.

Marissa Streit
Chief Executive Officer
[REDACTED]

