

Fauci Exposed: Historical Research of COVID

Analysis by [Dr. Joseph Mercola](#) ✓ Fact Checked

STORY AT-A-GLANCE

- › Charles Rixey, a COVID-19 analyst, combed through 100,000 pages of FOIA documents and reviewed more than 1,000 research articles, forming a conclusion over six months of investigation that “one of the worst developments of the pandemic is the evaporation of public trust in scientists”
- › This erosion of trust came at the hands of “America’s doctor,” Fauci, who sprung to action at the start of the pandemic – not to protect the public, as his duty required, but to protect himself
- › One of the major pieces of propaganda is “The Proximal Origin of SARS-CoV-2,” a paper published in March 2020 that became the preeminent “proof” that SARS-CoV-2 had a natural origin and couldn’t possibly have come from a lab; its authors originally stated the virus appeared to be engineered
- › Rixey reveals that Fauci and colleagues issued a mandate to control the COVID-19 origin narrative February 3, 2020, and scientists got the signal that pursuing the lab-origin theory would result in “career death”

By now, many have heard that the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) – an arm of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) – has funded controversial gain-of-function (GOF) research on bat coronaviruses at the Wuhan Institute of Virology (WIV).

Dr. Anthony Fauci, NIAID director, told a House Appropriations subcommittee that \$600,000 was given to the nonprofit EcoHealth Alliance, which funneled the money to WIV over a five-year period for the purpose of studying bat coronaviruses and whether they could be transmitted to humans.¹

Fauci has denied funding GOF research, even though evidence shows he did fund it,² but it goes much deeper than this. Now that it's been proven beyond a reasonable doubt that SARS-CoV-2 is laboratory derived – the likely result of GOF research – we must look back on Fauci's early pandemic response under a different lens.

Fauci Censored Science, Stymied Research to Protect Himself

Charles Rixey, a COVID-19 analyst, combed through 100,000 pages of FOIA documents and reviewed more than 1,000 research articles, forming a conclusion over six months of investigation that “one of the worst developments of the pandemic is the evaporation of public trust in scientists.”

This erosion of trust came at the hands of “America's doctor,” Fauci, who sprang to action at the start of the pandemic – not to protect the public, as his duty required, but to protect himself, Rixey alleges. Rixey wrote on Prometheus Shrugged:³

“Fauci quietly but directly ensured that scientific censorship was implemented, in large measure, to prevent public awareness of the extent of his role in GOF research and the controversies surrounding it. The evidence proves that, at the start of the pandemic, Dr. Fauci and many leading scientists moved to protect themselves – not us, who weren't yet aware of the potential calamity at our doorstep.

Fauci LED the efforts to obstruct research into COVID's origins, colluding with the President's Science Advisor Kelvin Droegemeier and Wellcome Trust head Jeremy Farrar, to proactively undermine consideration of the evidence that directly tied their global research initiatives to the lab at the center of the COVID-19 pandemic.

To date, all of their efforts have been focused on preventing disclosure of embarrassing connections – not preventing another novel pathogen from sparking a global pandemic; to prevent future scrutiny, not future tragedy.”

Fauci Pushes Natural Origin, Despite Evidence of Engineering

One of the major pieces of propaganda is "The Proximal Origin of SARS-CoV-2,"⁴ a paper published in Nature Medicine in March 2020 that became the preeminent "proof" that SARS-CoV-2 had a natural origin and couldn't possibly have come from a lab.

It was later revealed that Fauci, Farrar and Dr. Francis Collins, NIH director, had a hand in the paper, as one of its authors wrote a March 6, 2020 email to the trio and colleagues, thanking them for their "advice and leadership."

According to Rixey, however, the five editors of the Nature Medicine paper, who he refers to as "the Proximals," were aware of the existence of a furin cleavage site (FCS) on the virus as early as February 1, 2020, the day a conference call was organized by Farrar and Fauci "to address several aspects of the SARS-CoV-2 genome that pointed towards an artificial origin, by means of generating adaptive changes through passaging and/or direct manipulation of the genome."⁵ He adds:⁶

“Also completely obscured is the fact that at least one, and very likely all, of the people on the conference call were aware of the existence of the FCS ... It’s even worse when you consider that 18 months later, they still can’t explain it – the Proximals refuse to respond to the fact that the FCS doesn’t exist within the sarbecovirus sub-genus that SARS-CoV-2 falls under.

This is a problem, because members of the sub-genus are too distinct to recombine with the varieties of SARS-like viruses from other branches that do contain the FCS.”

The FCS is significant. To gain entry into your cells, the virus must first bind to an ACE2 or CD147 receptor on the cell. Next, the S2 spike protein subunit must be proteolytically cleaved (cut). Without this protein cleavage, the virus would simply attach to the

receptor and not get any further. “The furin site is why the virus is so transmissible, and why it invades the heart, the brain and the blood vessels,” Dr. Steven Quay explained.⁷

While furin cleavage sites do exist in other viruses like Ebola, HIV, zika and yellow fever, they’re not naturally found in coronaviruses, which is one reason why researchers have called the furin cleavage site the “smoking gun” that proves SARS-CoV-2 was created in a lab. The entire group of coronaviruses to which SARS-CoV-2 belongs does not contain a single example of a furin cleavage site, Quay said.

Fauci’s Noble Lie

The concept of the noble lie was first described by Plato. It refers to the notion that, in the case of high-status individuals or designated public leaders, it’s acceptable to lie if the lie is made in the interest of the common good.

Fauci’s lying is a prime example of this concept, as his expertise has been held as indisputable by mainstream media since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic. He’s been caught lying to both the public and the U.S. Senate on a number of issues, but nothing has been done about it.

Fauci hasn’t acted alone, but he’s been one of the most prominent faces behind what could amount to one of the greatest noble lies of all time.

“The world’s leading experts in virology and public health called attention to a threat by setting the world on fire, rather than themselves – and then blaming us for being too simple to believe their noble lie,” Rixey writes.⁸

2015: Novel Bat SARS-Like Virus Created to Infect Human Cells

Rixey takes readers back to January 31, 2020, when virologist Kristian Andersen – one of the Proximals, whose paper found the virus could not have been created in a lab – emailed Fauci, cc’ing Farrar, stating, “The unusual features of the virus make up a really small part of the genome (<0.1%) so one has to look really closely at all the sequences to see that some of the features (potentially) look engineered.”⁹

This exchange was a precursor to the February 1, 2020 conference call mentioned above. Another big player in the noble lie is Ralph Baric, Ph.D., at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, who developed humanized mice used in GOF research by WIV.¹⁰

Baric worked closely with Shi Zhengli, Ph.D., the director of WIV's Center for Emerging Infectious Diseases, also known as "bat woman," on research using genetic engineering to create a "new bat SARS-like virus ... that can jump directly from its bat hosts to humans." According to Peter Gøtzsche with the Institute for Scientific Freedom:¹¹

"Their work focused on enhancing the ability of bat viruses to attack humans so as to 'examine the emergence potential.' In 2015, they created a novel virus by taking the backbone of the SARS virus replacing its spike protein with one from another bat virus known as SHC014-CoV.¹² This manufactured virus was able to infect a lab culture of cells from the human airways.

They wrote that scientific review panels might deem their research too risky to pursue but argued that it had the potential to prepare for and mitigate future outbreaks. However, the value of gain-of-function studies in preventing the COVID-19 pandemic was negative, as this research highly likely created the pandemic."

February 3: A Mandate to Control the Narrative Is Issued

Adding to the puzzle, COVID-19 vaccine maker Moderna, together with NIAID, sent mRNA coronavirus vaccine candidates to Baric at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill on December 12, 2019 — prior to the pandemic, raising significant red flags.¹³ Meanwhile, Rixey's research led him to conclude:¹⁴

"The Proximals were gathered by Farrar & Fauci explicitly to compare emerging arguments with what was known of Baric's work, the spectrum of experiments conducted at the Wuhan Institute of Virology."

After the February 1 conference call, a February 3 meeting was held by Fauci, Droegemeier, Chris Hassell, senior science adviser for the U.S. Department of Health

and Human Services, and National Academies' policy director Alexander Pope, during which the "group slapped the table on what the narrative was going to be – not what the science indicated." Rixey writes:¹⁵

"Therefore, the signal was sent to all scientists that pursuing the lab origins angle meant career death (no academy membership), no funding (via Fauci or Ross or Farrar), no publication in the big 4 journals during the historic pandemic (NEJM, Science, The Lancet & Nature [by virtue of their publishing of the tone-setting pieces]), no executive patronage for things like generic drugs, etc."

Fauci Censors Public GOF Discourse He Called for in 2012

Fauci has long supported controversial GOF research, which he spoke about at a hearing before the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs at the U.S. Senate, held April 26, 2012.¹⁶

That year he called for open debate about GOF research and its risks, and a moratorium was placed on U.S.-funded GOF research in October 2014, after a string of concerning events, including publication of controversial GOF studies and high-profile "incidents" at U.S. biocontainment laboratories, led to more than 300 scientists launching a petition calling for an end to gain-of-function research.¹⁷

But that moratorium was lifted by the NIH in December 2017,¹⁸ without any engagement of the public or the president/representatives they elected. As Rixey notes:¹⁹

"The recent Congressional appearances by Fauci, however, have shown that he is willing to drag this fight out forever in defense of his legacy, and many politicians are sympathetic to his plight."

Thus, it's clear that better questions are needed to build the proper level of awareness amongst the public to the full implications of Fauci's concerted effort to prevent that same public discourse he claimed to support in 2012."

Fauci Should 'Resign Immediately'

“The only proper action for Dr. Fauci to take at this point is to resign immediately,” Rixey writes, “and apologizing for prioritizing the suppression of embarrassing & extensive conflicts of interest, double standards and political decisions masked as sound policy.”²⁰

Along with his resignation, a retraction of “Proximal Origin of SARS-CoV-2” is called for, as “each of its five authors intentionally framed the COVID origin debate around ‘evidence’ and ‘facts’ that they couldn’t prove, and a finality of their conclusions that the known facts couldn’t justify,” Rixey says.²¹

Rixey compiled a list of 10 questions he believes should be formally answered by Fauci. Among them are much-needed explanations for apparent subversion, selective inclusion, redactions, diverging narratives and secrecy, including:²²

- **When did you first learn of the existence of the furin cleavage site within the genome of SARS-CoV-2?**
- **Why were emails with the topic heading “humanized mice” redacted?**
- **Why did the world’s leading virologists/microbiologists and top American/U.K. officials refrain from releasing their knowledge of the existence of the FCS when they first learned of it?**

“The truth,” Rixey says, “... is that our generation’s most prominent infectious disease expert is gaslighting the citizens of the country he swore an oath to protect.”²³

Sources and References

- ¹ [New York Post May 25, 2021](#)
- ² [National Review May 13, 2021](#)
- ^{3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23} [Prometheus Shrugged July 22, 2021](#)
- ⁴ [Nature Medicine volume 26, pages 450–452 \(2020\)](#)
- ^{7, 10} [YouTube June 29, 2021](#)
- ¹¹ [Scientific Freedom May 19, 2021](#)
- ¹² [Nature Medicine volume 21, pages 1508–1513 \(2015\)](#)
- ¹³ [Confidential Disclosure Agreement](#)
- ¹⁶ [GovInfo.gov Hearing April 26, 2012](#)
- ¹⁷ [The Cambridge Working Group July 14, 2014](#)
- ¹⁸ [U.S. CDC, Dual Use Research of Concern and Bird Flu: Questions & Answers](#)