

Gabbard Drops Fauci COVID-19 Receipts on Last Day

Analysis by [Dr. Joseph Mercola](#)

June 29, 2026

STORY AT-A-GLANCE

- › Newly declassified government records suggest a U.S. national laboratory considered a laboratory origin for COVID-19 to be just as plausible as a natural origin as early as May 2020, raising new questions about what officials knew during the pandemic's early months
- › The released documents describe federally funded coronavirus research that included spike protein engineering, receptor adaptation experiments, and testing in humanized mice, helping explain why those techniques later became central to debates over the virus's origin
- › According to the report, declassified records show Anthony Fauci participated in a 2021 intelligence briefing on COVID-19's origins, prompting new scrutiny over whether his later congressional testimony matched the documented timeline
- › Internal emails and reviewer-selection discussions described in the records suggest scientists and intelligence officials continued debating competing origin theories behind the scenes even as the public conversation increasingly focused on a natural origin
- › The documents underscore why reviewing original records, following the timeline and comparing private discussions with public statements gives you a stronger foundation for evaluating major public health claims

In her final days as Director of National Intelligence, Tulsi Gabbard released a collection of newly declassified documents that reignite one of the COVID-19 pandemic's most consequential unresolved questions: where did COVID-19 come from, what did

government officials know – and when?¹

The records, which span intelligence assessments, internal communications, grant reports and scientific research documents, paint a picture of a far more complicated behind-the-scenes discussion than the public was told at the time. They also raise specific questions about whether senior officials shaped, or suppressed, the public narrative around those origins.

This story reaches far beyond any one scientist or government agency. It's about transparency, oversight, research funding and whether the public received a complete picture during a global crisis that reshaped daily life, health care and public policy. Looking at what these newly released files actually claim, what evidence they contain, and why the details continue to fuel debate allows you to evaluate the record for yourself rather than relying on anyone else's conclusions.

Declassified Files Tie COVID Research, Intelligence, and Fauci Together

A report published by ZeroHedge centers on the declassified documents that describe [federally funded coronavirus research](#) tied to the years before and during the COVID-19 pandemic.² The documents seek to determine whether important evidence about the virus's origin and related research activities was known inside government long before the public learned about it.

- **The declassified files rely heavily on government records to build their case** – The evidence includes intelligence assessments, internal emails, National Institutes of Health (NIH) grant reports, briefing records and other official documents rather than recollections or interviews alone.

Together, those records create a timeline that compares what government agencies, researchers and senior officials reportedly discussed behind closed doors with what was later communicated publicly. The article argues that differences between

those internal records and later public statements raise important questions about how information regarding [COVID-19's origins](#) evolved over time.

- **The grant records describe research that extended well beyond basic virus surveillance** – According to the report, Year 5 progress documents for [EcoHealth Alliance's NIH grant](#) outlined several planned laboratory activities, including sequencing spike genes from bat coronaviruses, creating mutant viruses to evaluate their ability to recognize human receptors, performing receptor-binding experiments, and conducting infection studies in humanized mice.

Humanized mice are specially bred laboratory mice that carry human cells or tissues so scientists can study how diseases behave inside a living system that more closely resembles people.

- **Several research projects also overlapped with earlier proposals** – The article states that the work described in the grant report paralleled elements of the 2018 DEFUSE proposal involving EcoHealth Alliance; Peter Daszak, president of EcoHealth Alliance; Ralph Baric, a coronavirus researcher at the University of North Carolina; and researchers at the [Wuhan Institute of Virology](#).

The DEFUSE proposal is significant because DARPA – the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency – reportedly reviewed and rejected it in 2018, meaning federal officials had already evaluated this type of research before the pandemic began. According to the released documents, that proposal discussed creating chimeric bat coronaviruses. A chimeric virus combines genetic material from different viruses so researchers can study how individual pieces influence behavior.

The relevance is straightforward – if a chimeric virus combining bat and human-adapted elements were created in a lab and accidentally released, it could look, genetically, like something that evolved naturally. The proposal also described receptor adaptation studies, consideration of furin cleavage site insertion and testing in humanized mice.

- **Understanding these technical terms helps you evaluate the debate yourself –** Spike proteins act like keys that help viruses enter cells. Receptors serve as the locks on those cells. Receptor adaptation experiments examine whether changes to the virus improve its ability to fit those locks.

Furin cleavage sites are sections of a virus that make it easier for human enzymes to activate the virus before it enters cells. These laboratory techniques became central topics during later debates over COVID-19's origin.

- **The files also show that some people had already been exposed to bat-related coronaviruses –** According to the report, surveillance work performed under the same NIH grant tested 1,497 rural residents in southern China and found that nine people, or 0.6%, carried antibodies against bat SARS-related or HKU10 coronaviruses.

Antibodies are proteins your immune system creates after exposure to an infection, making them useful markers that show whether someone encountered a virus in the past. Researchers often conduct antibody surveys to understand how frequently viruses circulate among people who live near wildlife reservoirs.

A 0.6% exposure rate may sound small, but it confirms that bat coronaviruses were already making the jump to humans in the region – quietly, before any outbreak was recognized. That baseline matters: if officials monitoring this research knew related viruses were reaching people in southern China, the question of what they concluded about COVID-19's origin, and how urgently they acted, becomes harder to answer with a simple "we didn't know."

The Declassified Records Raise New Questions About Fauci's Testimony

According to the ZeroHedge report, the newly released records show that Anthony Fauci, then director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID), participated in a June 4, 2021, secure briefing with Central Intelligence Agency (CIA)

personnel, National Security Council officials and other intelligence representatives to discuss COVID-19 origins, including pangolin research, reports of sick Wuhan Institute of Virology researchers and competing origin theories. The report states that Fauci also recommended scientists for the intelligence community (IC) to consult.

- **The article argues these records conflict with Fauci's later testimony** – According to the report, Fauci testified during a 2024 congressional interview that he had no knowledge of or participation in discussions with intelligence officials about viral research.

The declassified files, according to the report, describe the June 4, 2021, briefing in specific detail – including the attendees and topics discussed. Because that account directly contradicts Fauci's congressional statement on the same question, the report concludes he provided false testimony.

- **Internal communications suggest scientific disagreements continued behind the scenes** – One example involves a June 8, 2021, email that referenced a 2016 meeting at the New York Academy of Medicine where Daszak reportedly discussed colleagues in China "manipulating the spike protein on coronavirus to make them more virulent."

The report also describes internal discussions that referenced a Department of Defense report concerning a "suspicious added furin-site" and FBI reporting that examined unusual genetic characteristics.

- **The timing of these internal discussions adds context to one of the most influential scientific publications of the early pandemic** – In March 2020, a paper titled *The Proximal Origin of SARS-CoV-2*, published in *Nature Medicine*, argued strongly against a laboratory origin and was widely cited by public health officials and media as definitive.³

According to the declassified records described here, government scientists and intelligence analysts continued to privately examine competing theories and unresolved technical questions over the following months and into 2021, raising

questions about whether the scientific consensus presented to the public reflected the full range of evidence being considered behind closed doors.

- **Other communications reflected disagreement rather than complete consensus** – According to the article, one analyst warned that complex scientific information could easily confuse people without specialized training while still arguing that the evidence deserved additional scrutiny. Another internal observation stated that "the IC took direction straight from NIH ... the people that funded the Wuhan Lab" and referred to "a complex web of money and politics influencing analysis."
- **The released files also describe efforts to select outside reviewers for COVID-origin assessments** – According to the report, July 2021 emails evaluated several candidates before rejecting them because of political sensitivity or perceived conflicts of interest.

The article states that James Clapper was viewed as politically "hot," Anthony Fauci was flagged because of his NIH funding connections, Michael Morell was considered "too public," while Sue Gordon and another individual identified only as "Beth" were also set aside.

Whether those decisions strengthened or weakened the review process remains contested. Standard scientific review practice requires that evaluators disclose financial relationships, prior collaborations and public statements relevant to the subject under review, precisely so readers can weigh those factors themselves. By that measure, the selection discussions described here raise questions worth examining.

Taken together, these documents don't resolve the question of COVID-19's origin, but they do reveal how much was being debated behind closed doors while public officials presented a narrower picture. That gap between private deliberation and public messaging is exactly why developing your own framework for evaluating health and science claims matters.

How to Protect Yourself from Misleading Public Health Narratives

The newly released documents suggest the public was not shown the full picture. According to the records described in this article, government officials privately considered a laboratory origin to be a credible explanation while influential scientific publications and public officials publicly promoted a natural origin and dismissed competing views. This underscores why I believe your strongest protection is learning to examine the evidence for yourself instead of relying on [official narratives alone](#).

- 1. Start with the original records, not the headlines** – Headlines often tell you what to think. Original documents allow you to decide for yourself. Intelligence assessments, grant reports, internal emails, and hearing transcripts provide a timeline of what officials knew, when they knew it, and how those discussions compared with later public statements. The closer you stay to primary documents, the less likely you are to be influenced by selective reporting.
- 2. Compare what was said privately with what was said publicly** – One of the strongest themes running through these documents is the difference between internal discussions and the public narrative.

According to the records summarized here, government scientists and intelligence officials continued examining a laboratory origin even while much of the public conversation shifted toward a single explanation. Whenever those two stories diverge, it deserves careful scrutiny rather than dismissal.

- 3. Follow the money and the timeline together** – Research funding, grant proposals, scientific collaborations and intelligence briefings become much more meaningful when viewed chronologically. Put those events in order. Look at when research was proposed, when meetings occurred, when intelligence assessments were written and when public statements followed. Patterns often become much easier to recognize once the full timeline is laid out.

- 4. Ask who shaped the scientific discussion** — Science advances through open debate, not by discouraging competing hypotheses. Whenever reviewer selection, funding relationships or conflicts of interest become part of the story, pay attention. Transparency strengthens confidence in scientific conclusions. Efforts that limit debate or discourage scrutiny deserve the same level of examination as the scientific evidence itself.

- 5. Remain open to new evidence instead of defending old narratives** — Scientific understanding changes as new documents, testimony and data emerge. If newly released records strengthen or weaken a conclusion you previously accepted, let the evidence lead you. Your goal is not to defend a position. Your goal is to understand what happened as accurately and completely as the available evidence allows.

FAQs About the Newly Released COVID Documents

Q: What do the newly declassified documents claim about COVID-19's origins?

A: According to the documents described in this article, a U.S. national laboratory concluded in May 2020 that a laboratory origin was just as plausible as a natural origin. The records also suggest government officials continued discussing the lab-origin hypothesis privately while the public narrative largely emphasized a natural origin.

Q: What type of coronavirus research do the declassified records describe?

A: The records describe federally funded research involving bat coronaviruses, including spike protein engineering, receptor adaptation experiments, testing in humanized mice and discussions about furin cleavage sites. These research methods later became central to debates about SARS-CoV-2's characteristics.

Q: Why do the documents raise questions about Fauci's testimony?

A: According to the report, the newly released records show that Fauci participated in a June 4, 2021, intelligence briefing about COVID-19's origins. The article argues those records conflict with Fauci's later congressional testimony that he had no knowledge of or participation in discussions with intelligence officials about viral research.

Q: Why are the internal emails and reviewer discussions important?

A: The documents describe internal scientific disagreements, intelligence discussions and efforts to select outside reviewers for COVID-origin assessments. Together, they provide additional context about how government agencies and researchers evaluated competing explanations for the pandemic's origin behind the scenes.

Q: What's the biggest lesson from these newly released records?

A: The documents underscore the importance of examining original evidence instead of relying only on headlines or official summaries. Looking at intelligence assessments, grant reports, internal communications and timelines allows you to better understand how scientific conclusions and public messaging developed over time.

Sources and References

- ¹ [Office of the Director of National Intelligence, Fauci Funded Wuhan Lab Research That Sparked COVID June 18, 2026](#)
- ² [ZeroHedge June 21, 2026](#)
- ³ [Nature Medicine 2020; 26: 450-452](#)