

Fauci Must Be Fired and Arrested

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

STORY AT-A-GLANCE

- › Dr. Anthony Fauci, director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) is making news again as revelations of abusive research on dogs have surfaced
- › In a recent letter, NIH principal deputy director Lawrence Tabak acknowledges that Fauci lied when stating the NIH/NIAID have never funded gain-of-function (GOF) research, as EcoHealth Alliance experiments on a bat coronavirus resulted in a virus that was highly virulent and infectious to humans
- › It appears the NIH is trying to scapegoat EcoHealth to circumvent responsibility. Tabak claims the result was unintentional, and that EcoHealth failed to report the GOF outcome to the NIH, as this would have triggered a review. EcoHealth, in turn, claims they did report it in 2018, which means Fauci would have been aware of the GOF research
- › In 2018, EcoHealth and the Wuhan Institute of Virology submitted a \$14 million grant proposal to the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) for the construction of SARS-related bat coronaviruses with human-specific cleavage sites to evaluate their growth potential. DARPA rejected the proposal because it failed to fully address the risks of GOF research
- › U.S. Congress is now trying to curtail funding of GOF in general and EcoHealth Alliance in particular

The crimes of Dr. Anthony Fauci, director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID), a division of the National Institutes of Health (NIH), is making news again as revelations of abusive research on dogs have surfaced.

Interestingly, while many shrug at abuse of human beings, including the elderly, far fewer are willing to overlook the torture of dogs.

In the video above, Kim Iversen makes the case that Fauci should resign or be fired over his repeated lies, questionable research ethics and mishandling of the pandemic.

Many others have also chimed in on the matter. In an October 24, 2021, article¹ on Substack, Leighton Woodhouse points out that “Fauci has been abusing animals for 40 years,” and that “the stuff you’ve seen on social media barely scratches the surface.”

The Beagle Experiments

In one experiment that has raised public ire, beagles were sedated and their heads placed in mesh cages filled with sand flies that had been intentionally starved before the experiment to encourage feeding.

The study² in question, “Enhanced Attraction of Sand Fly Vectors of *Leishmania Infantum* to Dogs Infected with Zoonotic Visceral Leishmaniasis” was published in PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases in July 2021. Some of the photos from this study have circulated on Twitter and other social media platforms. According to the researchers:

*“The sand fly *Phlebotomus perniciosus* is the main vector of *Leishmania infantum*, etiological agent of zoonotic visceral leishmaniasis in the Western Mediterranean basin. Dogs are the main reservoir host of this disease. The main objective of this study was to determine, under both laboratory and field conditions, if dogs infected with *L. infantum*, were more attractive to female *P. perniciosus* than uninfected dogs.”*

Spotlight on Animal Testing

In the Ron Paul Liberty Report above, Ron Paul discusses the public outcry over Fauci’s cruel research on beagles. However, that’s just the tip of the iceberg. According to Woodhouse,³ “The experiment was just one of countless tests done on animals with the funding of the NIH, and of NIAID in particular, over the course of decades.”

The White Coat Waste Project⁴ estimates anywhere from tens of millions to more than 100 million animals – including more than 1,100 dogs – are experimented on in the U.S. each year, and most of these experiments are paid for by U.S. taxpayers.

The NIH funds medical research to the tune of \$40 billion annually, and an estimated 47% of that research involves animal testing.⁵ The NIAID alone has an annual budget of \$6 billion, almost all of which goes to funding of animal research.

Other Fauci-funded research on dogs include a 2020 experiment carried out by the University of Georgia where beagles were infected with a parasite before being sacrificed and autopsied.

“The purpose of the experiment was to test a drug that, by the investigators’ own admission, had already been ‘extensively tested and confirmed’ in numerous other animal species,” Woodhouse writes.⁶

While the University claims this and all other experiments were carried out in accordance with the Animal Welfare Act, four “critical” violation reports have allegedly been filed against the University after U.S. Department of Agriculture inspections in 2021 alone.^{7,8,9}

In 2019, NIAID paid \$1.68 million to feed toxic drugs to beagle puppies before sacrificing them. In this case, the puppies had their vocal cords cut “so that lab technicians don’t have to hear them cry and howl in distress.”¹⁰

Other NIAID-funded experiments on dogs include research where beagles were infected with pneumonia to induce septic shock and acute hemorrhage. Survivors were euthanized after 96 hours. In another experiment, beagles were infected with anthrax to test the effectiveness of an already approved anthrax vaccine.

In yet another, researchers induced heart attacks in dogs which then underwent MRI scanning before being euthanized and autopsied. What do we have to show from all this torture? Very little, it turns out. Even when medications look promising in animal studies, 90% end up failing in human clinical trials, Woodhouse notes, typically due to differences in physiology.

Why Is NIAID Funding a Psychological Torture Factory?

Perhaps one of the most gruesome experiments paid for by Fauci involves the psychological torturing of monkeys, for purposes that remain unclear. The experiment involves first boosting the monkeys' capacity for terror by destroying a particular part of their brains with acid.¹¹

The monkeys are then tormented with plastic spiders and mechanical snakes as their behavior is observed. Bizarrely, these particular psychological experiments have been funded for 43 years straight, costing taxpayers nearly \$100 million, even though they've not resulted in a single drug or medication.

As noted by White Coat Waste Project vice president Justin Goodman, "Some people have made a career out of torturing monkeys."¹² At the end of December 2020, the White Coat Waste Project reported that:¹³

"As a result of our investigation, Congress has directed the NIH to commission an independent study by the National Academies of the NIH's intramural primate testing and how modern alternatives can reduce their use. This direction is in the NIH's 2021 funding bill¹⁴ (see page 69)."

A Gain-of-Function Cover-Up?

In related news, in an NIH letter,^{15,16,17} the agency acknowledges that Fauci lied to Congress when he emphatically insisted the NIH/NIAID have never funded gain-of-function (GOF) research.

The letter, dated October 21, 2021, was sent by NIH principal deputy director Dr. Lawrence Tabak to James Comer, ranking member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform, "to provide additional information and documents regarding NIH's grant to EcoHealth Alliance Inc."

"It is important to state at the outset that published genomic data demonstrate that the bat coronaviruses studied under the NIH grant to EcoHealth Alliance,

Inc. and subaward to the Wuhan Institute of Virology (WIV) are not and could not have become SARS-CoV-2," Tabak writes.

"Both the progress report and the analysis attached here again confirm that conclusion, as the sequences of the viruses are genetically very distant ... The limited experiment described in the final progress report provided by EcoHealth Alliance was testing if spike proteins from naturally occurring bat coronaviruses circulating in China were capable of binding to the human ACE2 receptor in a mouse model.

All other aspects of the mice, including the immune system, remained unchanged. In this limited experiment, laboratory mice infected with the SHC014 WIV 1 bat coronavirus became sicker than those infected with the WIV1 bat coronavirus. As sometimes occurs in science, this was an unexpected result of the research, as opposed to something that the researchers set out to do ...

The research plan was reviewed by NIH in advance of funding, and NIH determined that it did not fit the definition of research involving enhanced pathogens of pandemic potential (ePPP) because these bat coronaviruses had not been shown to infect humans. As such, the research was not subject to departmental review under the HHS P3CO Framework.

However, out of an abundance of caution and as an additional layer of oversight, language was included in the terms and conditions of the grant award to EcoHealth that outlined criteria for a secondary review, such as a requirement that the grantee report immediately a one log increase in growth.

These measures would prompt a secondary review to determine whether the research aims should be re-evaluated or new biosafety measures should be enacted. EcoHealth failed to report this finding right away, as was required by the terms of the grant."

What Did Fauci Know?

In essence, it appears the NIH is throwing EcoHealth Alliance under the proverbial bus. Yes, EcoHealth Alliance ended up conducting GOF research when its manipulation resulted in a virus with wildly enhanced virulence in humans.¹⁸ While Tabak claims this was unintentional, that seems a bit odd, considering the experiment in question was testing the “emergency potential” of bat coronaviruses in the human population.

Either way, Tabak claims EcoHealth failed to properly report this outcome to the NIH, so the NIH cannot be held responsible for not taking appropriate action. According to the NIH, researchers must file a report any time a virus produces “a one log increase in growth.” EcoHealth’s experiment resulted in a log increase of 10, which should have triggered an NIH review and potentially shut down of the experiment.

“ The letter seems to be setting up EcoHealth as the ‘fall guy’ entity in this story, pinning all blame on the organization in order to allow for the U.S. Government Health agency to rinse its hands clean of any improper behavior. ~ Jordan Schachtel ”

EcoHealth, on the other hand, claims “These data were reported as soon as we were made aware, in our Year 4 report in April 2018.”^{19,20} Now, if EcoHealth reported the results, then Fauci must have been aware that GOF had taken place, and the NIH for some reason let it slide without review.

Is NIH Looking for a Scapegoat?

As noted by Jordan Schachtel in an October 22, 2021, Substack article:²¹

“If you read the entire text of the letter, especially in light of the sudden, unexplained resignation of NIH chief Francis Collins, it seems to be desperate to find a scapegoat for the U.S.-approved gain-of-function research.”

There are two major unproven claims that have been advanced by the NIH: First, EcoHealth, which has long served as a middleman between U.S. and Chinese Communist Party 'health' networks, was accused of violating the terms of the grant it had received ...

EcoHealth has long collaborated with the alleged COVID-19 origin lab in Wuhan, China ... But the letter seems to be setting up EcoHealth as the 'fall guy' entity in this story, pinning all blame on the organization in order to allow for the U.S. Government Health agency to rinse its hands clean of any improper behavior.

The second cause for concern in this letter involves the NIH completely ruling out the possibility that its research grant contributed to the outbreak ... It claims it is scientifically impossible for their approved gain-of-function research to have modified this particular virus. And in doing so, they add a strange comparison between human evolution and the evolution of a virus to make their case ...

Scientists have weighed in on social media to make it clear that the NIH does not have a definitive case on this front. Renowned molecular biologist Richard Ebright went as far as to label it a 'false' claim.²²

Scientist Alina Chan tweeted,²³ "How can this type of work not be flagged as gain-of-function research of concern? Knowing what they knew in 2018, there was a reasonable expectation that this type of experiment could enhance the pathogenicity of MERS in humanized animal models and therefore humans."

Jaime Yassif, senior fellow for global biological policy and programs at the Nuclear Threat Initiative, told CQ,²⁴ "I would have flagged this project. Looking at the experiment of concern that's highlighted in the letter, it appears to me as gain-of-function research, even before the 'one log' requirement." Commenting on the letter, Comer stated:²⁵

"NIH confirmed that EcoHealth violated the terms of their grant by concealing data on dangerous coronavirus experiments in Wuhan. Even worse, NIH Director Collins and Dr. Anthony Fauci potentially misled the Committee and the American people about its knowledge of this cover up."

More Incriminating Evidence Against EcoHealth

But there's more. As reported by Vanity Fair:²⁶

"... another disclosure last month made clear that EcoHealth Alliance, in partnership with the Wuhan Institute of Virology, was aiming to do the kind of research that could accidentally have led to the pandemic.

On September 20, a group of internet sleuths calling themselves DRASTIC (short for Decentralized Radical Autonomous Search Team Investigating COVID-19) released a leaked \$14 million grant proposal that EcoHealth Alliance had submitted in 2018 to the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA).

It proposed partnering with the Wuhan Institute of Virology and constructing SARS-related bat coronaviruses into which they would insert 'human-specific cleavage sites' as a way to 'evaluate growth potential' of the pathogens. Perhaps not surprisingly, DARPA rejected the proposal, assessing that it failed to fully address the risks of gain-of-function research.

The leaked grant proposal struck a number of scientists and researchers as significant for one reason. One distinctive segment of SARS-CoV-2's genetic code is a furin cleavage site that makes the virus more infectious by allowing it to efficiently enter human cells. That is just the feature that EcoHealth Alliance and the Wuhan Institute of Virology had proposed to engineer in the 2018 grant proposal."

Amazingly, NIH Suddenly Revises Its Gain-of-Function Webpage

Adding fuel to suspicions that the NIH/NIAID are trying to cover their tracks is the fact that the NIH suddenly, in the third week of October 2021, deleted the definition of GOF from its website, replacing it with a section on enhanced potential pandemic pathogens (ePPP) research.²⁷

nature can cause pathogens to gain new functions or enhance existing characteristics such as fitness or pathogenicity (ability to cause disease). We have seen many examples of that with SARS-CoV-2 since the beginning of the pandemic.

Gain-of-Function Research

The term gain-of-function (GOF) research describes a type of research that modifies a biological agent so that it confers new or enhanced activity to that agent. Some scientists use the term broadly to refer to *any* such modification. However, not all research described as GOF entails the same level of risk. For example, research that involves the

of SARS-CoV-2 since the beginning of the pandemic.

ePPP Research

On limited occasions, when justified by compelling public health need and conducted in very high biosecurity laboratories, NIH has supported certain research that may be reasonably anticipated to create, transfer or use potential pandemic pathogens resulting from the enhancement of a pathogen's transmissibility and/or virulence in humans. The U.S. Government and the Department of Health and Human Services define such research as enhanced potential pandemic pathogen (ePPP) research. NIH supported ePPP research similar

“The National Institutes of Health appears to be engaged in an ongoing misinformation campaign and a coverup of an unprecedented scale,” Schachtel writes.²⁸ “Sure, Fauci lied, but that might only scratch the surface of the ongoing whitewashing campaign advanced by U.S. Government Health institutions.”

Appropriations Bill Bars Federal Funding of GOF

As reported by CQ, the U.S. Congress is now trying to curtail funding of GOF in general and EcoHealth Alliance in particular:²⁹

“Congressional efforts to curtail funding to EcoHealth Alliance included House votes to prohibit Defense Department funding through the fiscal 2022 defense bill (HR 4432) and the National Defense Authorization Act (HR 4350).

The draft fiscal 2022 Senate Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill does not contain any language targeting gain-of-function research or the Wuhan Institute of Virology, but other bills do.

The House-passed Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill (HR 4502) included language to bar federal funding for the Wuhan Institute of Virology or gain-of-function research. It was adopted by voice vote during the markup process.

A Senate-passed technology bill (S 1260) included an amendment to ban any federal agency from funding gain-of-function research in China. The amendment was accepted by voice vote. The House has not taken up the bill yet.”

A Crisis of Trust

Commenting on the latest revelations, health care entrepreneur and political commentator Vivek Ramaswamy tweeted:³⁰

“Another ‘conspiracy theory’ becomes accepted fact ... So to sum it up:

- 1. US bans gain-of-function research*
- 2. Rogue bureaucrats fund it abroad instead*
- 3. Lab leak occurs. Global pandemic ensues*
- 4. Scientific leaders lie about it and label dissenters as racists*

Want to create a crisis of trust in science? That’ll do it... The facts have been apparent for a long time. The fact that the media missed it says a lot about the quality of true journalism in the US today: almost entirely absent.”

Sources and References

- ^{1, 3, 5, 6, 9, 10} [Substack Leighton Woodhouse October 24, 2021](#)
- ² [PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases July 2021; 15\(7\): e0009647](#)
- ⁴ [Whitecoatwaste.org](#)
- ⁷ [Twitter Amy Meyer October 25, 2021](#)
- ⁸ [Twitter Amy Meyer October 25, 2021 #2](#)
- ¹¹ [White Coat Waste Project Blog February 23, 2020](#)
- ¹² [Washington Times February 24, 2020](#)
- ¹³ [White Coat Waste Project Blog February 23, 2020, Updated December 30, 2021](#)
- ¹⁴ [NIH Appropriations Act 2021](#)
- ¹⁵ [Twitter Richard Ebright NIH Letter dated October 20, 2021](#)
- ¹⁶ [NIH Letter dated October 20, 2021](#)
- ^{17, 19, 26} [Vanity Fair October 22, 2021](#)

- ^{18, 24, 25, 29} CQ October 22, 2021
- ²⁰ ZeroHedge October 25, 2021
- ^{21, 27, 28} Dossier.substack.com October 22, 2021
- ²² Twitter Richard Ebright October 22, 2021
- ²³ Twitter Alina Chan October 21, 2021
- ³⁰ Twitter Vivek Ramaswamy October 23, 2021