

Health Officials Caught Deploying Fear and Staging Coverup

Analysis by [Dr. Joseph Mercola](#)

✓ Fact Checked

March 13, 2023

STORY AT-A-GLANCE

- › In a March 5, 2023, memorandum, the Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Pandemic laid out evidence showing Dr. Anthony Fauci prompted the creation of a paper to “disprove” the lab leak theory, and that the authors of this paper skewed available evidence to achieve that goal
- › According to the Subcommittee, while Dr. Jeremy Farrar — former head of the Wellcome Trust and now chief scientist for the World Health Organization — is not credited as having had any involvement with the fabricated paper, evidence suggests he actually led the drafting process, and “made direct edits” to the paper
- › The Telegraph has reviewed more than 100,000 leaked WhatsApp messages sent between health officials, ministers and other government officials, showing the British government was intentionally deploying scare tactics to force compliance with lockdowns and other COVID measures
- › Then-health secretary Matt Hancock said he wanted to “deploy” a new COVID variant to “frighten the pants off” the public. One of his media advisers, Damon Poole, agreed with the plan, saying “Yep that’s what will get proper behavior change”
- › The messages show officials mocking travelers forced into quarantine and other deplorable behaviors. They also show decisions were made on the fly, for political reasons rather than scientific ones

In January 2022, House Oversight Committee Republicans released a batch of emails sent to and from the National Institutes of Health (NIH),^{1,2,3} showing that scientists in the

earliest days of the pandemic strongly suspected SARS-CoV-2 was a genetically engineered virus.

The correspondence also revealed that NIH leaders — Dr. Anthony Fauci and then-NIH chief Dr. Francis Collins — were nervous about the possibility that they'd funded the creation of this virus and were determined to suppress questions about its origin.

Fauci, Collins and at least 11 scientists convened for a conference call February 1, 2020, during which they discussed the evidence for genetic manipulation. Yet, no more than three days later, by February 4, four of the participants had already drafted a paper titled "The Proximal Origin of SARS-CoV-2," in which they dismissed the possibility of a lab origin for the virus.

One of the authors of this paper, Kristian Andersen, Ph.D., a professor at Scripps Research, has so far insisted that Fauci did not attempt to influence the working group's conclusions.

In a letter to Sens. James Comer and Jim Jordan, Scripps Research — answering questions on Andersen's behalf — claimed that Andersen "objectively weighted all the evidence available to him." In a March 5, 2023, memorandum,^{4,5} the Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Pandemic laid out evidence showing that this assertion is "demonstrably false."

Fauci and Collins Prompted Creation of 'Proximal Origin'

According to the Select Subcommittee, the evidence available clearly shows that Fauci did indeed prompt Andersen to write "Proximal Origin," and for a specific reason, namely to "disprove" the lab leak theory. "The authors of this paper skewed available evidence to achieve that goal," the Subcommittee writes.

As noted in the memorandum,⁶ in a February 8, 2020, email, Andersen stated: "Our main work over the last couple of weeks has been focused on trying to disprove any type of lab theory ..." Furthermore, in a February 12 email to the journal Nature, Andersen openly and clearly admitted Fauci's and Collins' influence:⁷

"Prompted by Jeremy Farrah [sic], Tony Fauci, and Francis Collins, Eddie Holmes, Andrew Rambaut, Bob Garry, Ian Lipkin, and myself have been working through much of the (primarily) genetic data to provide agnostic and scientifically informed hypothesis around the origins of the virus."

"This email directly contradicts Scripps' earlier statement that Dr. Andersen 'objectively' weighed all the evidence regarding the origins of COVID-19. Instead, it appears that Dr. Andersen was given direction and sought to formulate a paper, regardless of available evidence, that would disprove a lab leak," the Subcommittee writes.⁸

Pangolin Narrative Was a Red Herring From the Start

The Subcommittee also highlights evidence showing that Andersen did not tell the truth when, in a July 2021 New York Times interview, he stated that features of SARS-CoV-2 that were initially thought to be unique were also found in coronaviruses in other species, such as pangolins, and that this was what convinced him the virus was zoonotic in origin.

Correspondence with the journal Nature proves Andersen actually found the pangolin data unconvincing. During the peer review of "Proximal Origin," one reviewer asked the authors to comment on two recent reports about coronaviruses in pangolins. In reply, Andersen stated that "these additional pangolin CoV sequences do not further clarify the different scenarios discussed in our manuscript." Another reviewer commented:

"The paper itself is interesting, but unnecessarily speculative. It's not clear why the authors do not refute a hypothetical lab origin in their coming publication on the ancestors of SARS-CoV-2 in bats and pangolins ...

Once the authors publish their new pangolin sequences, a lab origin will be extremely unlikely. It is not clear why the authors rush with a speculative perspective if their central hypothesis can be supported by their own data. Please explain."

In his reply to the second reviewer, Andersen stressed that "Unfortunately, the newly available pangolin sequences do not elucidate the origin of SARS-CoV-2 or refute a lab origin. Hence the reviewer is incorrect on this point." He also clarified that "There is no evidence on present data that the pangolin CoVs are directly related to the COVID-19 epidemic."

So, while Andersen publicly claimed the pangolin data was a compelling piece of evidence for zoonotic in origin, in private, he did not believe this at all. "Based on this new evidence, the pangolin data was not the compelling factor; to this day, the only known intervening event was the February 1 conference call with Dr. Fauci," the Subcommittee writes.

Farrar's Involvement Was Hidden

In addition to Fauci and Collins, Dr. Jeremy Farrar, then-director of the Wellcome Trust in the U.K., also appears to have played a prominent role in the creation of "Proximal Origin." According to the Subcommittee memorandum:⁹

"The evidence available ... suggests Dr. Farrar, the former Director of the Wellcome Trust and current Chief Scientist at the World Health Organization, was more involved in the drafting and publication of Proximal Origin than previously known."

Emails show Eddie Holmes, Ph.D., asked Farrar for permission to get Dr. Ian Lipkin involved. Lipkin, a professor of epidemiology at Columbia University, was not on the February 1 conference call and was not involved in the original drafting of Proximal Origin.

However, February 10, 2020, Holmes sent the Proximal Origin draft to Lipkin and asked him to review it, stating that the furin cleavage site was "still an issue" that needed to be explained. Lipkin replied that the paper, overall, provided "a plausible argument against genetic engineering," but did "not eliminate the possibility of inadvertent release following adaptation through selection in culture at the Institute in Wuhan."

Lipkin also noted that "Given the scale of the bat CoV research pursued there and the site of emergence of the first human cases we have a nightmare of circumstantial evidence to assess." Holmes wrote back, saying:

"I agree. Talking to Jeremy [Farrar] in a few minutes ... It is indeed striking that this virus is so closely related to SARS yet is behaving so differently. Seems to have been pre-adapted for human spread since the get go. It's the epidemiology that I find most worrying."

According to the Subcommittee, while Farrar is not credited as having had any involvement with "Proximal Origin," the evidence suggests he actually led the drafting process, and "made direct edits" to the paper. Two emails proving this were sent between Lipkin and Farrar on February 17, 2020. Lipkin thanked Farrar for "shepherding this paper," and Farrar, in turn, confirmed that he would "push Nature" to publish it.

Considering Farrar's involvement in the creation and publication of a "scientific" paper that had no other intention than misleading the public and cementing a false narrative into place, can he really be trusted as chief scientist for the WHO?

Worse, Farrar also played a central role in the Recovery and Solidarity trials, both of which killed patients by overdosing them on hydroxychloroquine in an apparent effort to prove the drug was dangerous and couldn't be used against COVID.¹⁰

The Dangers of Partisanship

As noted by British journalist and columnist Ian Birrell,¹¹ "The true COVID lab leak scandal is how easily our politicians and scientists dismissed it. That blanket dismissal of a lab leak as a dangerous conspiracy theory showed the dangers of partisanship ..."

"... significant circumstantial evidence has emerged that strengthens the case for laboratory leakage during speculative research in Wuhan," Birrell writes. "Such fears are intensified by Beijing's shameful cover-up of early cases and blatant blocking of investigations in Wuhan, despite the desperate need to track down the source to prevent another deadly pandemic."

Behind this question lies a second issue of huge importance, one that reflects badly on the overlapping worlds of politics, journalism and science.

For a small group of prominent scientists, marshalled by the powerful chiefs of funding bodies in Britain and the United States, deliberately stifled this debate over birth of the biggest public health crisis for a century – despite their own concerns over research in Wuhan and the virus's unusual properties.

They accused those asking valid questions of spreading conspiracy theories and used their immense influence to dismiss 'any type of laboratory-based scenario' as implausible.

Then they were aided by patsy politicians appeasing Beijing, supine journalists so in thrall to contacts that they failed to do their job, and world-famous specialist publications with such close ties to China that they have now ruined their reputations. This was the real COVID conspiracy that is now unravelling ..."

Birrell, a self-proclaimed liberal, admits being skeptical of the lab leak theory in the beginning, but once he started looking into it, "It did not take long ... to tap into the private concerns held by many scientists," he says. He discovered China had covered up the initial outbreak and withheld details about transmission. He also reviewed the studies presenting cases for the lab leak theory, and found them credible. He adds:

"Science, like journalism, depends on fierce debate to test evidence and theories. Instead we saw the power of consensus and groupthink to stifle free thinking; capture of specialist journalists by their contacts to crush skepticism; the dubious role of technology giants to determine valid grounds for debate; and the risks of scientists and journals following funding sources rather than firm evidence.

Think again about COVID's emergence – and lacking firm proof, how on earth did it take so long for the authorities to admit that it is possible the virus might have been linked to scientific research in secretive Wuhan labs?"

Well, based on what we know about Fauci's involvement in the cover-up, one potential answer to Birrell's question is that the NIH funded research that contributed to the creation of SARS-CoV-2, which could threaten the future of the entire agency – and the U.S. government. Another potential answer is that NIH feared even the suggestion of it being manmade because it might result in a global ban on the genetic engineering of viruses.

The Lockdown Files

Meanwhile, on the other side of the Atlantic, The Telegraph^{12,13} has reviewed more than 100,000 leaked WhatsApp messages sent between health officials, ministers and other government officials, showing the British government was intentionally deploying scare tactics to force compliance with lockdowns and other COVID measures.

“ Then-health secretary Matt Hancock said he wanted to 'deploy' a new COVID variant to 'frighten the pants off' the public. One of his media advisers, Damon Poole, agreed, saying 'Yep that's what will get proper behaviour change.' ”

As reported by The Telegraph:¹⁴

"[Then-Health Secretary] Matt Hancock wanted to 'deploy' a new COVID variant to 'frighten the pants off' the public and ensure they complied with lockdown, leaked messages seen by The Telegraph have revealed ...

In a WhatsApp conversation on Dec 13 ... Damon Poole – one of Mr. Hancock's media advisers – informed his boss that Tory MPs were 'furious already about the prospect' of stricter COVID measures and suggested 'we can roll pitch with the new strain' ...

Mr. Hancock then replied: 'We frighten the pants off everyone with the new strain.' Mr Poole agreed, saying: 'Yep that's what will get proper behaviour change' ... 'When do we deploy the new variant,' asked Mr. Hancock ...

The exchange was not the only time the former health secretary and other senior officials discussed tactics to frighten the public into compliance.

Six months earlier, in June 2020 – when the UK was coming out of its first COVID lockdown – Mr. Hancock and Sir Patrick Vallance, the Government's Chief Scientific Adviser, appeared pleased that a study on the virus's spread showing it going in a 'positive direction' had not received publicity, while a 'gloomy' survey had been picked up by the media.

'If we want people to behave themselves maybe that's no bad thing,' said Mr. Hancock in a WhatsApp message. Sir Patrick appeared to agree, responding: 'Suck up their miserable interpretation and over deliver' ...

Four months later, in Oct 2020, Mr. Poole suggested in a group chat that a decision to stop publishing a so-called watchlist of the areas with the highest prevalence of the virus would be helpful to the Government, because it would make every area of the country concerned about the spread of COVID in a second wave.

'It helps the narrative that things are really bad if we don't publish,' messaged Mr. Poole. In Jan 2021, Mr. Case suggested that the 'fear factor' would be 'vital' in combatting the latest COVID wave during the third lockdown."

They Never Followed Science

The messages also show officials mocking and making fun of travelers forced into quarantine and other deplorable behaviors.¹⁵ "Any idea how many people we locked up in hotels yesterday?" Case asked Hancock in a February 16, 2021, message. "None. But 149 chose to enter the country and are now in Quarantine Hotels due to their own free will!" Hancock replied. "Hilarious," Case shot back.

Aside from revealing unsavory personality traits, the messages clearly prove that decisions were made on the fly, and for political reasons rather than scientific ones. For example, in June 2020, then-Prime Minister Boris Johnson decided not to lift lockdowns based on public polling, which allegedly suggested the lockdown was too popular to mess with.

In another instance, Johnson's decision to mandate mask wearing in secondary schools across the U.K. was made for no other reason than avoiding an argument with Nicola Sturgeon, the first minister of Scotland, where mask mandates for high schoolers were already planned. Meanwhile, his own chief medical officer, Hancock, told him there were "no very strong reasons" to mask students as the risk of infection was low.

Government Officials Respond to Revelations

In response to the leaked messages, Sir Charles Walker, a leading member of the COVID Recovery Group – an informal group of Conservative MPs that opposed and voted against lockdowns – told The Telegraph he was "distressed" by the conversations that have now been brought to light, adding:¹⁶

"What makes me so angry is the evils and the psychological warfare we deployed against young people and the population, all those behavioral psychologists. And there needs to be a reckoning. We need to understand and fully appreciate the damage that those sorts of campaigns did.

Those voices that raised concerns were just othered. We were positioned as being anti-lockdown, Right-wing headbangers. And actually wanting to do the right thing isn't Right-wing. We did terrible things to youngsters. We did terrible things to a large number of people. We need to make sure we never do those things again."

Other COVID Recovery Group members voiced similar concerns and criticisms. Craig Mackinlay, Tory MP for South Thanet, told The Telegraph:¹⁷

"An artificial climate of fear was created, which has led to all the corollary outcomes that many of us, particularly in the COVID Recovery Group, were concerned about. Ongoing negative health issues, education issues – and not least the destruction of our economy, as one crackpot idea after another found its way onto the statute book."

Sir John Redwood, another COVID Recovery Group member agreed, saying the tactics employed "always backfire, they always mislead and they don't lead to good government."

Similarly, oncology specialist professor Karol Sikora told The Telegraph¹⁸ he was "horrified" when reading the WhatsApp exchanges, in no small part because he has "no doubt" many cancer patients avoided seeking treatment due to COVID fears – fears that were actually unjustified but intentionally hyped.

Indeed, the revelations now flooding out in England and the U.S. paint a gross and unsavory picture of government officials intentionally lying to the public, and people have died and lives have been ruined as a result. On the upside, the call for accountability is finally starting to get louder, as people begin to realize what's been done to them.

That said, most of these globalist technocrats are still protected by other cabal members in key positions, so whether any of them will ever pay the price for their crimes against humanity remains to be seen. Much of it will depend on the backbone of those in government who are not part of the globalist cabal.

Sources and References

- ¹ [Farrar Fauci Communications](#)
- ² [House Oversight Committee COVID Origins](#)
- ³ [YourNews January 11, 2022](#)
- ^{4, 6, 7, 8, 9} [Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Pandemic Memorandum, March 5, 2023](#)
- ⁵ [USRTK March 5, 2023](#)
- ¹⁰ [Meryl Nass Substack February 20, 2023](#)
- ¹¹ [iNews March 5, 2023](#)

- ¹² [The Telegraph, The Lockdown Files \(Archived\)](#)
- ^{13, 14} [The Telegraph March 4, 2023 \(Archived\)](#)
- ¹⁵ [The Telegraph, 10 Things Learned So Far March 4, 2023](#)
- ^{16, 17, 18} [The Telegraph March 5, 2023 \(Archived\)](#)