

Pharma's War on Scientists to Mandate Jobs for Life

By [Dr. Joseph Mercola](#)

Global Research, December 31, 2021
[Mercola](#) 29 December 2021

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Media Disinformation](#), [Science and Medicine](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the "Translate Website" drop down menu on the top banner of our home page (Desktop version).

To receive Global Research's Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

Visit and follow us on Instagram at [@globalresearch_crg](#).

*Another cache of emails obtained via a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request by the American Institute for Economic Research (AIER) reveals **Dr. Anthony Fauci** and his boss, National Institutes of Health director **Francis Collins**, colluded to quash dissenting views on the lockdowns*

*October 4, 2020, three medical professors — **Martin Kulldorff** from Harvard, Sunetra Gupta from Oxford and Jay Bhattacharya from Stanford — launched the Great Barrington Declaration, which called for focused protection of high-risk individuals rather than the continuation of blanket lockdowns*

As support of the declaration rapidly spread, Fauci and Collins discussed how they could stop the call for a sane, science-based approach. In an email to Fauci, Collins wrote, "There needs to be a quick and devastating published take down of its premises"

The emails between Fauci and Collins are the smoking gun showing that it is they who are waging war against science

Despite having a combined annual budget of \$58 billion, and a combined staff of 31,000, the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the NIH/NIAID have not yet conducted an actual study to determine how natural immunity stacks up against the COVID jab, likely because they don't want to know the answer

*

The more we learn about **Dr. Anthony Fauci**, the worse he looks. The grandfatherly figurehead has now had two years in the limelight, urging people to "follow the science," which he has shamelessly equated to his own ever-shifting opinion.

Another cache of emails obtained via a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request by the American Institute for Economic Research (AIER) now reveals Fauci and his boss, National Institutes of Health director Francis Collins, colluded behind the scenes to quash dissenting

views on the lockdowns.¹

Fauci and Collins Conspired to Destroy Dissent

October 4, 2020, three medical professors — **Martin Kulldorff from Harvard, Sunetra Gupta from Oxford and Jay Bhattacharya from Stanford** — **launched the Great Barrington Declaration**, a statement anyone could sign onto that called for focused protection of high-risk individuals, such as the elderly, rather than the continuation of blanket lockdowns. AIER sponsored the declaration.

“Current lockdown policies are producing devastating effects on short and long-term public health,” the declaration stated. “Keeping these measures in place until a vaccine is available will cause irreparable damage, with the underprivileged disproportionately harmed.”

As support of the declaration rapidly spread, Fauci and Collins seemingly panicked, and discussed how they could possibly stop the growing call for a sane, science-based approach.

In an October 8, 2020, email to Fauci, Collins wrote:^{2,3,4,5}

“The proposal from the three fringe epidemiologists who met with the Secretary seems to be getting a lot of attention ... There needs to be a quick and devastating published take down of its premises ...”

“Don’t worry, I got this,” Fauci replied. Later, Fauci sent Collins links to newly published articles refuting the focused protection solution, including an op-ed in Wired magazine, and an article in The Nation, titled “Focused Protection, Herd Immunity and Other Deadly Delusions.” “Excellent,” Collins replied.

This correspondence is a real peek behind the curtain as to who Fauci and Collins really are. They’re not interested in debating scientific merit. Their go-to strategy is simply to demolish the opposition by any means necessary.

Fauci and Collins are just ‘nasty bureaucrats who want to destroy anyone who challenges their power.’ ~ Daniel McAdams

Clearly, there’s nothing “fringe” about these scientists. Bhattacharya, for example, has conducted NIH-funded research for decades.⁶ If he’s a “fringe” scientist, why is Collins funding him?

As noted by **Daniel McAdams** of the **Ron Paul Liberty Report** (video above), behind the scenes, Fauci and Collins are just “nasty bureaucrats who want to destroy anyone who challenges their power ... The scientific method does not involve, ‘Oh my gosh, that guy said something that contradicts me, I must destroy him.’”

Fauci’s War on Science

As noted by Jeffrey Tucker in a December 19, 2021, Brownstone article,⁷ the attacks on the declaration and its creators were particularly shocking considering “They were merely stating the consensus based on science and experience. Nothing more.”

Indeed, March 2, 2020, 850 scientists signed a letter⁸ to the White House warning against the use of lockdowns, travel restrictions and the closing of businesses and schools.

Fauci himself had even told a Washington Post reporter that “The epidemic will gradually decline and stop on its own without a vaccine”⁹ — a scientifically correct stance he’s since abandoned. According to Tucker, the emails between Fauci and Collins are the smoking gun showing that it is they who are waging war against science.

“What we find in these emails are highly political people who are obsessed not with science but with messaging and popular influences on the public mind,” Tucker writes.¹⁰

“What do we learn from these emails? The attacks on tens of thousands of medical professionals and scientists were indeed encouraged from the top. The basis for the attacks were not scientific articles. They were heavily political popular pieces.

This adds serious weight to the impression we all had at the time, which was that this was not really about science but about something far more insidious. You can discover more about this in Scott Atlas’s book on the topic [‘A Plague Upon Our House’]. These new emails confirm his account. It was an outright war on top scientists ...

My own estimate is that the convinced advocates of lockdowns when they took place were probably fewer than 50 in the U.S. How and why they managed to grab hold of the reins of power will be investigated by historians for many decades.

The incredibly positive response to the Great Barrington Declaration, which has garnered 900,000 signatures in the meantime, demonstrates that there was and is still life remaining in traditional public health measures deployed throughout the 20th century and still respect for human dignity and science remaining among medical professionals and the general public.

This war on dissent against lockdowns is not only a scandal of our times. The lockdowns and now the mandates have fundamentally transformed society ...

We seem ever more to be on the precipice of total disaster, one that will be difficult to reverse. It is urgent that we know who did this, as well as how and why, and take steps to stop it before more damage is done and then becomes permanent.”

Bhattacharya Speaks Out

When news of the Fauci-Collins collusion broke, Bhattacharya tweeted,¹¹ “Now I know what it feels like to be the subject of a propaganda attack by my own government. Discussion and engagement would have been a better path.”

According to Bhattacharya, Collins and Fauci cooked up the false counternarrative that focused protection would “let the virus rip” through populations with devastating effect. This erroneous talking point was then thrown at them again and again.

“When reporters started asking me why I wanted to ‘let the virus rip,’ I was puzzled,” Bhattacharya tweeted December 19, 2021.¹² “Now I know that Collins and Fauci primed the media attack with the lie.

I was also puzzled by the mischaracterization of the GBD [Great Barrington Declaration] as a 'herd immunity strategy,' Biologically the epidemic ends when a sufficient number of people have immunity, either through COVID recovery or vax. Lockdown, let-it-rip, and the GBD all lead to that.

As Martin Kulldorff has said, it makes as much sense to say 'herd immunity strategy' as it does to say 'gravity strategy' for landing an airplane. The only question is how to land safely, not whether gravity applies.

So the question is how to get through this terrible pandemic with the least harm, where the harms considered include all of public health, not just COVID. The GBD and focused protection of the vulnerable is a middle ground between lockdown and let-it-rip.

Lockdowners like Collins & Fauci ... could have engaged honestly in a discussion about it, but would have found that public health is fundamentally about focused protection ... Instead, Fauci & Collins decided to smear Martin Kulldorff, Sunetra Gupta, me and supporters of the GBD. They lied about the ideas it contains and orchestrated a propaganda campaign against us ...

Fauci & Collins are silent about lockdown harms because they are culpable. The sad fact is that they won the policy war, they got their lockdowns, and now ... own the harms. They cannot deny it. The GBD warned them.

They also cannot say that the lockdowns worked to suppress COVID. In the U.S., we followed the Fauci/Collins lockdown strategy and we have 800k COVID deaths. Sweden — more focused on protecting the vulnerable — did better and cannot be ignored ...

[History] will judge those in charge of the COVID policy, and it will not judge kindly. [Collins] smears the GBD and its authors because he has no substantive argument left ... Collins' interview with Baier marks a sad end to an illustrious career, and I take no joy in saying so. Fauci should join him in retirement. They have done enough damage."

Against Fading Odds, Fauci Tries to Keep Narrative Alive

The damaging character revelations emerge just as Fauci and President Biden struggle to whip up panic about Omicron to keep the need for pandemic countermeasures going. It's a challenge, for sure, as most people have already realized that Omicron is no worse than a common cold.

During a December 19, 2021, CNN interview, Fauci stated that they "did not anticipate the extent of mutations" that occurred in Omicron.¹³ So, basically, despite sinking billions of dollars into research, scientists were unable to predict the mutations. That should tell us something.

Disturbingly, there's now evidence suggesting Omicron might be yet another lab creation. In a recent Bannons War Room interview, **Dr. Robert Malone, inventor of the mRNA and DNA vaccine core platform technology,**¹⁴ reviewed what we know so far about the Omicron variant.

As noted by Malone, the press has been talking about "everything except for the obvious,

which is that this is a ‘vaccine’-escaped mutant.” The variant appears highly resistant to the COVID shots, which is a sign of it having mutated within one or more COVID-jabbed individuals, yet the first recommendation from the mental giants in charge of COVID responses was to push COVID booster shots. This is as irresponsible and irrational as it is unscientific.

“The boosters are a perfect way to bias our immune system so we’re LESS able to respond to this new variant,” Malone explained. “This is [like] jabbing everybody with a flu vaccine from three seasons ago and expecting it to have effects against the current [flu strains].”

Omicron Emerged From Old 2020 Strain

As for the nature and origin of Omicron, Malone said:

“It has the hallmark of a viral agent under tight genetic selection for evolution to escape the ‘vaccine’ responses against the receptor bonding domain. The question that is outstanding right now is — because this is so different from the other strains that are being tracked; it’s in its own separate little evolutionary branch — how did this happen?”

What Malone is referring to is the fact that the closest genetic sequences to Omicron date back to mid-2020. It doesn’t seem to belong to any of the evolutionary branches that have emerged since.¹⁵ In the time-lapse graphic¹⁶ below, Twitter user Chief Nerd illustrates the genomic epidemiology of SARS-CoV-2 from the original strain until now, using data from nextstrain.org.¹⁷

Time-lapse I made of the genomic epidemiology of SARS-COV-2 since the 2020 Wuhan strain

Notice that Omicron makes a sudden appearance inconsistent with the other variants, and contains the largest number of mutations

Source: <https://t.co/fFLpbNWA2q> pic.twitter.com/kBKwM8K04f

— Chief Nerd (@TheChiefNerd) [December 2, 2021](#)

It’s a great illustration of just how odd an unnatural Omicron’s emergence really is. As the time-lapse gets toward the end of 2021, suddenly there’s Omicron, emerging like a straight line from a mid-2020 strain, having no semblance to any of the other strains. There’s no precedent for this oddity occurring in nature.

In all, Omicron is said to have some 50 mutations from the original Alpha strain, many of which specifically allow it to circumvent COVID shot-induced antibody defenses.

According to molecular biologist and cancer geneticist Philip Buckhaults, Ph.D.,¹⁸ Omicron has 25 nonsynonymous and only one synonymous spike mutation compared to its most recent common ancestor (AV.1). Were it a natural occurrence, that ratio ought to be somewhere between 25 to 50 and 25 to 100.

Until and unless we end up with conclusive proof of its origin, we need to keep all options open, Malone says, and that includes the possibility of Omicron being cooked up in a lab from a previous strain.

One plausible theory is that scientists enabled an early SARS-CoV-2 variant to build antibody resistance, possibly by passaging them through human or humanized cell lines in the presence of convalescent plasma.

Congressman Calls for Natural Immunity Study

December 14, 2021, a Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Crisis held a remote hearing in which they debated the need for an accelerated vaccination effort. In the outtake from that meeting (video above), Congressman Jim Jordan, R-Ohio, points out that the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the NIH/NIAID have a combined annual budget of about \$58 billion, and a combined staff of 31,000.

With that kind of budget and an army of staff, why has the U.S. government not done a study to determine how natural immunity stacks up against the COVID jab? Jordan asked. The answer he received (from an, unfortunately, unidentified doctor) was refreshingly direct:

“I don’t think they want to know the answer,” because “it would undermine the indiscriminate vaccination policy for every single human being, including extremely low risk people.”

According to a Columbia University study, more than half the American population have now been exposed to the SARS-CoV-2 virus in one form or another, and have natural immunity, and according to an Israeli study, natural immunity is 27 times more effective than the COVID shot.¹⁹

So, why are government leaders and so-called health authorities still acting as though natural immunity is irrelevant and the only way to control the pandemic is through repeated injections with experimental — and clearly hazardous — gene transfer technology?

I believe the answer is they’re ignoring natural immunity because their primary objective and goal is to have everyone injected. They want everyone routinely jabbed so they can justify the rollout of health passports, which will become the foundation for an all-encompassing digital ID control system.

In short, our public health agencies have been hijacked and are carrying out an anti-human, anti-health agenda intended to enslave the public in a technocratic control grid.

There’s no doubt anymore that the vaccine passports will be expanded to encompass financial transactions and incorporate a social credit system. Together, all of these pieces will allow an unelected elite to control the lives of every person on the planet, down to the minutest details of our everyday lives.

While Fauci and Collins are certainly not alone in this effort, and likely not even close to the top of the technocratic food chain, they have played very important roles. It’s time to see them for who and what they are, and demand that they be held to account for their actions.

*

Note to readers: Please click the share buttons above or below. Follow us on Instagram, @crg_globalresearch. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

Notes

¹ [Wall Street Journal December 21, 2021](#)

² [YouTube Liberty Report, 7:13 minutes](#)

³ [The Blaze December 18, 2021](#)

⁴ [Daily Mail December 18, 2021, Updated December 19, 2021](#)

⁵ [ZeroHedge December 20, 2021](#)

^{6, 12} [Twitter Jay Bhattacharya December 19, 2021](#)

^{7, 9, 10} [Brownstone December 19, 2021](#)

⁸ [Letter to White House](#)

¹¹ [Twitter Jay Bhattacharya December 17, 2021](#)

¹³ [NY Post December 19, 2021](#)

¹⁴ [Trial Site News May 30, 2021](#)

¹⁵ [NPR December 1, 2021](#)

¹⁶ [Twitter Chief Nerd December 2, 2021](#)

¹⁷ [Nextstrain.org](#)

¹⁸ [Twitter Dr. Buckhaults November 30, 2021](#)

¹⁹ [YouTube The Hill Studies cited around 3 minute mark](#)

Featured image is from Children's Health Defense

The original source of this article is [Mercola](#)
Copyright © [Dr. Joseph Mercola](#), [Mercola](#), 2021

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

Become a Member of Global Research

Articles by: **Dr. Joseph
Mercola**

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca