

Three Questions for Dr. Fauci on His Alleged Secret Visit to CIA Headquarters

By [Jon Miltimore](#)

Global Research, October 06, 2023

[American Institute for Economic Research](#) 4
October 2023

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Intelligence](#), [Science and Medicine](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the Translate Website button below the author's name.

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

Click the share button above to email/forward this article to your friends and colleagues. Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [Twitter](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

Dr. Anthony Fauci and the CIA have some splainin' to do.

According to a new letter from the House's Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Pandemic, Fauci was admitted to CIA headquarters "without a record of entry" while the agency was conducting its official analysis of the origins of COVID-19.

The letter claims Fauci "participated in the analysis to 'influence' the Agency's review." The date of the alleged meeting is not disclosed.

Rep. Brad Wenstrup (R., Ohio), chair of the committee, gave the inspector general of the Department of Health and Human Services until October 10 to submit all requested items and pertinent communications related to the then-director of National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases' clandestine meeting at Langley.

"The American people deserve the truth—to know the origins of the virus and whether there was a concerted effort by public health authorities to suppress the lab leak theory for political or national security purposes," Wenstrup said.

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CORONAVIRUS PANDEMIC

2157 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6143

Majority (202) 225-5074
Minority (202) 225-5081

September 26, 2023

The Honorable Christi A. Grimm
Inspector General
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Office of Inspector General
330 Independence Avenue SW
Washington, D.C. 20201

Dear Inspector General Grimm:

The Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Pandemic (Select Subcommittee) has received concerning information regarding the Central Intelligence Agency's investigation into the origins of COVID-19.

According to information gathered by the Select Subcommittee, Dr. Anthony Fauci, then-director of National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, played a role in the Central Intelligence Agency's review of the origins of COVID-19. The information provided suggests that Dr. Fauci was escorted into Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) Headquarters—without a record of entry—and participated in the analysis to “influence” the Agency's review. Our goal is to ensure the scientific investigative process regarding the origins of COVID-19 was fair, impartial, and free of alternative influence.

The Select Subcommittee's goal is to ensure accountability and transparency. The American people deserve the truth—to know the origins of the virus and whether there was a concerted effort by public health authorities to suppress the lab leak theory for political or national security purposes. Accordingly, information regarding specific movements of Dr. Fauci throughout the pandemic is reasonable and hardly intrusive, especially considering he is no longer employed by the federal government, he is no longer a protectee of the Inspector General, and we are not requesting any information regarding his current movements.

To assist the Select Subcommittee with its investigation, we request the following documents and information as soon as possible but no later than October 10, 2023:

1. Documents sufficient to show any Department of Health and Human Services Office of Inspector General authorized, supported, or otherwise affiliated movements of Dr. Anthony Fauci from January 1, 2020 through December 31,

Dr. Fauci has not yet made any public statements on the matter, but his alleged visit to CIA headquarters raises important questions.

Did Fauci request the meeting or the CIA?

Why was the meeting held in secret?

Was the CIA aware that Fauci had interests that may have conflicted with his ability to make an objective assessment of the origins of COVID-19?

Each of these questions is important, but let's begin with the last one.

1. A Conflict of Interest?

As director of NIAID, Fauci, early in the pandemic, dismissed allegations that COVID-19 might have emerged from the Wuhan Institute of Virology, calling these claims “[conspiracy theories](#)” and alleging it was “[molecularly impossible](#).”

It was later learned that Fauci made these statements even though scientists he commissioned to author a paper on the origins of the virus [privately said](#) otherwise.

It turns out Dr. Fauci had a very good reason to conceal the fact that COVID-19 likely escaped from the lab in Wuhan, as most US government agencies now believe ([including the FBI](#) and the CIA).

The National Institutes of Health (NIH), the agency that oversees NIAID, [admitted](#) in the fall of 2021 that for years the agency had been funding what was described as “risky virus research in Wuhan,” a charge Fauci had repeatedly and vociferously denied. Fauci, a longtime defender of gain-of-function research, had signed off on funding provided to the non-profit organization EcoHealth Alliance that had resulted in an “unexpected result”: an enhanced coronavirus from bats created in partnership with the Wuhan Institute of Virology.

That NIH had funded gain-of-function research is now [beyond dispute](#), evidenced by the recent termination of funding for WIV after NIH “determined that...WIV conducted an experiment that violated the terms of the grant regarding viral activity, which possibly did lead...to...unacceptable outcomes.”

[According to](#) *Vanity Fair* reporter **Katherine Eban**, officials at EcoHealth Alliance say they informed NIH of this “unexpected result” (an enhanced coronavirus) in a progress report in 2018, but Fauci says he didn’t see the progress report prior to his congressional testimony.

All of this helps explain why Fauci was so insistent from the very beginning that COVID-19 originated naturally from a wet market, even though scientists who wrote the “Proximal Origin” paper in *Nature* in early 2020 told him it was “friggin’ likely” and “plausible” the virus emerged from the Wuhan lab.

Was the CIA aware of this potential conflict of interest when Fauci allegedly visited CIA headquarters in an attempt to “influence the Agency’s review”?

2. Why Was the Meeting Held in Secret and Who Authorized It?

Putting aside the question of conflicting interests, there is the simple question of secrecy.

One could argue Fauci visited CIA headquarters because he was director of NIAID and an infectious disease expert. The problem with this argument is that Fauci had already made many public statements on the origins of the virus, and if he was simply offering an elaboration of his points, there would be no need to hold such a meeting secretly.

Moreover, the CIA was conducting an *independent* review. That means the agency was supposed to reach its determination without outside influence.

A visit from Fauci has all the appearances of attempting to influence the outcome of the CIA’s report, which is no doubt why the visit went “without a record of entry.”

Who authorized the secret visit and why?

3. Who Requested the Meeting and Who Was Present?

The fact that Fauci's alleged visit to Langley was done surreptitiously suggests that both the CIA and Fauci understood there were troubling ethics in making such a visit when the agency was conducting an independent review of COVID-19's origins.

This raises an important question: Who requested the meeting, Fauci or the CIA?

This is not a trivial question. Mere weeks ago, a letter sent to CIA Director William Burns stated that **a senior-level CIA whistleblower claimed the agency attempted to bribe six of its analysts who concluded with a low level of confidence that COVID-19 originated in the Wuhan lab, allegedly offering six of the seven agents cash incentives to change their conclusions.**

"The whistleblower," the letter [states](#), "contends that to come to the eventual public determination of uncertainty, the other six members were given a significant monetary incentive to change their position."

If the charge is true, it means public officials attempted to bribe CIA analysts tasked with providing an official government assessment of the origins of the most deadly pandemic in a century to influence the outcome of their report.

Congress of the United States

Washington, DC 20515

September 12, 2023

The Honorable William J. Burns
Director
Central Intelligence Agency
1000 Colonial Farm Rd.
Langley, VA 22101

Dear Director Burns:

The Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Pandemic (Select Subcommittee) and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (HPSCI) (together “the Committees”) have received new and concerning whistleblower testimony regarding the Agency’s investigation into the origins of COVID-19.

A multi-decade, senior-level, current Agency officer has come forward to provide information to the Committees regarding the Agency’s analysis into the origins of COVID-19. According to the whistleblower, the Agency assigned seven officers to a COVID Discovery Team (Team). The Team consisted of multi-disciplinary and experienced officers with significant scientific expertise. According to the whistleblower, at the end of its review, six of the seven members of the Team believed the intelligence and science were sufficient to make a low confidence assessment that COVID-19 originated from a laboratory in Wuhan, China. The seventh member of the Team, who also happened to be the most senior, was the lone officer to believe COVID-19 originated through zoonosis. The whistleblower further contends that to come to the eventual public determination of uncertainty, the other six members were given a significant monetary incentive to change their position.

These allegations, from a seemingly credible source, requires the Committees to conduct further oversight of how the CIA handled its internal investigation into the origins of COVID-19. To assist the Committees with their investigations, we request the following documents and information as soon as possible, but no later than September 26, 2023.

1. All documents and communications regarding the establishment of all iterations of the COVID Discovery Team(s);
2. All documents and communications between or among the members of all iterations of the COVID Discovery Team(s) regarding the origins of COVID-19;
3. All documents and communications between or among members of all iterations of the COVID Discovery Team(s) and other employees or contractors of the Agency regarding the origins of COVID-19;

That’s a very serious charge. The public deserves answers.

‘A Massive Coverup Spanning from China to DC’?

From the beginning of the pandemic, there has been a persistent government effort to silence and marginalize those who questioned NIH’s policies and conclusions.

It began with coordinated attacks on those who challenged the government’s COVID policies, which was first revealed when the American Institute for Economic Research [published emails](#) showing NIH Director **Francis Collins** instructing subordinates (including Fauci) on the need for “a quick and devastating published take down (sic)” of the premises of [the Great Barrington Declaration](#), whose authors Collins described as “fringe epidemiologists.” (These “fringe” epidemiologists came from Stanford, Harvard, and Oxford University.)

The attacks later shifted toward those who challenged the government's assertion that COVID could only have originated naturally, a claim that was treated as dogma. Social media sites [suspended users](#) (at the behest of the government) who suggested COVID could have been man-made.

It's become apparent that "fighting misinformation" was never NIH's goal, or that of any other government agency. The goal was to fight information that conflicted with the government's narratives, [a common practice](#) of authoritarian regimes.

David Asher, the man who led the State Department's investigation into the origins of COVID-19, recently explained to *New York* magazine journalist **David Zweig** that the reason we have so little information about COVID's origins is because people in power prefer it that way.

"Our own State Department told us 'don't get near this thing, it'll blow up in your face,'" Asher [told Zweig](#). "It's a massive coverup spanning from China to DC."

The unprecedented attacks on free speech Americans have witnessed in the last three years stem directly from what Asher describes. During the pandemic, NIH was awarded \$150 million to fight "misinformation," [a block of money that has been halted](#) in the wake of NIH's blunders and First Amendment challenges.

The most important thing to understand is that the war on "misinformation" isn't an effort to spread the truth; it's an effort to conceal it.

Free speech is [truth's greatest](#) ally, which is precisely why authoritarian regimes throughout history have been so hostile to it. The famed Supreme Court Justice Louis D. Brandeis had it right when he observed, in *Whitney v. California* that "the freedom to think as you will and to speak as you think are means indispensable to the discovery and spread of political truth."

If Americans want the truth about the origins of COVID-19, they should stop supporting government-led efforts to censor speech and start pressing those in power to answer questions—starting with Dr. Fauci and the CIA.

*

Note to readers: Please click the share button above. Follow us on Instagram and Twitter and subscribe to our Telegram Channel. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

Jonathan Miltimore is the Managing Editor of *FEE.org*. His writing/reporting has been the subject of articles in *TIME* magazine, *The Wall Street Journal*, *CNN*, *Forbes*, *Fox News*, and *the Star Tribune*.

Featured image is from Children's Health Defense

The original source of this article is [American Institute for Economic Research](#)
Copyright © [Jon Miltimore](#), [American Institute for Economic Research](#), 2023

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: **[Jon Miltimore](#)**

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