

**STATEMENT BY:****Adam Andrzejewski, CEO & Founder****United States Homeland Security & Governmental Affairs Committee****June 14, 2024**

During the pandemic, the American people started to feel that Big Pharma was very close to Big Government. Thanks to our two federal lawsuits demanding transparency, we [know more details and they do not inspire confidence.](#)

In 2022 and 2023, pharmaceutical and healthcare companies paid the National Institutes of Health a sum of \$710,381,160 in third party royalties.

These were payments to NIH, its leadership and scientists by healthcare entities licensing inventions created in federal, taxpayer-paid labs. The two-year average of such payments over the prior decade was less than \$5 million, for an increase of more than 175 times.

Fauci's institute, The National Institute of Allergies and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) received \$690,218,610 of the \$710 million, or 97%. In the same period, the other 26 institutes under the NIH received some \$26 million in total.

It was an extreme cash haul at Fauci's institute: Between 2009-2021, OpenTheBooks.com, the organization I founded and lead, [previously reported that \\$325 million](#) was paid to all NIH institutes. Fauci's NIAID received \$23.9 million of that – or an average of \$2 million per year.

NIH and NAID wasted countless taxpayer dollars illegally resisting the requirement to tell taxpayers what was happening with their tax dollars. That's because in the next two years – 2022 and 2023– Fauci's institute collected the equivalent of 175 years in NIAID royalty payments. Nearly \$690 million in just two years vs. \$23.9 million over 12 years.

We had to sue NIH twice in federal court over their royalty payment database with Judicial Watch, our legal partner, as counsel. It's been a two-and-a-half-year battle to open the NIH books.

[Download the NIH third party royalty production FY 2022 & FY2023 from our website at OpenTheBooks.com.](#)

[Download all NIH third party royalty production FY2010 through FY2021 from our website at OpenTheBooks.com.](#)

When you follow the money, our findings call into question every decision made by Dr. Anthony Fauci and other NIH leaders during the pandemic.

However, because of agency redactions, we still don't know how much individual scientists are receiving in royalties from the companies licensing their patents. And because NIH still hasn't updated their active license database since 2020, we don't know which licenses are related to COVID-19 inventions.

Even if scientists were not collecting patent royalties, there are plenty of reasons to suspect that pandemic policies were influenced by factors beyond pure public interest.

Scientists and agency decisionmakers are of course interested in advancing their own reputations by steering billions of dollars toward their own research areas. The royalties may just have been the icing on the cake.

The NIH began creating a vaccine with Moderna in January 2020, months before the release of the Proximal Origin paper. In [February](#), Moderna delivered the first vaccines for human testing, and by [March 16](#), the vaccine had started clinical trials.



While Dr. Anthony Fauci appears to have amnesia about his stance on the origins of COVID, he is on record backing up the Proximal Origin paper, [stating](#) in an April press briefing that it convincingly showed the virus jumped from animals to humans.

Fauci has lied before about COVID. Perhaps most famously, he admitted he lied to the public about mask efficacy in order to preserve the limited supply for hospital staff. Later, of course, he fully supported mask mandates for everyone despite now admitting “no science” backed up the mandate.

Is the narrative about the origin of COVID another purposeful deception by “experts” who don’t want the public to know what they really think?

Perhaps they wanted to cover up the federal involvement in gain-of-function research in Wuhan. Perhaps they believed the public would be less likely to take a vaccine for a man-made virus. Or perhaps they did not want to threaten their relationship with patent licensees based in China.

Because our lawsuit forced NIH disclosures, we now know that before the pandemic, there were at least 28 major Chinese companies licensing NIH technologies including:

Wuhan Institute of Biological Products Co Ltd (64 payments) - This company is a [subsidiary](#) of the state-owned pharmaceutical company Sinopharm. In 2016, the company moved next to the Wuhan Institute of Virology to [collaborate](#) with them.

Yisheng Biopharma Holding Ltd (42 payments) - First based in Beijing, and then Hong Kong, and now has a [U.S. subsidiary in Gaithersburg](#), Maryland [and works with the U.S. Army](#) on infectious disease research like Ebola.

WalVax BioTech (35 payments) - The company is [engaged](#) in research and development, manufacturing and distribution of, they claim, “safe and efficacious quality vaccines” in China with major investments from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.

Guangzhou HeAn Biological (24 payments) - In 2017, the company made the FDA’s “top grossing license agreements” on their [list](#) of “technology transfer success stories.”

Other Chinese companies licensing NIH technologies developed with taxpayer funds and paying royalties identified (by no means exhaustive) include:

Wuhan Inst of Biological Products; WuXiAppTec, Inc.; Chengdu; Changchun Hongda Bio. Pharm. Co., Ltd.; Ping An Technology (Shenzen) Company LTD; Sinotau Pharmaceutical Group; Beijing Kinghawk Pharma; Beijing Zhongyuan Ltd; Sinovac; Beijing Luzhu Biopharm Co., Ltd.; Shanghai ChemPartner Co., Ltd.; Beijing Cell-fusion Biotechnology Co.; Shandong Yidu Biotechnology Co., Ltd.; Xinkexian (Beijing) Biological; Pharmaron Beijing Co., LTD; International Medica Foundation; Dalian Hissen Bio-Pharm; Shanghai Institute of Biological PR; Anhuilongcom Biologic Pharmacy Co LTD; HJB (Hangzhou) Co., Ltd.; China Novartis; Chengdu Boavax Company; and Ningbo Rongan Biological.

None of these relationships were disclosed by NIH until our reporting in 2023 and 2024 after production in our federal lawsuit vs. NIH.

Did these relationships influence the NIH response on the origin of Covid? To fully understand the relationships, we need NIH to un-redact the payment amount it the individual scientist because we still can’t follow the money, i.e. how much did each company pay and how much did each individual scientist receive?

Another crisis is inevitable. Americans should have faith that our policymakers are working in our best interest. The magnitude of the COVID response demands full transparency if we are to rebuild the broken trust in our government.

**ADAM ANDRZEJEWSKI**

CEO/Founder