FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Orthomolecular Medicine News Service, Feb 23, 2026

The Vitamin D Question

How Anthony Fauci's Policy Framework Marginalized Nutritional Prevention

by Richard Z. Cheng, MD, PhD
Editor-in-Chief, Orthomolecular Medicine News Service (OMNS)

"Fauci intentionally suppressed vitamin D," physician-scientist Dr. Robert W. Malone wrote in a 2022 Substack commentary.

Malone's statement is his allegation. It reflects his interpretation of federal policy priorities and his understanding of how nutritional prevention was handled within national strategy.

His claim is serious. It is provocative. And it forces an unavoidable question:

Did U.S. infectious disease policy structurally marginalize nutritional prevention in favor of pharmaceutical countermeasures?

That question deserves examination - not dismissal.

Vitamin D is used here as a clear example, but the broader issue is host-resilience medicine: a multi-micronutrient terrain approach that includes vitamin C, zinc, selenium, and other determinants of immune competence. The policy question is why host-directed nutritional optimization was not treated as strategically urgent during COVID-19.

The Structural Question

There is no publicly released documentary evidence showing that Dr. Fauci personally ordered marginalization of vitamin D research. The question here is therefore structural: what did funding and guidance frameworks prioritize?

That distinction matters.

But institutional priorities are not defined only by written prohibitions.

They are revealed by:

- What receives funding
- What receives public emphasis
- What is accelerated
- What is framed as "insufficient evidence"

For more than four decades, U.S. infectious disease policy - particularly within NIAID's strategic framework during Dr. Fauci's tenure - prioritized pharmaceutical countermeasures: vaccines, antivirals, and pathogen-targeted therapeutics.

Notably, Dr. Fauci publicly stated in 2020 that he takes vitamin D (and vitamin C) himself and that deficiency may affect susceptibility to infection-yet these views were not operationalized into a comparable national micronutrient optimization strategy.

Host-directed nutritional immune optimization, including vitamin D sufficiency, was not elevated to comparable strategic prominence in federal guidance or funding initiatives.

This is not an allegation of conspiracy.

It is a critique of framework.

The Evidence on Vitamin D Was Established Early

By the mid-2000s, peer-reviewed literature had already linked vitamin D status to respiratory infection susceptibility [1, 2]:

Mechanistic research subsequently clarified that vitamin D:

- Induces antimicrobial peptides such as cathelicidin and defensins [3]
- Modulates inflammatory cytokine responses [4]
- Supports epithelial barrier integrity [4]

During COVID-19, multiple observational analyses and clinical studies strengthened the association between vitamin D status and respiratory outcomes [5, 6]. A highly cited early synthesis also argued that vitamin D supplementation could reduce risk of influenza and COVID-19 infections and deaths [7].

The issue was not lack of biological plausibility, but the evidentiary framework adopted for federal guideline recommendations.

The NIH Guideline Position

Throughout much of the pandemic, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) COVID-19 Treatment Guidelines stated:

"There is insufficient evidence to recommend either for or against the use of vitamin D for the prevention or treatment of COVID-19."

That archived guidance page was later removed when the NIH reorganized its COVID-19 guideline website, limiting direct public access to prior official language.

The evidentiary standard applied to micronutrient interventions remained conservative.

At the same time, novel pharmaceutical platforms were advanced under emergency authorization frameworks.

This asymmetry in application of evidentiary thresholds is part of the structural debate.

Funding Patterns and Strategic Emphasis

Public NIH funding records demonstrate extensive investment in:

- Vaccine platform development
- Antiviral pharmaceuticals
- Pathogen-specific countermeasures

There was no comparable national mobilization to raise population vitamin D sufficiency during COVID-19.

No coordinated federal initiative to optimize baseline micronutrient status.

Institutional marginalization does not require explicit prohibition. It can occur through:

- Persistent underfunding
- Higher evidentiary thresholds for low-cost preventive measures
- Limited public communication regarding nutritional optimization

Publicly available funding data indicate substantial asymmetry in research emphasis.

The Paradigm Conflict

Respiratory RNA viruses such as influenza and SARS-CoV-2 exploit host vulnerability:

- Micronutrient deficiency
- Impaired epithelial barrier integrity
- Oxidative stress
- Dysregulated inflammatory signaling

Vitamin D status influences each of these domains.

Yet federal strategy remained predominantly focused on pathogen suppression rather than host optimization.

Dr. Malone's allegation resonates because it highlights a deeper paradigm divide:

Pathogen-centered medicine versus host-resilience medicine.

This is the core issue.

Institutional Marginalization vs. Individual Intent

Public commentary has alleged that vitamin D research was intentionally marginalized during the tenure of Dr. Anthony Fauci at NIAID.

No internal memoranda or written directives establishing such intent have been produced publicly.

That distinction is important.

But institutional behavior is not defined solely by explicit prohibition. It is revealed through prioritization.

The relevant questions are therefore structural:

1. Was there documented personal intent to suppress vitamin D research?
   No direct documentary proof has been presented publicly.
2. Did federal funding structures and guideline frameworks marginalize nutritional prevention?
   Public funding allocations and official guideline language suggest this question warrants

serious scrutiny.

During Fauci's tenure, NIAID funding and strategic emphasis heavily prioritized:

- Vaccine platform development
- Antiviral pharmaceuticals
- Pathogen-targeted countermeasures

Large-scale federally funded prophylactic micronutrient trials were comparatively rare.

Institutional marginalization does not require a written ban. It can manifest as:

- Persistent underfunding
- Higher evidentiary thresholds for low-cost preventive measures
- Selective guideline framing
- Failure to issue precautionary public health recommendations for low-risk interventions

Public reporting has examined royalty payments associated with NIH intellectual property related to COVID-19 vaccines.

For example, Moderna disclosed a $400 million royalty payment to NIAID in 2022 as part of patent settlement agreements. NIH has publicly acknowledged that some agency scientists receive royalty income tied to intellectual property developed within the agency [8-10].

The amounts distributed to individual scientists have not been fully disclosed publicly.

While royalty arrangements are permitted under federal law and do not in themselves establish misconduct, questions about transparency have contributed to public concern regarding institutional incentives.

While individual intent remains unproven, the structural marginalization of host-directed nutritional prevention during respiratory outbreaks is observable.

This was not a 'one-person' phenomenon; it reflects a broader institutional ecosystem of guideline committees, academic leadership, journal gatekeeping norms, and funding priorities.

The Cost of Omission

Vitamin D deficiency is widespread:

- In northern latitudes
- During winter months
- Among elderly populations

Even modest reductions in respiratory mortality through population-level vitamin D optimization could have translated into substantial public health impact.

Yet during COVID-19:

- There was no coordinated national campaign to raise serum 25(OH)D levels.
- No emergency advisory to optimize baseline vitamin D status.
- No federal mobilization to address widespread micronutrient insufficiency.

In a pandemic defined by urgency, vitamin D never became a strategic priority.

That omission is the policy question that deserves careful evaluation.

Beyond Vitamin D

Other micronutrients with immune relevance include:

- Vitamin C [11]
- Zinc [12]
- Selenium [13]

Each plays documented roles in antiviral defense and immune regulation.

These measures were not elevated to national strategic priority during respiratory crises.

Accountability and Reflection

Anthony Fauci's influence on U.S. infectious disease policy was substantial.

Vaccines and antivirals were aggressively advanced.

The structural question is not whether pharmaceutical countermeasures were developed.

The structural question is:

Why was host nutritional resilience not treated as equally urgent?

Why were low-risk, biologically plausible interventions consistently framed as "insufficient evidence," while novel pharmaceutical technologies were accelerated under emergency frameworks?

These are legitimate policy questions.

They deserve transparent evaluation.

The Orthomolecular Perspective

Orthomolecular medicine asserts a foundational principle:

Optimize the biochemical environment of the host.

Vitamin D sufficiency is not alternative medicine.

It is human physiology.

Future infectious disease strategy must incorporate both arms:

Suppress the pathogen.

Strengthen the host.

Anything less is incomplete medicine.

References:

1. Cannell, J.J.; Vieth, R.; Umhau, J.C.; et al. Epidemic Influenza and Vitamin D. Epidemiol Infect 2006, 134, (6), 1129-1140. DOI: 10.1017/S0950268806007175.

2. Grant, W.B.; Garland, C.F. The Role of Vitamin D3 in Preventing Infections. Age Ageing 2008, 37, (1), 121-122. DOI: 10.1093/ageing/afm182.

3. Gombart, A.F.; Pierre, A.; Maggini, S. A Review of Micronutrients and the Immune System-Working in Harmony to Reduce the Risk of Infection. Nutrients 2020, 12, (1), 236. DOI: 10.3390/nu12010236.

4. Aranow, C. Vitamin D and the Immune System. J Investig Med 2011, 59, (6), 881-886. DOI: 10.2310/JIM.0b013e31821b8755.

5. Brenner, H.; Holleczek, B.; Schöttker, B. Vitamin D Insufficiency and Deficiency and Mortality from Respiratory Diseases in a Cohort of Older Adults: Potential for Limiting the Death Toll during and beyond the COVID-19 Pandemic? Nutrients 2020, 12, (8), 2488. DOI: 10.3390/nu12082488.

6. Villasis-Keever, M.A.; López-Alarcón, M.G.; Miranda-Novales, G.; et al. Efficacy and Safety of Vitamin D Supplementation to Prevent COVID-19 in Frontline Healthcare Workers. A Randomized Clinical Trial. Arch Med Res 2022, 53, (4), 423-430. DOI: 10.1016/j.arcmed.2022.04.003.

7. Grant, W.B.; Lahore, H.; McDonnell, S.L.; et al. Evidence That Vitamin D Supplementation Could Reduce Risk of Influenza and COVID-19 Infections and Deaths. Nutrients 2020, 12, (4), 988. DOI: 10.3390/nu12040988.

8. Accusers' Bad Math: NIH Researchers Didn't Pocket $710 Million in Royalties during Pandemic. Available online: https://www.science.org/content/article/bad-math-nih-researchers-didn-t-pocket-710-million-royalties-during-pandemic (accessed 17 February 2026).

9. NIH, O. of F.M. Royalties. Available online: https://ofm.od.nih.gov/Pages/Royalties.aspx (accessed 17 February 2026).

10. Moderna, Inc. Moderna Reports Fourth Quarter and Fiscal Year 2022 Financial Results. Press Release, February 2023. Available online: https://feeds.issuerdirect.com/news-release.html?newsid=4505017405420608&symbol=MRNA (accessed 17 February 2026).

11. Hemilä, H. Vitamin C and Infections. Nutrients 2017, 9, (4), 339. DOI: 10.3390/nu9040339.

12. Read, S.A.; Obeid, S.; Ahlenstiel, C.; et al. The Role of Zinc in Antiviral Immunity. Adv Nutr 2019, 10, (4), 696-710. DOI: 10.1093/advances/nmz013.

13. Beck, M.A.; Nelson, H.K.; Shi, Q.; et al. Selenium Deficiency Increases the Pathology of an Influenza Virus Infection. FASEB J 2001, 15, (8), 1481-1483.