



Gregg Dieguez <gadieguez@gmail.com>

Re: the lies of Peter McCullough (was: chasing down the lies)

Bruce Laird <laird2007@hotmail.com>

Wed, Oct 6, 2021 at 2:53 PM

To: Gregg Dieguez <gadieguez@gmail.com>, Mary Chitty <mgchitty@gmail.com>, Bruce Laird <laird2007@hotmail.com>

Gregg,

In this video from May 2021, Peter McCullough gives a talk with a slide deck having a title similar to the title of the paper you are trying to debunk. See: "Pathophysiologic Basis and Clinical Rationale for Early Ambulatory Treatment of COVID-19." Published online 18 May 2021.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DU02mdnoNws>

On the title slide, he identifies himself as "Professor of Medicine, Texas A&M College of Medicine." This is a lie and a legal No-No (see below). In the talk he defends the use of HCQ and ivermectin. Starting at 5:47 in the video, he claims that 11 studies (listed on a slide) show positive results from ivermectin treatment. He also specifically mentions and dismisses the study published in JAMA, where the results for ivermectin showed no benefit. He claims that the JAMA study "is considered invalid, and there's been, I think, over 100 letters to the editor asking for that paper to be retracted."

You can spend a lot of time trying to figure out how good the studies are, that McCullough cites as evidence for positive benefit from treatment of COVID with ivermectin. But here is all you really need to know: McCullough has been disavowed at Baylor. He has not been affiliated there since at least Feb 2021. He is widely seen as a pariah in the legitimate medical community, as illustrated by Baylor's lawsuit (see below). Unfortunately, he has appeared with regularity on Fox News programs; and his videos are often cited by far-right media as scientific evidence against vaccination, or for the use of off-label COVID treatments like HCQ and ivermectin.

Baylor reached a separation agreement with McCullough in Feb 2021. They then had to file a defamation lawsuit against him in July, on the grounds that his wild assertions - about how the SARS-2 vaccines harm tens of thousands of people, and about using HCQ and ivermectin for off label treatment if COVID - were damaging Baylor's reputation.

Terms of the Feb separation agreement with Baylor included that he was to stop referring to himself as affiliated in any way with Baylor, which he has clearly violated many times (e.g., title slide in his May 2021 video). See: Kevin Krause, "Baylor health sues COVID-19 vaccine skeptic and demands Dallas doctor stop using its name." Dallas Morning News, 29 Jul 2021.

<https://www.dallasnews.com/news/courts/2021/08/13/baylor-health-sues-covid-19-vaccine-skeptic-and-demands-dallas-doctor-stop-using-its-name/>

From the article:

Contrary to medical consensus, the Dallas physician has stated that people under age 50 with no health risks do not need the COVID-19 vaccine, according to court records. And he said this month on a Fox News show hosted by Laura Ingraham that the vaccines don't protect against the delta variant and there's "no clinical reason to go get vaccinated."

Baylor sued McCullough on Wednesday in Dallas County district court, alleging he continues to use his former Baylor titles, including vice chief of internal medicine at Baylor University Medical Center, in violation of a February separation agreement. McCullough, 58, and Baylor negotiated the confidential agreement in which the doctor agreed to no longer state that he is employed by or affiliated with Baylor or any of its related entities, according to the lawsuit.

Baylor says in its lawsuit that the doctor has breached that “key” term of the Feb. 24 [2021] agreement “dozens if not hundreds of times since then” in media interviews, online biographies and elsewhere. Most of McCullough’s media interviews in question relate to his opinions about the COVID-19 vaccines, the lawsuit states.

Baylor says in the lawsuit that its medical experts have carefully studied available data and recommend that everyone who is eligible for the vaccines receive them in accordance with Centers for Disease Control and Prevention guidelines.

The lawsuit includes screen grabs of tweets attributing to McCullough the false claim that COVID-19 vaccines have killed up to 50,000 Americans. The physician also has been criticized for some of his other views on COVID-19 treatments.

Several doctors with the Texas chapter of nonprofit Doctors for America said in a letter published in December in The Dallas Morning News that McCullough gave “baseless, misleading commentary” promoting the use of hydroxychloroquine as “an early outpatient treatment for patients with COVID-19.” Studies have shown that use of the drug has been linked to “higher rates of harm,” the doctors wrote.

I think it’s a sad commentary on America, that we live in a country where a charlatan like McCullough is only being sued for defamation, and not for causing the deaths of hundreds (thousands?) of people who believed his BS about staying unvaxed, or administering ivermectin when they got infected.

Sometimes it's easier to research and debunk the author of the lies, than to debunk the lies themselves. . .

BGL

From: Gregg Dieguez <gadieguez@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 6, 2021 10:27 AM
To: Mary Chitty <mgchitty@gmail.com>; Bruce Laird <laird2007@hotmail.com>
Subject: chasing down the lies

It's a part-time passion I'm having these days, chasing the lies and misinformation. I'm going to be writing about Ivermectin tomorrow, but this article by McCullough was the key research cited by OAN re HCQ - and OAN is going to need discrediting later - and it was largely based on this article:

[Pathophysiological Basis and Rationale for Early Outpatient Treatment of SARS-CoV-2 \(COVID-19\) Infection](#)

^ is that Journal any good? What was said about this article after further review? That article cited two serious articles to support its claims re anti-malarials. The JAMA article cited DID NOT support McCullough's claims. This one DID:

Int Jnl Infect Disease: [https://www.ijidonline.com/article/S1201-9712\(20\)30534-8/fulltext](https://www.ijidonline.com/article/S1201-9712(20)30534-8/fulltext)

Treatment with hydroxychloroquine, azithromycin, and combination in patients hospitalized with COVID-19

not a Trial: Prospective trials are needed to examine this impact. >> It was an observational study with regression implying benefit.

So, after the fact a year plus, do we know anything about those findings being discredited or revised?

--

Gregg A. Dieguez

Midcoast Community Council Member

Founder: MIT Club of Northern Calif. Energy & Environment Program

[Recent Articles](#)

P.O. Box 370404

Montara, CA 94037

650-544-0714