

The Delusion Called Fauci

The delusion called Fauci

by [Jon Rappoport](#), [No More Fake News](#)

May 28, 2020

This one was too good to pass up.

[In an interview with the National Geographic](#), Tony Fauci made comments about “alternative views” of the origin of the coronavirus. But he was really talking about all unorthodox medical information:

“Anybody can claim to be an expert even when they have no idea what they’re talking about—and it’s very difficult for the general public to distinguish. So, make sure the study is coming from a reputable organization that generally gives you the truth—though even with some reputable organizations, you occasionally get an outlier who’s out there talking nonsense. If something is published in places like New England Journal of Medicine, Science, Nature, Cell, or JAMA—you know, generally that is quite well peer-reviewed because the editors and the editorial staff of those journals really take things very seriously.”

Right you are, Tony.

So, Tony, here is a very serious statement from a former editor of one of those “places,” the New England Journal of Medicine:

“It is simply no longer possible to believe much of the clinical research that is published, or to rely on the judgment of trusted physicians or authoritative medical guidelines. I take no pleasure in this conclusion, which I

reached slowly and reluctantly over my two decades as an editor of The New England Journal of Medicine.” (Dr. Marcia Angell, NY Review of Books, January 15, 2009, “Drug Companies & Doctors: A Story of Corruption)

And here is another one, from the editor-in-chief of the prestigious journal, The Lancet, founded in 1823:

“The case against science is straightforward: much of the scientific literature, perhaps half, may simply be untrue. Afflicted by studies with small sample sizes, tiny effects, invalid exploratory analyses, and flagrant conflicts of interest, together with an obsession for pursuing fashionable trends of dubious importance, science has taken a turn towards darkness...”

“The apparent endemicity of bad research behaviour is alarming. In their quest for telling a compelling story, scientists too often sculpt data to fit their preferred theory of the world. Or they retrofit hypotheses to fit their data. Journal editors deserve their fair share of criticism too. We aid and abet the worst behaviours. Our acquiescence to the impact factor fuels an unhealthy competition to win a place in a select few journals. Our love of ‘significance’ pollutes the literature with many a statistical fairy-tale...Journals are not the only miscreants. Universities are in a perpetual struggle for money and talent...” (Dr. Richard Horton, editor-in-chief, The Lancet, in The Lancet, 11 April, 2015, Vol 385, “Offline: What is medicine’s 5 sigma?”)

Why stop there? Let’s consult a late public-health expert whose shoes Fauci would have been lucky to shine: Dr. Barbara Starfield, Johns Hopkins School of Public Health.

On July 26, 2000, the US medical community received a titanic shock, when Starfield revealed her findings on healthcare in America.

The Starfield review, *“Is US health really the best in the*

world?”, published in the Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA), came to the following conclusion, among others:

Every year in the US, correctly prescribed, FDA approved medical drugs kill 106,000 people. Thus, every decade, these drugs kill more than a MILLION people.

On the heels of Starfield’s astonishing findings, media reporting was perfunctory, and it soon dwindled. No major newspaper or television network mounted an ongoing “Medicalgate” investigation. Neither the US Department of Justice nor federal health agencies undertook prolonged remedial action.

All in all, those parties who could have made effective steps to correct this ongoing tragedy preferred to ignore it.

On December 6-7, 2009, I interviewed Dr. Starfield by email. Here is an excerpt from that interview.

Q: What has been the level and tenor of the response to your findings, since 2000?

A: The American public appears to have been hoodwinked into believing that more interventions lead to better health, and most people that I meet are completely unaware that the US does not have the ‘best health in the world’.

Q: In the medical research community, have your medically-caused mortality statistics been debated, or have these figures been accepted, albeit with some degree of shame?

A: The findings have been accepted by those who study them. There has been only one detractor, a former medical school dean, who has received a lot of attention for claiming that the US health system is the best there is and we need more of it. He has a vested interest in medical schools and teaching hospitals (they are his constituency).

Q: Have health agencies of the federal government consulted with you on ways to mitigate the [devastating] effects of the US medical system?

A: NO.

Q: Are you aware of any systematic efforts, since your 2000 JAMA study was published, to remedy the main categories of medically caused deaths in the US?

A: No systematic efforts; however, there have been a lot of studies. Most of them indicate higher rates [of death] than I calculated.

Q: Did your 2000 JAMA study sail through peer review, or was there some opposition to publishing it?

A: It was rejected by the first journal that I sent it to, on the grounds that 'it would not be interesting to readers'!

—end of interview excerpt—

Physicians are trained to pay exclusive homage to peer-reviewed published drug studies. These doctors unflinchingly ignore the fact that, if medical drugs are killing a million Americans per decade, the heraldic published studies on which those drugs are based must be fraudulent. In other words, the medical literature is completely unreliable, and impenetrable.

WHICH IS EXACTLY WHAT THE TWO ESTEEMED MEDICAL EDITORS I QUOTED ABOVE—MARCIA ANGELL AND RICHARD HORTON—ARE SAYING.

If you know a doctor who enjoys sitting up on his high horse dispensing the final word on modern medicine, you might give him the quotes from Dr. Angell and Dr. Horton, instruct him to read them, and suggest he get in touch with Angell and Horton, in order to discover what has happened to his profession.

As in: DISASTER.

But please, continue to believe everything Fauci is saying. He must be right about the “pandemic.” After all, he has a very important position, and he’s on television.

So what if his policies have torpedoed the economy and devastated and destroyed lives across the country?

So what if he accepted, without more than a glance, [that fraud Neil Ferguson’s](#) computer projection of 500,000 deaths in the UK and two million in the US? In 2005, Ferguson said 200 million people could die from bird flu. The final official tally was a few hundred.

So what?

Fauci has an important position, and he’s on television.

And that’s the definition of science, right?