


BOOK REVIEW

***The Real Anthony Fauci. Bill Gates, Big Pharma, and the Global War on Democracy and Public Health* by Robert F. Kennedy**

Reviewed by
Harald Walach

hw@chs-institute.org

Change Health Science Institute
Berlin, Germany



Skyhorse, 2021. 450 pp. \$21.90
ISBN 13-1-5107-6680-8

<https://doi.org/10.31275/20222427>

PLATINUM OPEN ACCESS



Creative Commons License 4.0
CC-BY-NC. Attribution required
No commercial use

DISCLOSURES

I have done some background research and reading on mercury toxicity (Mutter et al., 2010; Mutter et al., 2005), from thimerosal (ethylmercury, a preservative that used to be in vaccines until about 10 years ago) to amalgams. This is an area where Robert F. Kennedy has been politically quite active with his Children's Health Defence foundation. I am therefore favorably inclined to Kennedy's activities, although I am certainly not an antivaxxer. I have also done primary research on Covid-19 right from the beginning (Walach & Hockertz, 2020a, 2020b)—modeling (Klement & Walach, 2021), conducting surveys (Walach et al., 2022; Walach et al., 2021c), looking at data, blogging in Germany—conducting two highly visible and highly controversial studies (Walach et al., 2021a; Walach et al., 2021d), which have both been retracted within a week, one of them republished (Walach et al., 2021b), the other still under a new review. I was critical of the official Covid-19 narrative as soon as I discovered huge discrepancies between original data and reports in the media, as well as analyses of media-prone scientists who were ostensibly wrong; we have succeeded in publishing a critique of one such dangerously wrong analysis (Dehning et al., 2020) about 2 years after the original one was out, following two rejections and long rounds of reviewing (Kuhbandner et al., 2022). So, I have learned a lot of lessons there. I initially thought, we are dealing with a mistake. The more I saw, the more I lost that stance of innocence and thought that perhaps there was an initial accident or problem, but surely very soon some people used it to ride their own hobbyhorses. Collateral utility, as I call it. That is the reason I embarked on my own social-science study: interviews with activists in Germany and elsewhere, who wrote articles, blogged, were visible in the public. I have conducted 13 interviews so far, and the tacit and express knowledge from those interviews is of course also feeding my viewpoint.

So, I approached this book with eagerness, hoping to find some enlightenment for all the puzzles I had encountered: the hostility of peers who did not agree with my findings, for instance. I have published controversial stuff previously. But never before did I feel such vitriolic hatred, even from very good colleagues who happened to see things differently. Never before was my sincerity and honesty, even though I might be mistaken, challenged. And never before was my university position cancelled because of an inconvenient analysis that some saw as wrong, as happened to me in summer 2021. Never before was I the object of a shitstorm hashtag on Twitter.

Readers of the journal and members of the SSE will be familiar with these experiences. They happen whenever a core of a fortified mainstream narrative is challenged either by data, analytical reasoning, or both.

All these personal experiences convinced me, reluctantly, I must say, that whatever was at the base of this worldwide Corona virus crisis was much more sinister than just a grand mistake. That was the point in time when I happened to come across the title of



this book, was electrified, and bought it. It is a long time since I have been as thrilled by a book that related facts, not a novel.

It is an important book because it poses a fundamental challenge to the integrity of medical science in the United States, and indeed worldwide, and especially regarding COVID-19 science. With all of its own bias—see below—it is still a very important contribution that should be read and discussed widely.

CONTENT OVERVIEW

This is an extremely well-researched piece that tries to unravel the network of conflicts of interest that might have contributed to, or triggered, the Corona virus crisis. It is the background research for a coroner's inquest for a charge of high treason. The author is of course not so stupid as to say so, but this is what I read between and behind the lines. It incriminates Anthony Fauci, the head of the National Institutes of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NAID) with having instigated, funded, and overseen the research in the virology lab in Wuhan, which was the trigger for the pandemic, and with having covered up these origins. It also charges him with having built up an immensely dense web of researchers, who, out of comradery, but also because they depend on his funding, do his bidding. They are in such powerful positions as journal editors, reviewers on panels that judge license applications for drugs or grant proposals to steer the scientific and public opinion. Ten years ago, Bill Gates entered the picture with his foundation, making friends with Fauci and offering him collaboration for their mutual benefit, and, allegedly, that of mankind. The latter is of course the public image both of Fauci and Gates and his foundation. But in reality, so the narrative in the book goes, they are only interested in propelling their influence, power, and wealth. Fauci, by holding a job that is the best remunerated position of all public offices, including the president of the United States, and by owning wagonloads of patents (Martin, 2021) and shares in pharmaceutical companies, such as Gilead pharmaceutical or Moderna, that produce the very products Fauci and his cronies invent and patent. Gates, by investing in those companies through his personal shareholder company and his foundation, thus increasing his return on investment massively, and being part of the big international game of restructuring not only the health of the human population but also the political arena.

This is the reason why Kennedy calls this whole thing a "coup d'état." This is the most decisive word in this book, I feel. It is very cleverly placed. It shows up only on page 389 of 450 pages, when Kennedy discusses the infamous role of Robert Kadlec, a bioweapons expert for the US Army.

He was President Trump's Covid-19 crisis manager. But he had long-time connections, it seems, with various CIA activities that Kennedy describes in this last part of the book. He shows how the CIA was involved with various vaccine operations across the world, and, of course, various coup d'états:

The pervasive CIA involvement in the global vaccine putsch should give us pause . . . The CIA has been involved in at least seventy-two attempted and successful coups d'état between 1947 and 1989, involving about a third of the world's governments. . . . The CIA does not do public health. It doesn't do democracy. The CIA does coups d'états. (p. 389)

There you have it. This is the place where the vocabulary changes to a clear treason-suggestive narrative. Then follow various descriptions of exercises—biowarfare threat simulation, preparedness exercises, modeling exercises—in most of which some military and CIA input can be detected through people organizing these exercises. The book culminates in the stark statement, toward the end:

After twenty years of modeling exercises, the CIA—working with medical technocrats like Anthony Fauci and billionaire Internet tycoons—had pulled off the ultimate coup d'état: Some 250 years after America's historic revolt against entrenched oligarchy and authoritarian rule, the American experiment with self-government was over. The oligarchy was restored, and these gentlemen and their spymasters had equipped the rising technocracy with new tools of control unimaginable to King George or to any other tyrant in history. (p. 433)

This is a clear conspiracy narrative. Well, having read Talbot (2015), I can understand Kennedy. There, a conspiracy against JFK and his father Robert Kennedy, Sr., is alleged, at whose core the CIA is surmised to be. Thus, here comes the challenge to duel. Not with saber or pistol, but with words and the judiciary system. After all, Kennedy is a lawyer and knows his business. If a coroner picks this book up, he would be obliged, in my lay version of judicial understanding, to charge Fauci, and perhaps Gates, with high treason. That is, after all, what planning a coup d'état is.

Now, let's be clear: Nowhere is this allegation directly mentioned. This is my reading between and behind the lines. But the whole architecture of this book works toward this conclusion. And the words carrying the uttermost weight in the proceedings are not Kennedy's own words. Rather he lets others speak: Many of the direct passages are quotations from other people's books, papers,

interviews, as if a lawyer were letting witnesses speak.

A man of Kennedy's stature, who has made a lot of enemies already, would not survive a day without being sued for billions, if anything of what he says and alleges in this book were not either pretty well documented and proven, or the opinion of someone else who—freedom of speech—anyone can quote. And so this basic argument is craftily built up from the beginning. Everything that is factual is extremely well supported by references. If I counted correctly—the notes are at the end of the chapters—then we are talking about roughly 2,200 references. Many of them lead to newspaper and magazine publications, Youtube videos and interviews, but quite a few are also original scientific references, monographs, and journal publications.

Thus, the end makes the subtitle clear. The book is about a conspiracy narrative. At its core is Anthony Fauci. His co-conspirator is Bill Gates in Kennedy's story, who both together used, if not crafted, that SARS-CoV-2 pandemic to press through with a medical agenda, bringing those novel vaccines into the world's population, and using the resulting chaos to install a somewhat more autocratic way of handling the world, abolishing a lot of what used to be all too self-evident: liberties of movement, freedom of speech, let alone sufficient income and security, as well as a psychological sense of safety.

Is this conspiracy narrative plausible? Yes, if you accept that conspiracies are not always, but sometimes, behind what we see, and if you accept that while some details might be wrong the large picture remains untouched. Is it politically viable? We shall see. It will be viable if the larger politics follow the route laid out so far, and my guess is that this is exactly what the author wants to prevent. I myself have become a conspiracy convert, mainly through the book shedding light on my own experiences. Had I not been involved with this whole business, I might have put the book down; oh no, not another conspiracy theory. But having been activated and having found myself in the limbo between hard-to-swallow policies on the one hand, mask mandates, lockdown, restriction of freedom, and a reality that did not at all warrant those activities, I was in need of an explanation. For a long time, my explanation was a Talmudic saying: "There are two things in the universe that are infinite: God's mercy and human stupidity."

Human stupidity, when confronted with a novel challenge, together with media activists who act like headless chickens and are largely innumerate, go a long way to explain irrational reactions, unsound policy decisions, and unscientific pronouncements. But as one commentator in Germany observed: After about half a year it had become clear that none of the fear-mongering scenarios had borne out. In Germany, as was even officially pronounced in 2020, the year of the pandemic, our hospitals had fewer beds

occupied than in 2019, the intensive care units were less challenged and had fewer places filled than in 2019, and the number of respiratory diseases in hospitals were fewer than in 2019 (Frank, 2021). Never was there a shortage of ICU beds (Lausen & van Rossum, 2021). And there was no surplus mortality out of the ordinary. That might have been different in other countries. All that was obvious in the middle of 2020, and still our politicians drummed up fear of the virus and the collapse of the health system, and said: Only if we have a vaccination, will we be able to return to normal. And many thought that this behavior was in need of explanation. Would stupidity be sufficient? Are our leading politicians indeed so stupid? I thought: could be, who knows. We know that humans are very bad at judging random events as random, and they are very good in detecting patterns where there are none. Better detect one tiger too many than one too few. Your survival depended on it in olden times. So, we see "invisible hands" where there are none, and we are prone to detect mischievous plans where there is only incompetence. That, really, is the alternative explanation for the fiasco that we are in the midst of experiencing.

Kennedy now puts diverse threads together and weaves a net as dense as Fauci's net of cronies and dependents. Whoever wants to understand this should read this book. Even if one does not buy into the grand narrative of conspiracy developed here, it is a fountainhead of detailed knowledge and surprising insights. I am presenting some that were important for me.

The NIAID, the sub-branch of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Fauci runs, was a minor agency under threat of dissolution, together with the CDC in the 1950s and early 1960s. This was because infectious diseases, a major public health threat in the war years, were ever more receding. Good nutrition and sanitation were the most important drivers of this development. So NIAID director Richard M. Krause developed "The return of the microbes" strategy (p. 130). This was what Fauci took over from his boss, when Krause stumbled over a pharma scandal and vacated his seat for Fauci in 1984. Today, NAID is the single largest agency within NIH with an annual budget of 6 billion USD.

Enter HIV/AIDS in the 1980s. This is a fascinating story. Kennedy devotes some 120 pages to it, as this is the template: Via the hyping of a pandemic that never was and that was contained among subpopulations, Fauci succeeded not only to up his budget considerably, he also pulled the research—and the power—from the National Cancer Institute to his agency, together with the budget. He or some of his researchers developed some patents and the antiretrovirals took off: extremely potent, toxic, and expensive. This laid the ground for his power: a king's budget to distribute

to loyal barons, a dense network of researchers and reviewers, inroads into all kinds of political and media circles.

From then on Fauci had developed a simple strategy: When one scare vanishes, cook up a new one—bird flu, swine flu, Ebola, SARS, MERS, now SARS-CoV2—and always with a lot of noise. Each was a huge scare, with a dutiful entourage of scientists that supported his predictions, modelers that generated the scary figures, which never turned out to be true but which always provided him with an ever-growing budget and influence such that no one dared cross him for fear of personal consequences. That is the story Kennedy describes. An email dump of Fauci’s revealed by a Freedom of Information Act request and discussed in the *New York Post* on June 5, 2021, signed by Fauci himself on March 11, 2020, shows this tournament of scares graphically. The winner is: Coronavirus (Figure 1).

The final act: Due to the bioweapons convention, active research in bioweapons was largely disbanded in the US, Obama restricted research on gain-of-function of viruses, except “patriotic use,” i.e., some research on vaccines and potential threat scenarios as defensive research. And Fauci

and his cronies, Daszak, Baric, and others had to relocate their research into other countries. The newly built Wuhan lab was one of the prime funding recipients that received money from NIH, DARPA, and other agencies, often channeled through Daszak’s Eco Health Alliance, says Kennedy. And this is where the story begins:

Email material from Fauci, opened up via a Freedom of Information Act inquiry, shows that Fauci knew of the potential lab origin of the virus and had a problem, because the research was funded by him. Andersen of the Scripps Institute, who was the first to publicly call those who said otherwise conspiracy theorists (Andersen et al., 2020), alerted Fauci to a potential lab accident with Fauci’s “fingerprints on it.” An emergency phone call was arranged with all the top names in the field who later signed the infamous letter declaring the pandemic a zoonosis (Calisher et al., 2020), including Germany’s virus chieftain Christian Drosten, who alarmed the German public in weekly podcasts and frequent TV airings.

Might Fauci have made clever use of that accident? Kennedy suggests that. The vaccination platforms had




Figure 1. Scan of email-dump by Anthony Fauci published June 5, 2021, by the *New York Post* (Kennedy 2021, p. 371, reference note 142 on p. 377).

been developed many years ago, against other diseases such as HIV/AIDS, with no positive effect but with some disastrous consequences, which Kennedy details over many pages. Fauci, and Gates, had their stakes there—patents, shares in the companies, etc. Did they also actively promote this? It seems so, as they started investing in the respective companies early on, earlier than the pandemic was known. Kennedy is meticulous in his notes.

Let me give you one example: Medical doctors in the US and elsewhere had alerted the public to the benefit of early treatment of Covid-19 with antivirals, mainly cheap generic ones like hydroxychloroquine or ivermectin, together with anti-inflammatories zinc and later on aspirin for preventing clotting, if the early interventions were insufficient (McCullough et al., 2021). Altogether this proved useful and cheap, as the substances were all available; it would simply have been some off-label use, as hydroxychloroquine and ivermectin were antiparasitic medications, which, however, also are antivirally active. These cheap regimens were aborted, mainly by Fauci in cooperation with some WHO and researcher input from conflicted researchers. Why? Because Fauci had his own horse running, remdesivir, an antiviral agent that used the very same pharmacological principle as ivermectin, only it was patented and by many orders of magnitude more expensive, and much more laden with side effects. Fauci held a patent and it is produced by Gilead Pharmaceutical, a company Fauci appears to hold shares in. Kennedy cites some interesting cases where the usage of ivermectin contributed to a drastic fall in Covid-19 morbidity and mortality in India, some countries in Africa, and apparently also in China which seems to have adopted the McCullough protocol or something similar.

The turning point in the narrative is a 2010 meeting between Fauci and Gates in which Gates seems to have proposed cooperation to mutual benefit which Fauci obviously accepted. What happened next will have to await a new bestseller, I guess. But it is clear from the material presented that they teamed up in developing new patents, investing into research that benefited their mutual or individual interests. It is known that Gates has high stakes in the international vaccination campaigns. He donates via his foundation to NGOs like the international vaccination alliance GAVI, which he supports, or the WHO, where he is one of the five most important sponsors. He buys shares in the respective companies that produce the vaccines. And even though WHO and other organizations buy the vaccines at reduced costs and distribute them around the world, the profit goes back to Gates via his personal shareholder company that pockets the profits. Capitalist philanthropy: You invest one dollar via a charitable donation which multiplies by the activities you support and flows

back into your pockets tenfold or more. And it is known that Kennedy has a high stake in countering this.

So it is not surprising that Gates is the villain in that narrative, trying to kill off half the population with vaccines that are designed to make girls barren in Africa under the guise of philanthropy, gruesome but well-documented, and supporting another one of his pet projects, reducing net-carbon output to zero (Gates, 2021). A chapter is devoted to the eugenic leanings of the Gates family and the Rockefeller Foundation associated with the Gates. A series of chapters is devoted to some very dubious experiments in Africa to test useless HIV-vaccines with much collateral damage. Kennedy evokes his uncle Ted Kennedy, who as a U.S. Senator made the Tuskegee experiments on prison inmates public and stopped them, where syphilis was inflicted and went untreated to study its natural course (Rockwell et al., 1964). He puts some of the Fauci–Gates vaccination experiments on the same line. I am not knowledgeable enough to judge whether that is correct. But the documentation seems to support the claim. And on and on it goes. Its 450 densely printed pages are the story of a monstrous, heinous greed and preposterous arrogance of being the world's savior. If only 10% of what Kennedy says is true, it would be bad enough. And from what I know, I have discovered very few, quite minor mistakes.

PROS, CONS, AND CONTRIBUTION TO THE LITERATURE

There are weaknesses: The book meanders sometimes; some chapters are less well-written, possibly due to some assistants taking over. There are detours, like attacks on all kinds of vaccinations, reentries, and redundant information. Some references would have benefitted from going to the sources instead of giving secondary references. But overall it is diligently done and captivating writing. No measured academic pros and cons, but with careful crafting of words. It is a book on the way to the bestseller shelves. But there are not many books on those shelves that are its equal. The book marks a new era—the era where revolutions do not happen by force, but by nudging, media presence, and brainwashing. Or should we say brain mask mandates?

There is an old saying: The opposite of good is not bad, but well-intended. Now, this is what we see here: apparently well-intended, and perhaps even believed to be, acts of philanthropy, and sometimes greed and power-mongering badly clothed as philanthropy. Even if Kennedy is wrong, this dense network of grant recipients of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation—some 30.000 or so institutions worldwide—is of course a network of people grateful, dependent, and likely eager to return a favor. Whoever

is a recipient of a grant will be nobly inclined toward the benefactor and turn a blind eye to a benefactor's shrewd actions. Our German weekly *Der Spiegel*, once a critical magazine, has received grants by the Gates foundation and since has lost most of its teeth regarding medicine and vaccination. That's just one example.

So, the consequence of Kennedy's analysis, even if his conspiracy theory turns out to be wrong, is lucid: If we allow big money to buy its influence everywhere and to promulgate the opinions and standpoints of those who own and distribute it, then we are actually already living in a plutocracy, in a regime of the rich, that also happens to turn out a sani-fascism, a fascism preoccupied with health and sanitation. It forgets a fundamental truth: We have by one order of magnitude more bacteria and viruses in and on us than we have cells, 1 kg of mass, and without them we would be unable to live. And it also shows that those who have the money and the power do not always have the knowledge and the wisdom needed to guide the world to a place of greater freedom and comfort.

REFERENCES

- Andersen, K. G., Rambaut, A., Lipkin, W. I., Holmes, E. C., & Garry, R. F. (2020). The proximal origin of SARS-CoV-2. *Nature Medicine*, 26(4), 450–452. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0820-9>
- Calisher, C., Carroll, D., Colwell, R., Corley, R. B., Daszak, P., Drosten, C., Enjuanes, L., Farrar, J., Field, H., Golding, J., Gorbalenya, A., Haagmans, B., Hughes, J. M., Karesh, W. B., Keusch, G. T., Lam, S. K., Lubroth, J., Mackenzie, J. S., Madoff, L., Mazet, J., Palese, P., Perlman, S., Poon, L., Roizman, B., Saif, L., Subbarao, K., & Turner, M. (2020). Statement in support of the scientists, public health professionals, and medical professionals of China combatting COVID-19. *The Lancet*, 395(10226), e42–e43. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30418-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30418-9)
- Dehning, J., Zierenberg, J., Spitzner, F. P., Wibral, M., Neto, J. P., Wilczek, M., & Priesemann, V. (2020). Inferring change points in the spread of COVID-19 reveals the effectiveness of interventions. *Science*, 369(6500), eabb9789. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abb9789>
- Frank, G. (2021). *Der Staatsvirus. Ein Arzt erklärt, wie die Verunft im Lockdown starb*. Achgut.
- Gates, B. (2021). *How to avoid a climate disaster. The solutions we have and the breakthroughs we need*. Allen Lane.
- Klement, R. J., & Walach, H. (2021). Low Vitamin D status and influenza vaccination rates are positive predictors of early Covid-19 related deaths in Europe—A modeling approach. *Zenodo*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4680691>
- Kuhbandner, C., Homburg, S., Walach, H., & Hockertz, S. (2022). Was Germany's lockdown in Spring 2020 necessary? How bad data quality can turn a simulation into a dissimulation that shapes the future. *Futures*, 135, 102879. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2021.102879>
- Lausen, T., & van Rossum, W. (2021). *Die Intensivmafia: Von den Hirten der Pandemie und ihren Profiten*. Rubikon.
- Martin, D. E. (2021). *The Fauci/Covid-19 Dossier*. <https://hubspotusercontent10.net/hubfs/8079569/The%20FauciCOVID-19%20Dossier.pdf>
- McCullough, P. A., Kelly, R. J., Ruocco, G., Lerma, E., Tumlin, J., Wheelan, K. R., Katz, N., Lepor, N. E., Vijay, K., Carter, H., Singh, B., McCullough, S. P., Bhambi, B. K., Palazzuoli, A., De Ferrari, G. M., Milligan, G. P., Safder, T., Tecson, K. M., Wang, D. D., McKinnon, J. E., O'Neill, W. W., Zervos, M., & Risch, H. A. (2021). Pathophysiological basis and rationale for early outpatient treatment of SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) infection. *The American Journal of Medicine*, 134(1), 16–22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjmed.2020.07.003>
- Mutter, J., Naumann, J., Schneider, R., Walach, H., & Haley, B. E. (2005). Mercury and autism: Accelerating evidence? *Neuroendocrinology Letters*, 26, 431–437.
- Mutter, J., Curth, A., Naumann, J., Deth, R., & Walach, H. (2010). Does inorganic mercury play a role in Alzheimer's disease? A systematic review and an integrated molecular mechanism. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease*, 22, 357–374. https://doi.org/DOI_10.3233/JAD-2010-100705
- Rockwell, D. H., Yobs, A. R., & Moore, M. B. (1964). The Tuskagee study of untreated syphilis: The 30th year. *Archives of Internal Medicine*, 114, 792–798.
- Talbot, D. (2015). *The devil's chessboard: Allen Dulles, the CIA, and the rise of America's secret government*. Collins.
- Walach, H., & Hockertz, S. (2020a). A reply to Dr. Pan's and Dr. Wu's response: Wuhan COVID-19 data—An example to show the importance of public health interventions to fight against the pandemic. *Toxicology*, 441, 152524. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tox.2020.152524>
- Walach, H., & Hockertz, S. (2020b). Wuhan Covid19 data—More questions than answers. *Toxicology*, 440, 152486. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tox.2020.152486>
- Walach, H., Klement, R. J., & Aukema, W. (2021a). The safety of COVID-19 vaccinations—Should we rethink the policy? *Science, Public Health Policy, and the Law*, 3, 87–99.
- Walach, H., Klement, R. J., & Aukema, W. (2021b). Retracted: The safety of COVID-19 vaccinations—We should rethink the policy. *Vaccines*, 9(7), 693. <https://doi.org/10.3390/vaccines9070693>
- Walach, H., Ruof, V., & Hellweg, R. (2021c). German



- immunologists' opinion on SARS-CoV2—Results of an online survey. *Cureus*, e19393. <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.19393>
- Walach, H., Weikl, R., Prentice, J., Diemer, A., Traindl, H., Kappes, A., & Hockertz, S. (2021d). Retracted: Experimental assessment of carbon dioxide content in inhaled air with or without face masks in healthy children: A randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Pediatrics*. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2021.2659>
- Walach, H., Ofner, M., Ruof, V., Herbig, M., & Klement, R. J. (2022). Why do people consent to receiving SARS-CoV2 vaccinations? A representative survey in Germany. *Research Square*. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-1216502/v1>