Essay Grading ...

(under construction) When grading Daszak's Guardian essay, it's important to remember that our Celebrity Scientist author is:

- advertised (self & Org-wise) as a W*orld-Leading-Expert* - the *best-of-the-best* science intellects - selected in the original Top Ten origin-hunters - *on-the-planet*
- backed personally by *millions-of-dollars* in (taxpayer) funding - the visible *cream-off-the-top* of what your *Non-Profit Org*, the ironically-named *EcoHealth Alliance* raked-in (95% US tax-payer funded, tyvm Tony)
- backed by access to state-of-the-art Bat Lab facilities (the most-expensive kind - with horrific cruelty to animals, btw) (holy grail: cross the Rubicon to engineered, humanly contagious bat-viruses (to get more funding!))
- entrusted with representing the *World Health Organization on-behalf-of us-all* to understand the origin of a disaster that altered the course of humanity (killed millions whilst catapulting humanity into a future-gone-bad Blade-runner un*reality*).

Hell! That's an awful lot of world-leading-intellect-force to contend with there, Pete! In your mind (& that of many scientists), simply stating your credentials is a winning argument all by itself: *Ignore the Conspiracy Theorists - Scientists **KNOW** Covid wasn't created in a lab.* But it's not enough for a winning argument. The beauty of *logic* is that it doesn't care about how much money or power you've got or whether you're a Top Ten scientist or a humble chicken farmer. Logic only cares about your premise, your details to support that premise, & whether your conclusion is based on sound reasoning ... or not. To simply keep saying *I JUST KNOW*, & anyone who questions me is a Conspiracy Theorist, doesn't cut it.

On any report card, it's important to say something positive, so if the goal was to create a *fog-of-irrationality* to cover your Ass/ Origins of Covid by spreading CCP disinformation, then i'd have to give you *A+ ... for effort. (*Though *THE Guardian/Oxford* deserves part of the credit as the mega-platform promoting you) The audaciousness you showed, your social-media-skills, your use of MSM to trumpet your messaging - that was all top-notch.

But as a critical thinking argument Pete, if that was written by a Year 10 student, you couldn't in all honesty give it a pass mark ...

Here's a recap as to why:

You've provided *no-evidence* to support your contention that ex-head of MI6's call to investigate a lab-origin *dissolves all logic & reason. Thereby making* him/the authors of the paper he dared cite C*onspiracy Theorists ..*

A barrage of immature name-calling doesn't make it so, Pete, i'm sorry. It's unscientific. It only diminishes you, & your argument.

Your use of the pejorative term *Conspiracy Theorist* (like it means something) four times, in the one article, is too much. (As is the dozens of more times you use it in all your Covid-writings - are you on some kinda money-per-mention deal?)

Your efforts to dismiss research pointing to a lab-origin as an *outlandish claim,* equivalent to saying SARS *originated from space is* a silly Strawman.

You claim *Scientists KNOW ...* But no explanation of *how they know* - given the WIV database was taken down & we haven't even had the investigation yet. If one of the chief investigators is claiming it's a foregone conclusion even before it's happened, then straight-away we can deduce that the WHO Investigation is a sham. That that person is heavily invested in covering the truth up.

You do cite the notorious *Proximal Origin* paper published in Nature (aka *The Pangolin Paper*), assuring us it was *peer-reviewed* & written by *senior virologists* who *strongly refuted* a lab-origin. But provide no details. Again, the words *Nature, senior virologists, peer-reviewed* are meant to be winning arguments. Listen to THE Experts. Don't question them.

But when one did question them, examinations of that paper (including a world-first critique by Formosa Hut), exposed the glaring China COIs of these *senior virologists.* As well as the flawed logic of blaming Covid onto pangolin & the Nanhua Seafood Market in the first place (see links for details). When a far more obvious explanation (WIV) was staring them in the face.

(Edit note: FOI emails (obtained after i wrote this) from the authors of Prox-O revealed that they all thought Covid *looks engineered* - they wrote the paper specifically to deflect attention from that. Still not in jail somehow (Mar '23)

The implications of the above are frightening: our world-leading experts, that we pay for, relied on - when it came to the crunch, they were happy to betray us, & every principle of science & ethics, in order to commit a global, academic fraud. Why? To protect a totalitarian regime - & their own self-interests.

At Formosa Hut we have this *Golden Rule*:

When a person resorts to irrational name-calling in a discussion about details - they are revealing their insecurity.

For example a homophobe might be insecure about their own sexuality, or a racist about their personal value as a human. The language used in emotive outbursts is always revealing. It was this rule that first alerted us to something odd going on with *THE Science Community*. Why on earth are you demonizing people for stating the obvious? In Daszak's case, for example, he can't stop using the term ***Conspiracy Theorist*** to attack his opponents & accusing them of being devoid of ***logic and reason***.

Therefore, using *Golden Rule* theory, Pete, you *are* conspiring to cover-up the origin of Covid, & *logic* is your greatest insecurity.

You see *logic* as your enemy. Which in your case, it is:

Logically, the WHO Investigation would include a deep-dive into what was going on at the Bat Lab, right-next-door to where the outbreak occurred.

Logically, you would not be part of the investigation due to your massive conflict of interest regarding WIV.

Logically, WIV wouldn't have shut down their database of bat-viruses (which is meant to be internationally accessible) if there was nothing to hide.

Logically, you wouldn't be ruling out a lab-event before it had even been examined.

Logically, you wouldn't be lauding a closed, totalitarian regime as *open & transparent*, when everyone knows they're not.

None of this would really matter - you'd be one more scientist with a COI-tainted viewpoint - who's way more interested in their next funding cheque than they are in the truth. What's frightening, though, is the platform you have (MSM + WHO), from which to spread your disinformation - the immense power that entails - including the power to force people across the globe to comply with this fake reality.

We've examined Daszak's Guardian article in-depth as a case-study & found it light on detail, big on name-calling, riddled with contradictions & non-truths. I chose it because it's typical of *all* Daszak's Celebrity Scientist contributions to the Origin of Covid discussion. To prove that assertion, & explain why he does it, the next page covers his other writings & the China COIs that motivate him.

Revision #8
Created 2023-03-21 23:07:52 UTC by dulandrift
Updated 2023-03-23 09:11:08 UTC by dulandrift