

Logic & Reason

Daszak - The Guardian

Determining the origins and emergence of a pandemic is as messy and complex as studying a plane crash.

*Just as an air crash investigator pieces together fragments at a crash site, pinpointing the origins of a new virus is **painstakingly difficult** (not so difficult as you're making out Pete - we'll look at that later) ...and **time-consuming** (= public money-consuming; to pay for the time consuming) ... and requires **logic and reason**. (tautology, but agreed).*

So using *logic and reason*, if the plane crashed in Wuhan - wouldn't you investigate the site of the crash in Wuhan? Look for the black box? In this case: WIV's internationally accessible database on which new viruses are meant to be logged?

As first reported by *DRASTIC*, that database has been mostly offline since Sep 12 2019, with at least 100 unpublished sequences of bat betacoronaviruses as well as unpublished experimental-results data from RaTG13 and BtCoV/4991, collected from the Yunan mine event in the spring of 2012.

What's the *logic and reason* behind holding an investigation and not looking at that?

According to you, it will exonerate WIV & vindicate your open and transparent advocacy of China. So why not investigate it?

*I know that (origin investigation requires logic and reason) because this is exactly what our organisation, EcoHealth Alliance, does. We work around the world to identify the origins of pandemics, **map them** and analyse them, and use these results to **predict where the next pandemic** will likely emerge.*

*We then target these "hotspots" for **enhanced surveillance**, capacity-building and **risk-reduction** programmes to **prevent diseases** emerging.*

Rewind to 2017 BC, EcoAlliance produced their predictive heatmap - lets see how they went with their *enhanced surveillance, capacity-building and risk-reduction programmes to prevent diseases emerging*.

Pic a

[image]

*Heat maps of predicted relative risk distribution of zoonotic EID (Emerging Infectious Diseases) events. **Pic a** shows the predicted distribution of new events being observed (weighted model output with current reporting effort)*

Most likely areas of new zoonotic crossover events, according to EHA were Europe, the US and Japan. China barely registers.

Here's a close up of Asia:

[image]

We've got three hotspots in China - Hong Kong, Shanghai and Beijing. Wuhan was not on the radar. It should have been. Given WIV was/is housing *more than 16 000 bat viruses*, it should be coloured blazing red.

Daszak's research partner, Shi Zheng-li (Bat Lady) commented when first told of the outbreak:

I wondered if [the municipal health authority] got it wrong. I had never expected this kind of thing to happen in Wuhan, in central China.

Shi had pegged Guangdong, Guangxi and Yunnan to be China's hotspots for a bat to human crossover event. Her first thoughts were: *Could they have come from our lab?*

The bottom-line is:

None of EcoHealth's scientists (with all their millions in funding) predicted an outbreak in Wuhan. So either their research has been a waste of money - or - there's another explanation for why it happened in Wuhan - it came from the lab.

The fact that Daszak is still insisting that WIV be excluded from any investigation only serves to heighten suspicion.

Revision #3

Created 21 March 2023 01:00:06 by dulanndrift

Updated 21 March 2023 08:42:15 by dulanndrift