

Evidence of Pandemic and Bioweapon Cover-Ups

Analysis by [Dr. Joseph Mercola](#)

✓ Fact Checked

April 07, 2022

STORY AT-A-GLANCE

- › As evidence of a potential bioweapons cover-up has started emerging, a company called Metabiota is gaining prominence
- › Metabiota’s mission is to make the world more resilient to epidemics by providing “data, analytics, advice and training to prepare for global health threats and mitigate their impacts.” Its founder is a World Economic Forum Young Global Leader graduate
- › Metabiota investors include In-Q-Tel, a CIA venture capital firm that specializes in high-tech investments that support or benefit the intelligence capacity of U.S. intelligence agencies, Hunter Biden’s investment fund, Rosemont Seneca and the U.S. Department of Defense’s Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA), which contracted Metabiota to run operations in U.S.-connected labs in Ukraine
- › In addition to having close ties to the WEF and its Great Reset agenda, Nathan Wolfe, the founder of Metabiota, has also served on the EcoHealth Alliance’s editorial board since 2004. In 2017, he co-wrote a study on coronaviruses in bats together with EcoHealth president Peter Daszak, Ph.D. EcoHealth worked closely with the Wuhan Institute of Virology (WIV) in China, where SARS-CoV-2 is suspected of having originated
- › Metabiota’s Global Partnerships are led by Andrew C. Weber, former assistant secretary of defense for Nuclear, Chemical and Biological Defense, who created the DTRA

As evidence of a potential bioweapons cover-up has started emerging, a company called Metabiota is gaining prominence. The links between Metabiota and several key players in the COVID pandemic and/or the Ukraine labs story are manifold, so there’s no

really simple way to unravel it in a logical sequence. That said, let's start with what Metabiota does and the connections of its founder, and expand from there.

Metabiota's Mission

Metabiota's mission is to make the world more resilient to epidemics by providing "data, analytics, advice and training to prepare for global health threats and mitigate their impacts."¹

Through data analysis, they help "decision makers across government and industry" to estimate and mitigate pandemic risks. But they also claim to support "sustainable development," which seems to have little to do with pandemic risk management.

That term, "sustainable development," is one promoted by Klaus Schwab, founder of the World Economic Forum (WEF). It's part and parcel of Schwab's plan for a global Great Reset and transhumanist revolution (aka, the Fourth Industrial Revolution).

It's not surprising, then, to find out that the founder of Metabiota, Nathan Wolfe, not only has close ties to the WEF, but is also a rising star there. He's a WEF Young Global Leader graduate and was awarded the WEF's Technology Pioneer award in 2021.

Metabiota and the Search for Pandemic Viruses

Metabiota was a core partner of a United States Agency for International Development's (USAID) Pandemic Threat Program called PREDICT, which sought to identify viruses with pandemic potential.

Contractors funded through this program have included the EcoHealth Alliance, headed by Peter Daszak. The PREDICT program, directed by Dennis Carroll, appears to have served as a proof of concept for the Global Virome Project that Carroll founded.

According to a recent investigation by U.S. Right to Know (USRTK),² Carroll appears to have diverted government funds from the PREDICT program while he was still running it,

to fund this personal side project, which was set up with the intention to collect, identify and catalogue 1 million viruses from wildlife in an effort to predict which ones might cause a human epidemic.

Metabiota's Funding

Metabiota receives funding from several interconnected organizations and agencies, including:³

- Pilot Growth Management, cofounded by Neil Callahan. Callahan is also a cofounder of Rosemont Seneca Technology Partners, and he sits on Metabiota's board of advisers
- The Global Virome Project, which reportedly paid (or was planning to pay) Metabiota \$341,000 to conduct a cost-benefit analysis⁴
- In-Q-Tel, a CIA venture capital firm that specializes in high-tech investments that support or benefit the intelligence capacity of U.S. intelligence agencies
- The U.S. Department of Defense's Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA).⁵ Specifically, in 2014, DTRA awarded Metabiota \$18.4 million in federal contracts for scientific and technical consulting services to the DTRA's labs in Ukraine and Georgia⁶

By outsourcing work to private companies, DTRA is able to circumvent Congressional oversight. Russia is now accusing the U.S. of funding secret and illegal bioweapons research in these Ukraine labs, and claims this was the real reason behind its invasion

- Rosemont Seneca,⁷ an investment fund co-managed by Hunter Biden.⁸ If Russia's accusations turn out to be true, this tie may prove deeply problematic for the White House, as this means the Biden family was more or less directly involved in the funding of that research

Wolfe has also received more than \$20 million in research grants from Google, the NIH and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, just to name a few, and was a friend of now-deceased Jeffrey Epstein. In his 2012 book, “The Viral Storm,” Wolfe thanked friends for their support, including Epstein and Boris Nikolic. Nikolic, a biotech venture capitalist, was named “back-up executor” in Epstein’s will.⁹

Epstein, who besides being a convicted pedophile and accused child sex trafficker, had a robust interest in eugenics. It’s now well-known that he dreamed of creating a “superhuman” race of his own by impregnating dozens of women at a time at his New Mexico ranch.¹⁰ Epstein also managed to secure meetings with Bill Gates,¹¹ whose family history is also marked by an interest in eugenics and population control.

Metabiota’s Founder Tied to Suspect in COVID Pandemic

In addition to having close ties to the WEF and its Great Reset agenda, Wolfe, the founder of Metabiota, has also served on the EcoHealth Alliance’s editorial board since 2004. In 2017, he even co-wrote a study on coronaviruses in bats together with EcoHealth Alliance president, Peter Daszak.

As you may recall, EcoHealth Alliance, a nonprofit organization focused on pandemic prevention, worked closely with the Wuhan Institute of Virology (WIV) in China, where SARS-CoV-2 is suspected of having originated.¹²

Daszak – who received funding for coronavirus research from the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID), led by Dr. Anthony Fauci, and the U.S. State Department¹³ – subcontracted some of that work to Shi Zheng-li at the WIV. He was also the coauthor on research projects at the WIV.

Once rumors of SARS-CoV-2 being man-made first began, Daszak played a central role in the plot to obscure the lab origin by crafting a scientific statement condemning such inquiries as “conspiracy theory.”^{14,15} This manufactured “consensus” was then relied on by the media to counter anyone presenting theories and evidence to the contrary.

This, despite the fact that he, in 2015, warned that a global pandemic might occur from a laboratory incident — and that “the risks were greater with the sort of virus manipulation research being carried out in Wuhan”!¹⁶

In 2021, two investigations into the origins of the COVID pandemic were opened, one by the World Health Organization¹⁷ and another by The Lancet,¹⁸ and Daszak somehow managed to end up on both of these committees, despite having openly and repeatedly dismissed the possibility of the pandemic being the result of a lab leak.¹⁹

Editor’s note: The WHO reference has been scrubbed from both the agency’s website and internet archives, but several news stories like this one from NPR,²⁰ published after the investigation was launched, are still live and accessible.

Interestingly, one of EcoHealth Alliance’s policy advisers is a former Fort Detrick commander named David Franz. Fort Detrick is the principal U.S. government-run “biodefense” facility, although Franz himself has publicly admitted that “in biology ... everything is dual use — the people, the facilities and the equipment.”²¹

Metabiota and the DTRA

In late May 2016, Metabiota hired Andrew C. Weber,²² a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, to head up its Global Partnerships.²³ Between 2009 and 2014, Weber served as assistant secretary of defense for Nuclear, Chemical and Biological Defense under then-president Obama.

Weber is credited with creating the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA) — a combat support agency within the U.S. DoD, specializing in countering weapons of mass destruction, including biological weapons^{24,25} — and as mentioned earlier, the DTRA has reportedly funded Metabiota to operate U.S.-funded biological research labs in Ukraine.

The DTRA has also issued a number of grants to the EcoHealth Alliance, totaling at least \$37.5 million,^{26,27} including a 2017 grant for \$6.5 million to “understand the risk of bat-borne zoonotic disease emergence in Western Asia.”²⁸

According to a December 2020 report by The Defender,²⁹ EcoHealth Alliance had tried to hide most of the Pentagon funding that it had received between 2013 and 2020, most of which came from the DTRA.

Metabiota's Bungled Ebola Response

In 2016, CBS News published a scathing critique of Metabiota's response to the 2014 Ebola epidemic in West Africa.³⁰ Metabiota had been hired by the WHO and the local government of Sierra Leone to monitor the spread of the epidemic, but according to an investigation by The Associated Press, "some of the company's actions made an already chaotic situation worse."

In a July 17, 2014, email obtained by AP, Dr. Eric Bertherat, medical officer at the WHO's Department of Epidemic and Pandemic Alert and Response, complained about misdiagnoses and "total confusion" at the small laboratory Metabiota shared with Tulane University in Kenema, Sierra Leone.

According to Bertherat, there was "no tracking of the samples" and "absolutely no control on what is being done." "This is a situation that WHO can no longer endorse," he wrote. Similarly, Sylvia Blyden, special executive assistant to the president of Sierra Leone, told AP Metabiota's response was a disaster:³¹

"They messed up the entire region," she said. She called Metabiota's attempt to claim credit for its Ebola work 'an insult for the memories of thousands of Africans who have died.'"

U.S. health official Austin Demby, who evaluated Metabiota's and Tulane's lab work at the request of the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the government of Sierra Leone, was also critical.

In one email, Demby noted used needles were left out and there was no ultraviolet light for decontamination. The space was also too small to safely process blood samples. "The cross-contamination potential is huge and quite frankly unacceptable," he wrote.

Anja Wolz, an emergency coordinator with Doctors Without Borders, told AP she witnessed Metabiota workers entering homes of suspected Ebola patients without protective gear, and leaving high-risk areas without performing any kind of decontamination procedure. She also accused Metabiota of miscalculating the severity of the outbreak, while insisting that they had the situation under control when clearly, they didn't.

Tulane microbiology professor Bob Garry was also critical of Metabiota's choice to have Dr. Jean-Paul Gonzalez run the operation, as Gonzalez, in 1994, had accidentally gotten infected with a rare hemorrhagic fever while working in a Yale University lab.

He failed to notify anyone about the exposure for more than a week, a delay that put more than 100 other people at risk. Gonzalez was ordered to take a remedial safety course, but according to Garry, such carelessness was a red flag, and he didn't think Gonzalez was the right man to teach Sierra Leoneans about Ebola.

"Do you really want the person who infected himself with hemorrhagic fever going around explaining to people how to be safe?" Garry asked in an email to a Metabiota media representative. Wolfe defended his company, saying there was no evidence they'd done anything wrong. Some of the problems he blamed on misunderstandings, and others on commercial rivalry.

Lab Accident 'Most Likely,' yet Least Probed Cause of COVID

In a March 28, 2022, report,³² U.S. Right to Know (USRTK) revealed the contents of a 2020 State Department memo³³ obtained by the group. USRTK writes:³⁴

"Origin of the outbreak: The Wuhan labs remained the most likely but least probed," reads the topline. The memo is written as a BLUF – 'bottom line up front' – a style of communication used in the military. The identity of the author or authors is unknown ...

'BLUF: There is no direct, smoking gun evidence to prove that a leak from Wuhan labs caused the pandemic, but there is circumstantial evidence to

suggest such is the case,' the memo reads. Apparently drafted in spring 2020, the memo details circumstantial evidence for the 'lab leak' theory – the idea that COVID-19 originated at one of the labs in Wuhan, China, the pandemic's epicenter.

The memo raises concerns about the 'massive amount' of research on novel coronaviruses apparently conducted at the Wuhan Institute of Virology and the nearby Wuhan Center for Disease Control lab ... The memo also flags biosafety lapses at both labs, calling the Wuhan Institute of Virology's 'management of deadly viruses and virus-carrying lab animals ... appallingly poor and negligent.'

The memo provides an extraordinary window into behind-the-scenes concerns about a lab accident among U.S. foreign policy leaders, even as this line of inquiry was deemed a conspiracy theory by international virologists, some of whom had undisclosed conflicts of interest.

The memo also calls into question these virologists' impartiality. Shi Zhengli, a Wuhan Institute of Virology coronavirus researcher nicknamed the 'Bat Woman,' has forged wide-reaching international collaborations, including with prestigious Western virologists, the memo notes.

'Suspicion lingers that Shi holds an important and powerful position in the field in China and has extensive cooperation with many [international] virologists who might be doing her a favor,' it reads ...

The memo laments that 'the most logical place to investigate the virus origin has been completely sealed off from inquiry by the [Chinese Communist Party]' ... The memo even suggests that other hypotheses may have served as a distraction from a probe of the city's extensive research on novel coronaviruses. 'All other theories are likely to be a decoy to prevent an inquiry [into] the WCDC and WIV,' it states ...

The memo cites a 2015 paper³⁵ coauthored by Shi titled 'A SARS-like cluster of circulating bat coronaviruses shows potential for human emergence' that

described creating a 'chimera,' or engineered virus, with the spike protein of a coronavirus from a Chinese horseshoe bat.

Editors at Nature Medicine added a note in March 2020 cautioning that the article was 'being used as the basis for unverified theories that the novel coronavirus causing COVID-19 was engineered' ... But the memo shows that the State Department indeed considered the paper relevant to the pandemic's origins."

NIH Retracted Gene Sequence at WIV Researcher's Request

While we've yet to obtain bulletproof evidence that SARS-CoV-2 was developed as a bioweapon, there's plenty of circumstantial evidence that points in that direction. Disturbingly, as time goes on, more and more of this circumstantial evidence seems to highlight the United States' involvement. If one proverbial finger is pointing at China, four others are pointing back at us.

This is profoundly bad news, but it really ought to strengthen our resolve to get to the bottom of it. None of us are safe until the mad scientists responsible for this pandemic are brought to justice. It doesn't matter who they are. In all likelihood, we'll find that blame cannot be pinned on a single nation. At bare minimum, the U.S. and China appear to be covering for each other.

As just one example, there are the deletions of information that have occurred both at the National Institutes of Health and the WIV, either at the other's request, or as what appears to be a favor.

As reported by Just the News,³⁶ NIH deleted a genetic sequencing submission of SARS-CoV-2 from its Sequence Read Archive (SRA) at the request of a researcher at the WIV. Emails³⁷ obtained via FOIA request to the NIH by Empower Oversight show a WIV researcher who had submitted two genetic sequences to the SRA, one in March 2020, and a second in June 2020, asked to have the last one retracted.

NIH initially stated that it would be better to edit or replace the submission rather than retracting it, but the researcher insisted it be removed, which they did. To be fair, the NIH also states it has retracted at least eight SRA submissions in total, most from American researchers, at their request. However, emails also show the NIH directed reporters on how to provide more favorable and less sensationalized coverage of the deletion of the Chinese sequence. Just the News writes:³⁸

"[Empower Oversight] says one of the most disconcerting elements of the emails is evidence showing the NIH has refused to participate in a transparent process to examine data on the deleted sequences.

'Most importantly, why has NIH refused to examine archival copies of deleted sequences in an open scientific process to determine whether any of that information might be able to shed light on the origins of the COVID-19 pandemic?' the group asked.

However, that argument was dismissed by NIH official Steve Sherry. Although sequences are never fully deleted, according to the agency, Sherry told a researcher who asked for transparency, 'As you know, when data sets are withdrawn from the database, that status does not permit use for further analyses.'"

WIV Deleted Mentions of US Collaborators

The WIV has also deleted information in what appears to be an effort to shield the NIH. Shortly after Fauci testified in a Senate hearing in March 2021,³⁹ the WIV quietly deleted all mentions of its collaboration with Fauci's NIAID, the NIH and other American research partners from its website. As reported May 15, 2021, by The National Pulse:⁴⁰

"March 21st, 2021, the lab's website listed six U.S.-based research partners: University of Alabama, University of North Texas, EcoHealth Alliance, Harvard University, the National Institutes of Health (NIH), the United States, and the National Wildlife Federation."⁴¹

One day later, the page was revised to contain just two research partners – EcoHealth Alliance and the University of Alabama.⁴² By March 23rd, EcoHealth Alliance was the sole partner remaining.⁴³

EcoHealth Alliance is run by long-standing Chinese Communist Party-partner Dr. Peter Daszak, who National Pulse Editor-in-Chief Raheem Kassam has repeatedly claimed will be the first ‘fall guy’ of the Wuhan lab debacle ...

Beyond establishing a working relationship between the NIH and the Wuhan Institute of Virology, now-deleted posts⁴⁴ from the site also detail studies bearing the hallmarks of gain-of-function research conducted with the Wuhan-based lab.”

Indeed, a now-deleted WIV web page titled “Will SARS Come Back?” stated that:⁴⁵

“Prof. Zhengli Shi and Xingyi Ge from WIV, in cooperation with researchers from University of North Carolina, Harvard Medical School, Bellinzona Institute of Microbiology ... examine the disease potential of a SARS-like virus, SHC014-CoV, which is currently circulating in Chinese horseshoe bat populations.

Using the SARS-CoV reverse genetics system, the scientists generated and characterized a chimeric virus expressing the spike of bat coronavirus SHC014 in a mouse-adapted SARS-CoV backbone.

The results indicate that group 2b viruses encoding the SHC014 spike in a wild-type backbone can efficiently use multiple orthologs of the SARS receptor human angiotensin converting enzyme II (ACE2), replicate efficiently in primary human airway cells and achieve in vitro titers equivalent to epidemic strains of SARS-CoV.

Evaluation of available SARS-based immune-therapeutic and prophylactic modalities revealed poor efficacy; both monoclonal antibody and vaccine approaches failed to neutralize and protect from infection with CoVs using the novel spike protein.

On the basis of these findings, they synthetically re-derived an infectious full-length SHC014 recombinant virus and demonstrate robust viral replication both in vitro and in vivo ...”

The WIV’s deletions of American research partners from its website (with the exception of EcoHealth Alliance), and its deletion of the article discussing genetic research on the SARS virus only served to strengthen suspicions of a cover-up. At the time, the most surprising thing about it was that they were covering up American involvement and not just their own.

Are We the Bad Guys?

Alas, as noted by Maajid Nawaz,⁴⁶ a former Islamist revolutionary who became an anti-extremism activist, if it turns out that the U.S. did in fact engage in illegal bioweapons development in Ukraine, it might just turn out that we’re the bad guys here. He writes, in part:⁴⁷

“On the 24th February 2022, the very day of Russia’s invasion, some of us were already worried about the prospect of biological weapons laboratories existing in Ukraine ...

The existence of bio-weapons labs on Ukraine’s border with Russia has since been confirmed by both Russia and the US (I say both because the Ukrainian government is essentially serving as a US proxy). The only remaining question is around what we were doing in those laboratories.

It is no longer in doubt that we funded bio-weapons research in the Wuhan lab in China, from where it is now believed that COVID most likely leaked from. So were we doing the same in Ukraine too? Russia has certainly made the allegation ...

The official representative of the Russian Ministry of Defense, Major General Igor Konashenkov stated⁴⁸ ‘In the course of a special military operation, the facts of an emergency cleansing by the Kiev regime of traces of a military

biological program being implemented in Ukraine, funded by the US Department of Defense, were uncovered.'

With this, he released this document drop⁴⁹ alleging ... that these papers substantiated their case. If Russia's allegations hold up, the US and her proxy Ukrainian regime would be in violation of the first article of the UN Convention on the Prohibition of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons.⁵⁰

Russia's announcement appears to have forced America's hand to admit that such bio labs do indeed exist. US Undersecretary of State Victoria Nuland framed this admission by stating that these labs were for defensive research only.

Under Secretary Nuland however continued to make the case that such labs would be dangerous if they fell into Russian hands, without apparently noticing the contradiction inherent in her position that such labs are only dangerous because they can be weaponized ...

Matching Russian precision strikes to a map of bio lab locations inside Ukraine certainly does suggest that Putin's 'special military operation' appears to be targeting some of these dangerous labs."

Indeed, Nawaz highlights a 2021 Ukrainian petition^{51,52} to president Zelensky, asking for a) the immediate closure of "American bio-laboratories in the territory of Ukraine," b) an investigation into the activities of those labs, and c) an investigation into potential Ukrainian participation in the creation of SARS-CoV-2.

In other words, at least some Ukrainians, by 2021, were wondering whether the U.S. labs in their country might have been involved in the creation of this pandemic.

Denouncements Ring Hollow

Not surprisingly, the U.S. State Department took a hard line, denouncing all allegations with the statement that "The United States does not have chemical and biological

weapons labs in Ukraine.”⁵³ In another statement,⁵⁴ the State Department “clarified” that the labs were for “biodefense,” not biological weapons, thus semantically cleansing their criminal activities.

The problem with that is that there’s no hard line between biodefense and bioweapons research. As admitted by EcoHealth Alliance’s policy advisor and former Fort Detrick commander David Franz, it’s all “dual use – the people, the facilities and the equipment.”⁵⁵ Biodefense implies biowarfare, as it involves the creation of more dangerous pathogens for the alleged purpose of finding treatments against them.

Bioweapons expert Francis Boyle, who drafted the Biological Weapons Anti-Terrorism Act of 1989, has also pointed out that most BSL-4 labs are dual use: “They first develop the offensive biological warfare agent and then they develop **the supposed vaccine**.”⁵⁶ And then, there’s the weapons proliferation agreement⁵⁷ between the U.S. and Ukraine, signed at the end of August 2005.

WEAPONS

Proliferation

Agreement Between the
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
and **UKRAINE**



Signed at Kiev August 29, 2005

AGREEMENT

between the Department of Defense of the United States of America
and the Ministry of Health of Ukraine
Concerning Cooperation in the Area of Prevention of Proliferation of
Technology, Pathogens and Expertise that could be Used in the Development of
Biological Weapons

The Department of Defense of the United States of America ("U.S. Department of Defense") and the Ministry of Health of Ukraine, hereinafter referred to jointly as the Parties,

Incidentally, former President Barrack Obama spearheaded the project to construct these Ukrainian labs back in 2005, when he was still a senator and, curiously, the online announcement of his involvement in this project has also been deleted from the web.⁵⁸

According to this agreement, the U.S. Department of Defense will assist the Ministry of Health in Ukraine, at no cost, to prevent "proliferation of technology, pathogens and expertise" found in a number of Ukraine labs, that "could be used in the development of biological weapons."

The Burning Question of Intent

So, the agreement itself clarifies that they're working on pathogens that COULD be used as biological weapons, and Nuland's stated concerns back this up. The only question remaining then is one of intention. What's the intended use of these pathogens? Defense? Or offense? And is there really a difference?

As noted by Nawaz, the U.S. clinging to the defense of "biodefense" and anti-bioweapons proliferation is "the equivalent of denying that Einstein's discovery of splitting the atom to generate energy is not also something that could be used to make nuclear weapons. After the COVID outbreak, the notion that bio labs can be weaponized should simply be presumed as a rule."

“ Was ensuring that a ‘next pandemic’ doesn’t occur by taking out these bio labs, what Putin had in mind by his phrase ‘special military operation’? ~ Maajid Nawaz”

Also, consider the network of players reviewed earlier. The Ukrainian-American collaboration to study pathogens capable of weaponization is run by the DTRA, which funds Metabiota, which is run by a WEF leader with close personal ties to the one person – Daszak – suspected of being a key player in the creation of SARS-CoV-2, a go-between of the NIH and the WIV, and a central force in the cover-up of the lab leak theory.

Interestingly, Metabiota is also financially backed by Hunter Biden's investment company, and let's not forget that young Biden also collected a six-figure salary from a Ukrainian gas company for doing literally nothing, other than supplying his "powerful name."⁵⁹

Circumstantial or not, it just doesn't look good. And, by now, it should be crystal clear that any lab doing defensive work is equally capable of churning out offensive weapons.

Debating that point is just silly, as it all boils down to semantics.

According to Bulgarian journalist Dilyana Gaytandzhieva, Metabiota is a key player in the Ukrainian labs. David Horowitz, a political writer, has noted that Metabiota is “a company that tracks the trajectory of outbreaks and sells pandemic insurance, but also seems to have its hand in the actual labs that ... might be the source of some of these outbreaks.”⁶⁰

In other words, could it be that Metabiota has been producing biological agents under diplomatic cover and then selling pandemic insurance and pandemic trackers to “help countries get ahead of what they are putting out”?⁶¹

Nawaz asks, “was ensuring that a ‘next pandemic’ doesn’t occur by taking out these bio labs, what Putin had in mind by his phrase ‘special military operation’?”⁶² At this point, it seems a valid question.

Sources and References

- ¹ [Metabiota.com](#)
- ² [USRTK March 16, 2022](#)
- ^{3, 5, 9} [The Daily Expose March 20, 2022](#)
- ⁴ [Disinformation Chronicle Substack March 22, 2022](#)
- ^{6, 60} [Medicalexperiments.news March 31, 2022](#)
- ⁷ [Rosemont Seneca Investments](#)
- ⁸ [Rosemont Seneca Team](#)
- ¹⁰ [New York Times July 31, 2019](#)
- ¹¹ [New York Times October 12, 2019](#)
- ^{12, 16} [Daily Mail January 9, 2021](#)
- ¹³ [Independent Science News March 24, 2021](#)
- ¹⁴ [USRTK November 18, 2020](#)
- ¹⁵ [GM Watch November 19, 2020](#)
- ¹⁷ [WHO.int Origins of the SARS-CoV-2 Virus](#)
- ¹⁸ [The Lancet October 10, 2020; 396\(10257\): 1102-1124](#)
- ¹⁹ [GM Watch September 23, 2020](#)
- ²⁰ [NPR. WHO Launches a New Group to Study the Origins of the Coronavirus. October 13, 2021](#)
- ^{21, 29, 55} [The Defender December 18, 2020](#)
- ²² [D60.darpa.mil Andrew Weber bio](#)
- ²³ [Twitter Alexis Baden-Mayer March 28, 2022](#)

- ²⁴ [DTRA.mil](#)
- ²⁵ [History of DTRA 1998-2008](#)
- ²⁶ [Daily Caller June 7, 2021](#)
- ²⁷ [USA Spending Project Grant to EcoHealth August 2019](#)
- ²⁸ [USA Spending Project Grant to EcoHealth October 2017](#)
- ^{30, 31} [CBS News March 7, 2016](#)
- ^{32, 34} [USRTK March 28, 2022](#)
- ³³ [State Department Memo](#)
- ³⁵ [Nature Medicine 2015; 21: 1508-1513](#)
- ^{36, 38} [Just the News March 29, 2022](#)
- ³⁷ [FOIA emails from the NIH](#)
- ³⁹ [MSNBC March 19, 2021](#)
- ⁴⁰ [National Pulse May 15, 2021](#)
- ⁴¹ [Web Archive WIV research partners March 21, 2021](#)
- ⁴² [Web Archive WIV research partners March 22, 2021](#)
- ⁴³ [Web Archive WIV research partners March 23, 2021](#)
- ^{44, 45} [Web Archive WIV Will SARS Come Back? December 4, 2015](#)
- ^{46, 47, 53, 59, 61, 62} [Maajid Nawaz Substack March 14, 2022](#)
- ⁴⁸ [CDN Substack](#)
- ⁴⁹ [Exposing the Darkness Substack March 6, 2022](#)
- ⁵⁰ [UN Convention on the Prohibition of Bacteriological \(Biological\) and Toxin Weapons](#)
- ⁵¹ [National File March 11, 2022](#)
- ⁵² [Petition on Ukraine's government website](#)
- ⁵⁴ [WSWS.org March 11, 2022](#)
- ⁵⁶ [Mercola interview with Francis Boyle published March 8, 2020](#)
- ⁵⁷ [Agreement Between the United States and Ukraine August 29, 2005](#)
- ⁵⁸ [Web Archive Bioprepwatch.com June 18, 2010](#)