A Reconstructed Historical Aetiology of the SARS-Coronavirus-2 Spike

Birger Sørensen, Andres Susrud & Angus Dalgleish
Immunor & St Georges University of London
May 26 2021

ABSTRACT (299 words)

We published the mode of action of our first-in-class third generation vaccine in QRB-D on 2 June 2020, making clear that we built outwards from analysis of the mode of action of SARS-Coronavirus-2. By 17 March 2020 we had discovered that the spike has six inserts which are unique fingerprints with five salient features indicative of purposive manipulation and we circulated an interim account in July 2020. In this paper we publish an updated and more complete account of the underlying virus aetiology and posit that the likelihood of it being the result of natural processes is very small. Since all relevant biological, computer-record and direct testimony from Wuhan has been destroyed or is unavailable, absolute proof cannot be provided. There is therefore a choice to be made between an agnostic and passive or an active methodological response which can more efficiently form and assess hypotheses. We employ an active scientific logic. First we describe here principles of engineering a virus for Gain of Function experiments. Then we update our bio-chemical analysis of the SARS-Coronavirus-2 virus's Mode of Action. We then set out the logic of our methodological choices. Fourthly, we add a diachronic dimension by analysing a sequence of five linked projects which, we suggest, shows by reasonable deduction how, where, when and by whom the SARS-Coronavirus-2 Spike acquired its special characteristics. We posit that this reconstructed historical aetiology meets the criteria of means, timing, agent and place to reverse the burden of proof. Henceforth, those who would maintain the zoonotic transfer hypothesis need to explain precisely why our simpler account of laboratory manipulation is wrong, before asserting that their evidence is persuasive. This is more especially when, as we also show here, the evidence used to support some of their arguments is actually in contradiction of them.

Conclusion

We have deduced the internal logic of published research which resulted in the exact functionalities of SARS-Coronavirus-2, including the convergence of agreement from difference classes of source, the timings of the stages of the research and the development of documented capabilities by named institutions and individuals. These meet the criteria of means, timing, agent and place in this reconstructed historical aetiology to produce sufficient confidence in the account to reverse the burden of proof. Furthermore, a basic biochemical expectation can be added to this. A natural virus pandemic would be expected to mutate gradually and become more infectious but less pathogenic which is what many expected with the COVID-19 pandemic but which does not appear to have happened. The implication of our historical reconstruction, we posit now beyond reasonable doubt, of the purposively manipulated chimeric virus SARS-CoV-2 makes it imperative to reconsider what types of Gain of Function experiments it is morally acceptable to undertake. Because of wide social impact, these decisions cannot be left to research scientists alone.