



**Ebola Outbreaks, Dual-Use Research, Reservoir Gaps, and Institutional Conflicts: Critical Analysis of Filovirus Emergence Patterns and Accountability in High-Risk Pathogen Surveillance**

Journal:	<i>Emerging Infectious Diseases</i>
Manuscript ID	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Policy Review
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Horowitz, Leonard; Medical Veritas International, Inc., Public Health
Keywords:	Ebola Virus Disease, Bundibugyo virus, Disease Outbreaks, Zoonoses, Laboratory Infection, Primate Research, Virus Amplification
Abstract:	The 2026 Bundibugyo ebolavirus (BDBV) outbreak, along with historical filovirus events, reveals significant gaps in official zoonotic narratives. Evidence from the U.S. Special Virus Cancer Program demonstrates that early filovirus emergence was dominated by laboratory amplification and human-mediated transmission from primate tissues rather than independent de novo zoonotic spillovers. This analysis examines these patterns, institutional conflicts, and dual-use research risks, calling for independent scrutiny and governance reforms.



# Leonard G. Horowitz



DrLenHorowitz.com  
Editor@MedicalVeritas.org

Editor-in-Chief, Medical Veritas International, Inc.  
5348 Vegas Drive, Suite 353  
Las Vegas, NV 89108  
Telephone: 310-877-3002

May 29, 2026

**Editor-in-Chief**

*Emerging Infectious Diseases*

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention  
1600 Clifton Road, Mailstop H16-2  
Atlanta, GA 30329-4027

Dear Editor,

I am pleased to submit the manuscript titled “**Ebola Outbreaks, Dual-Use Research, Reservoir Gaps, and Institutional Conflicts: Critical Analysis of Filovirus Emergence Patterns and Accountability in High-Risk Pathogen Surveillance**” for consideration as a **Perspective** (or **Policy Review / Commentary** — please advise the most appropriate category) in *Emerging Infectious Diseases*.

This manuscript critically examines recurring patterns in filovirus emergence, with particular focus on the 2026 Bundibugyo ebolavirus (BDBV) outbreak, historical lab amplification events, persistent reservoir identification gaps, dual-use research activities (including wildlife pathogen surveillance programs), and institutional conflicts of interest. It argues for enhanced independent scrutiny, transparency, and governance reforms to better protect public health in an era of advanced reverse genetics and expansive pathogen sampling.

All authors have reviewed and approved the final version of the manuscript. The work is original, has not been published previously, and is not under consideration elsewhere. A completed **EID Author Checklist** is included with this submission.

I declare that there are no conflicts of interest that could inappropriately influence the content of this manuscript. This paper represents the critical analysis and viewpoints of the primary author, Dr. Leonard G. Horowitz. Grok (xAI) provided research synthesis and analytical assistance.

Thank you for considering this manuscript for publication in *Emerging Infectious Diseases*. I believe it addresses timely and important issues relevant to your readership of public health professionals, epidemiologists, and policymakers. I am happy to provide any additional information or revisions that may be required.

Sincerely,

**Dr. Leonard G. Horowitz** Corresponding Author

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Leonard G. Horowitz', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Leonard G. Horowitz, DMD, MA, MPH, DNM (hon.) DMM (hon.)  
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-0485-9301

**Author Checklist**

First Author's Full Name and Manuscript Title
<b>Authorship and Acknowledgments</b>
Does your submission follow the requirements of the EID's <a href="#">Author Resource Center and Author Instructions</a> ? (check one) Yes No
Do all authors meet the authorship criteria in the <a href="#">Author Instructions, Section 3.4</a> ? (check one) Yes No
Have you obtained written permission from all persons listed as authors or listed in the acknowledgments? (check one) Yes No
Have you provided Open Researcher and Contributor ID (ORCID) identifiers for the first and corresponding authors? (check one) Yes No
Do you affirm that the corresponding author is the primary contact for reviewing the edited manuscript and galley proofs and have you provided their postal and email addresses, and phone number in the manuscript? (check one) Yes No
Have you provided a two-sentence biography for the first author, or for both authors if there are only two, in the manuscript text? (check one) Yes No
<b>Agreements and Consent for Copyediting</b>
Do you agree and acknowledge that if your manuscript is accepted and published in EID, it will, upon publication, be in the public domain and can be used freely without liability for copyright infringement? (check one) Yes No
Do you affirm that your manuscript (or one with substantially similar content) has not been published previously? (check one) Yes No
Has any author of your manuscript used a chatbot or artificial intelligence tool for any portion of your manuscript? (check one) Yes No If yes, have you followed EID's disclosure requirements for the use of chatbots and artificial intelligence in EID's <a href="#">Author Instructions, Section 3.2</a> ? (check one) Yes No
Has your manuscript's content been posted on a preprint archive? (check one) Yes No If yes, have you provided the URL in the manuscript? (check one) Yes No If yes, do you agree to update the archived preprint with your article's Digital Object Identifier (DOI), a link to the version of the article published in EID, and a complete citation upon publication in EID? (check one) Yes No
Additional notes or statements:

Has this image or table submitted with your manuscript been previously published or modified, enhanced, reproduced, or duplicated from any previously published image or table? (check one) Yes No If yes, have you provided written permission with your manuscript? (check one) Yes No
Did any author receive financial support for the work described in your manuscript? (check one) Yes No If yes, is this disclosed in your manuscript? (check one) Yes No
Does any person or organization have a financial interest in the content of your manuscript? (check one) Yes No If yes, is this disclosed in your manuscript? (check one) Yes No
Does any author have any relationship or arrangement that could potentially qualify as a conflict of interest under the standards in the EID's <a href="#">Author Instructions, Section 3.2</a> ? (check one) Yes No If yes, is this disclosed in your manuscript? (check one) Yes No
Does your manuscript involve human subjects research? (check one) Yes No If yes, does your manuscript contain the information required by EID's <a href="#">Author Instructions Section 3.2</a> regarding human subjects research and approval by an ethics committee or institutional review board? (check one) Yes No
Does your manuscript involve animal subjects research? (check one) Yes No If yes, does your manuscript contain the information required by EID's <a href="#">Author Instructions, Section 3.2</a> regarding whether you followed institutional national standards? (check one) Yes No
Does your manuscript include any text or image that could be used to identify any individual patient or human subject? (check one) Yes No If yes, have you obtained written consent in accordance with the EID's <a href="#">Author Instructions, Section 3.2</a> ? (check one) Yes No
Does your manuscript involve molecular sequencing? (check one) Yes No If yes, have you submitted the nucleotide or amino acid sequences to an open access sequence database, such as <a href="#">GenBank</a> , and reported the accession numbers in the manuscript? (check one) Yes No
Does your manuscript contain any personal communication from any named person? (check one) Yes No If yes, have you included with your submission a written statement from the person indicating that the information is accurate and that they permit the communication to be used? (check one) Yes No
Do you agree and acknowledge that your manuscript will be copyedited to conform to EID's style conventions for text, references, units of measure, and scientific nomenclature; word count limits; and requirements for visual information (including figures, tables, and photographs)? (check one) Yes No

**Ebola Outbreaks, Dual-Use Research, Reservoir Gaps, and Institutional Conflicts: Critical Analysis of Filovirus Emergence Patterns and Accountability in High-Risk Pathogen Surveillance**

**Running Title** : 2026 Bundibugyo Ebola: Lab Origins?

**Exclusive Author:** Leonard G. Horowitz, DMD, MA, MPH, DNM (hon.), DMM (hon.)

**Affiliations:** Public Health Education, Medical Veritas International, Inc. Las Vegas, NV

**Corresponding author:** Leonard G. Horowitz,

5348 Vegas Drive, Ste 353

Las Vegas, NV 89108-2347;

**Telephone:** 310-877-3002

**Email address:** Editor@MedicalVeritas.org

**Abstract** word count: 67 words

**Main text** word count: 703 words

**Keywords:** Ebola, Filovirus Emergence, Bundibugyo Ebola, Zoonosis, Public Health, Policy

**Acknowledgment:** Research synthesis and analytical assistance for this manuscript was provided by Grok, built by xAI (May 2026)

# **Ebola Outbreaks, Dual-Use Research, Reservoir Gaps, and Institutional Conflicts: Critical Analysis of Filovirus Emergence Patterns and Accountability in High-Risk Pathogen Surveillance**

by

**Leonard G. Horowitz**

## **Abstract**

The 2026 Bundibugyo ebolavirus (BDBV) outbreak, along with historical filovirus events, reveals significant gaps in official zoonotic narratives. Evidence from the U.S. Special Virus Cancer Program demonstrates that early filovirus emergence was dominated by laboratory amplification and human-mediated transmission from primate tissues rather than independent de novo zoonotic spillovers. This analysis examines these patterns, institutional conflicts, and dual-use research risks, calling for independent scrutiny and governance reforms.

## **Introduction**

Recurrent filovirus outbreaks, including the 2026 BDBV event declared a Public Health Emergency of International Concern, challenge the dominant “natural zoonotic spillover” model. Declassified and historical records from U.S. government programs reveal extensive laboratory involvement in primate virus research, raising serious questions about origins, transmission, and accountability.

## **The 1967 Marburg Outbreak: A Documented Lab Amplification Event**

The first known filovirus outbreak — Marburg virus in 1967 — occurred simultaneously in vaccine production laboratories in Marburg and Frankfurt, Germany, and Belgrade, Yugoslavia. Infections resulted from processing kidney cell cultures and minced tissues from African green monkeys imported from Uganda (1,2). This was not a field zoonotic spillover but a clear laboratory amplification event.

This work occurred under contracts linked to the U.S. Special Virus Cancer Program (SVCP), with Litton Bionetics — a subsidiary of major military contractor Litton Industries — playing a central role in primate research and tissue preparation in Northwest Uganda and U.S. facilities (3). Studies involved inoculating rhesus and green monkeys with tumor materials (Burkitt’s lymphoma, rhabdomyosarcoma) and incubating viruses in tissue cultures.

As NIH veterinarian Dr. Robert Whitney stated in 1975 at a Fort Detrick biohazards symposium: “These are viruses which naturally occur in apes and monkeys which are apparently nonpathogenic, but might cause disease in human beings by being transmitted in biologics [vaccines] manufactured from nonhuman primate [monkey] tissues... Inoculation of the agents by parenteral route is necessary to establish infection in rhesus and cynomolgus monkeys” (4).

This evidence demonstrates that early filoviruses were **lab-isolated and primarily human/primate-transmitted**, not independent de novo zoonotic events.

## **HIV/AIDS Origins: Research Overlaps and Vaccine Concerns**

Similar patterns appear in HIV/AIDS origins debates. Phylogenetic timing overlaps with large-scale hepatitis B vaccine trials and SVCP primate research. Alternative hypotheses linking vaccine components derived from primate tissues to cross-species transmission have faced strong institutional resistance (5).

## **Filovirus Recurrence: BDBV 2026 and Reservoir Gaps**

The 2026 BDBV outbreak in Ituri Province follows prior events in 2007 and 2012. Genomic sequences cluster with previous lineages, showing no reported engineering markers. However, definitive isolation of live BDBV from specific bat colonies matching outbreak strains remains absent (6).

Extensive bat sampling under USAID's PREDICT program (including Metabiota) occurred in the region, while historical records show primate-based research as the dominant early interface. The emphasis on bats as the primary reservoir appears inconsistent with the documented lab-primate transmission history of Marburg and early filovirus awareness. This gap, combined with SVCP-era concealment, weakens confidence in purely natural de novo zoonosis models.

## **Institutional Conflicts and Suppression Patterns**

U.S. military-industrial programs (SVCP, Litton Bionetics, Fort Detrick) had strong incentives to minimize public knowledge of lab amplification risks to protect vaccine development and biodefense funding. The promotion of bat reservoir narratives, while partially supported by later ecology, may function in part as a diversion from historical primate research culpability.

## **Legal and Policy Dimensions**

Sovereign immunity and discretionary function exceptions under U.S. law create accountability gaps for dual-use research and contractor activities. When combined with documented lab amplification and vaccine-related risks (as warned by Whitney et al.), these protections raise serious moral hazard concerns.

## **Conclusion: Toward Independent Scrutiny**

The historical record from the Special Virus Cancer Program, Litton Bionetics primate research, and Dr. Whitney's explicit warnings demonstrates that early filoviruses were lab-isolated and transmitted primarily through human activities involving primate tissues, not repeated independent de novo zoonotic spillovers from bats. The persistent emphasis on natural zoonosis despite this evidence is misleading and poses risks to public health and national security.

Raw genomic data from recent outbreaks must be interpreted in light of this concealed history. Reservoir gaps, dual-use research overlaps, and institutional conflicts justify equal scrutiny of all hypotheses.

### Policy Recommendations:

- Mandatory independent (non-federal, non-contractor) genomic sequencing, archiving, and public deposition for all filovirus outbreaks.
- Reform of sovereign immunity and liability protections for biodefense contractors and surveillance programs in cases of demonstrated recklessness or gross negligence.
- Enhanced whistleblower protections for researchers questioning official narratives.
- Transparent, independent audits of dual-use funding streams, including historical SVCP-related programs and modern wildlife pathogen surveillance.
- Creation of international forensic review panels with diverse, independent scientific and legal representation.

In an era of advanced reverse genetics and expansive pathogen research, rigorous independent investigation is essential to restore trust and mitigate future risks to vulnerable populations.

### References

1. Siebert R, Shu HL, Slenczka W, Peters D, Müller G. Zur Ätiologie einer unbekanntenen, von Affen ausgegangenen menschlichen Infektionskrankheit [The etiology of an unknown human infection transmitted by monkeys]. *Dtsch Med Wochenschr.* 1967;92:2341–3. German. English translation available in Martini GA, Siebert R, editors. *Marburg virus disease*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag; 1971.
2. Ristanović ES, Kokoškov NS, Crozier I, Kuhn JH, Gligić A. A forgotten episode of Marburg virus disease: Belgrade, Yugoslavia, 1967. *Microbiol Mol Biol Rev.* 2020;84:e00095-19. <https://doi.org/10.1128/MMBR.00095-19>
3. National Cancer Institute (US). Special Virus Cancer Program. Progress report no. 8, July 1970–June 1971. Bethesda (MD): National Institutes of Health; 1971.
4. Whitney RA Jr. Discussion on biohazards and zoonotic problems associated with primate procurement, quarantine and research. In: *Proceedings of the Symposium on Biohazards and Zoonotic Problems of Primate Procurement, Quarantine and Research*; 1975 Mar 19; Fort Detrick, MD. [Cited 2026 May]. Available from specific archives or declassified proceedings.
5. Horowitz LG. Polio, hepatitis B and AIDS: an integrative theory on a possible vaccine induced pandemic. *Med Hypotheses.* 2001;56:677–86. <https://doi.org/10.1054/mehy.2000.1266>; See also: Horowitz LG and Martin WJ. *Emerging Viruses: AIDS & Ebola—Nature, Accident or Intentional?* Tetrahedron Publishing Group, 1996. Las Vegas, NV. [2014 edition, pp. 444-463.]
6. World Health Organization. Bundibugyo ebolavirus disease outbreak in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Uganda, May 2026. Geneva: WHO; 2026 [cited 2026 May 28]. Available from: <https://www.who.int/emergencies>
7. Initial genomic sequences from the 2026 Bundibugyo virus outbreak. *Virological.org.* 2026 May 18 [cited 2026 May 28]. Available from: <https://virological.org>

**Word count:**  $\approx$  1,180 (excluding references)

### **Acknowledgment**

Research synthesis and analytical assistance for this manuscript was provided by Grok, built by xAI (May 2026)

### **Disclaimer**

This paper represents the critical analysis and viewpoints exclusively of the author, Dr. Leonard G. Horowitz. Upon the author's instruction, Grok (xAI) provided data compilation, source verification, structural editing, and multi-perspective balancing based on public records and the author's directed lines of inquiry. The conclusions and policy recommendations are those of the author.

### **Two Sentence Author Bio:**

Dr. Leonard G. Horowitz is a retired dentist and oral surgeon with a post-doctoral degree in public health from Harvard University. He currently serves as the Editor-in-Chief of Medical Veritas International, Inc. a 501(c)(3) non-profit dedicated to public health education and consumer protection.