

A Reconstructed Historical Aetiology of the SARS-Coronavirus-2 Spike
Birger Sørensen, Andres Susrud & Angus Dalglish
Immunor AS & St George's, University of London

May 26 2021

ABSTRACT

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 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.