

Scientists Have Recreated World's Deadliest Flu Virus

Analysis by [Dr. Joseph Mercola](#)

✓ Fact Checked

September 08, 2022

STORY AT-A-GLANCE

- › Scientists in the U.S. and Canada have resurrected the Spanish flu virus through reverse genetics. Not surprisingly, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and Dr. Anthony Fauci's National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) are involved
- › The scientists appear frustrated by the fact that their reverse engineered Spanish flu virus – even at the highest doses tested – was not lethal enough to kill the macaque species selected for the experiment. They argue we need to make a more dangerous version of the Spanish flu to be able to make better vaccines for it. This despite the fact that, until they resurrected it, it no longer existed in nature
- › The argument that we need to create dangerous viruses “just in case” Nature comes up with something similar, so we can create vaccines for said viruses in advance, simply doesn't hold water. This is science gone mad, and it must be stopped
- › Evidence points to SARS-CoV-2 being the product of gain-of-function research, and a number of U.S. institutions need to come clean about their work, including the EcoHealth Alliance (EHA), the University of North Carolina (UNC), the University of California at Davis (UCD), the NIH and the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)
- › All of these agencies and institutions have conducted and/or collaborated on research that may be able to solve the mystery of where SARS-CoV-2 came from. But instead of transparently sharing their data, they've merely declared that they've “not been involved in any experiments that could have resulted in the emergence of SARS-CoV-2.” Blanket denials are no longer enough. They must produce the data for independent review and analysis

Evidence points to SARS-CoV-2 being the product of gain-of-function (GoF) research. Indeed, attorney Tom Renz will soon release the results of a major legal investigation, which he claims will demonstrate – beyond a reasonable doubt – that SARS-CoV-2 was created as part of a GoF project.¹

Whether the outbreak was accidental, intentional or the result of negligence, the end result is the same – devastation of health, commerce, finance and civil life worldwide for years on end.

Now imagine what might happen if something like the Spanish flu got out – or worse, a turbo-charged, genetically engineered version of it. Incomprehensible as it may seem to the average person, scientists in the U.S. and Canada have resurrected this devastatingly lethal virus and, not surprisingly, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and Dr. Anthony Fauci's National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) are involved.

Mad Scientists Are Testing Recreated Spanish Flu on Monkeys

As reported by Renz, August 19, 2022:²

*"... this is so absurd that I am just starting with the reference document because I am concerned no one will believe it. Here it is: '**Spanish Flu GoF**.'³ Yes, that is right, Fauci and crew are now actively performing gain-of-function (GoF) work and infecting primates with the Spanish Flu ... Here is a quote from the document:*

'... Influenza virus A/South Carolina/1918 (H1N1) was generated by reverse genetics and handled in biosafety level 4 (BSL-4) containment at the National Microbiology Laboratory (NML).

Sequences of the 1918 influenza viral segments were based on data reported under GenBank accession numbers DQ208309, DQ208310, DQ208311, AF117241, AY744935, AF250356, AY130766, and AF333238.

1918 influenza virus was cultured using Madin-Darby canine kidney ... cells. MDCK cells were grown in minimum essential medium ... supplemented with 5% fetal bovine serum ... and 1 L-glutamine ...

A passage 2 (P2) virus stock was prepared using MEM supplemented with 0.1% bovine serum albumin (BSA) ... 1 L-glutamine, and 1 mg/mL N-tosyl-L-phenylalanine chloromethyl ketone (TPCK)-treated trypsin ...

This stock was used for animal inoculation. The mouse 50% lethal dose (MLD50) for this stock was determined previously to be 103.2 PFU; this value was confirmed prior to the use of the stock for macaque infection.'

I frankly do not care to debate the nuance of whether the recreation of generally extinct virus 'generated by reverse genetics' using pieces and parts of other animals qualifies as GoF; what I care about is that we have recreated the Spanish Flu and are experimenting with it on other animals."

Spanish Flu 'Not Lethal Enough'

As noted by Renz, the scientists appear frustrated by the fact that their reverse engineered Spanish flu virus – even at the highest doses tested – was not lethal enough to kill the two macaque species selected for the experiment.

Macaques were therefore deemed "not ideal for the development and testing of novel pandemic influenza-specific vaccines and therapies," necessitating "other physiologically relevant nonhuman primate models." Renz continues:⁴

"... given the result of the previous coronavirus GoF, can ANYONE possibly argue GoF work on the Spanish Flu is a good idea? Even the simple recreation of the disease demonstrates an incredible lack of respect for the disaster created by the coronavirus GoF.

So you may be asking, what moron could possibly be oblivious enough to support GoF work on the Spanish Flu while the world is still dealing with the

nightmare that is COVID? The answer should not be surprising ... NIH and NIAID are involved.

Apparently Fauci does not mind what he did with funding the creation of COVID and is at it again. You might also note the vaccine development crew's involvement. A foundational point in this article is that the newly recreated Spanish Flu is not dangerous enough. Here is a pull-quote:

'However, 1918 influenza was uniformly nonlethal in these two species, demonstrating that this isolate is insufficiently pathogenic in rhesus and Mauritian cynomolgus macaques to support testing novel prophylactic influenza approaches where protection from severe disease combined with a lethal outcome is desired as a highly stringent indication of vaccine efficacy.'

This means that these people are arguing that we need to make a more dangerous version of the Spanish Flu so they can make 'better' vaccines for it ... despite the fact that until they recreated it, it likely no longer existed in nature."

As noted by Renz, elected officials really need to answer the question, "Why is this kind of research allowed to continue on your watch?" Why are we reverse engineering the most lethal viruses the world has ever seen – after they've already been eradicated?

The argument that we need to create dangerous viruses "just in case" Nature comes up with something similar, so we can create vaccines for said viruses in advance, simply doesn't hold water. Stop creating these monstrosities, and we won't need the vaccines! This is science gone mad, and it must be stopped.

Besides, what are the chances that a virus would emerge naturally that just so happens to perfectly match the virus we now have a vaccine against? The entire premise is irrational from start to finish. It's biowarfare research and nothing else.

The Intentional Cover-Up of SARS-CoV-2's Origin

Fauci, former NIH chief Dr. Francis Collins, EcoHealth Alliance president Peter Daszak and other members of the scientific community have spent the last two and a half years actively stifling debate about the genesis of SARS-CoV-2.

And, coincidentally, most of them have clear-cut connections to bat coronavirus GoF research and/or the Wuhan Institute of Virology (WIV), which appears to be the lab from which the virus somehow escaped.

So, it appears those who insist SARS-CoV-2 is of natural origin, despite all the evidence to the contrary, are doing so because they don't want risky virological research to be blamed for the COVID pandemic. That would "blow their cover" and raise questions about the sanity of funding such research.

Some may be so enamored with their chosen careers, they cannot imagine doing anything other than tinkering with pathogens. For them, pulled funding is a threat to their livelihood. But for others, the underlying incentive may be more nefarious. Like I already said, there's really no reason for this kind of research other than the creation of weapons of mass destruction.

Whatever incentive any given player may have had, what's clear is that Fauci, Collins, Daszak and many others intentionally undermined efforts to get to the bottom of where SARS-CoV-2 came from.

Corrupted Science

Attesting to this corruption of science is Jeffrey Sachs, Ph.D., professor of economy at Columbia University, a senior United Nations adviser and chair of The Lancet COVID-19 Commission, convened in June 2020.

Sachs originally assigned Daszak to lead and organize the COVID-19 Commission's task force to investigate the virus's genesis (one of 11 task forces under the COVID Commission). Sachs ended up dismissing Daszak from the task force in June 2021, after he realized just how serious Daszak's conflicts of interest were,⁵ and that Daszak was lying to him.⁶

Eventually, he realized Daszak wasn't the only rotten apple in the bunch. Other members of The Lancet Commission's COVID Origins task force were also working against their mandate to investigate the pandemic's origin. The final straw came when Sachs sacked Daszak and several task force members suddenly attacked him for being "antiscience."

Shortly thereafter, a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request brought previously hidden NIH documents to light, and Sachs realized that those who were attacking him also had undisclosed ties that made their ability to get to the truth doubtful at best. At that point, in September 2021, he disbanded the whole task force.

Lack of Transparency Breeds Mistrust

In mid-May 2022, Sachs published a frank opinion piece in the journal PNAS,⁷ together with Neil Harrison, calling for a truly independent inquiry into the origin of SARS-CoV-2.

“ Much may be gleaned from information found in U.S.-based research institutions that were working with Wuhan-based institutions, including the WIV. Yet such material has not been disclosed for independent analysis.”

In their article, Sachs and Harrison argued that while transparency on the part of Chinese authorities would be "enormously helpful," much may be gleaned from information found in U.S.-based research institutions that were working with Wuhan-based institutions, including the WIV. Yet such material has not been disclosed for independent analysis. Here's an excerpt:⁸

"This lack of an independent and transparent US-based scientific investigation has had four highly adverse consequences. First, public trust in the ability of US scientific institutions to govern the activities of US science in a responsible manner has been shaken.

Second, the investigation of the origin of SARS-CoV-2 has become politicized within the US Congress; as a result, the inception of an independent and transparent investigation has been obstructed and delayed.

Third, US researchers with deep knowledge of the possibilities of a laboratory-associated incident have not been enabled to share their expertise effectively.

Fourth, the failure of NIH, one of the main funders of the US–China collaborative work, to facilitate the investigation into the origins of SARS-CoV-2 has fostered distrust regarding US biodefense research activities.

Much of the work on SARS-like CoVs performed in Wuhan was part of an active and highly collaborative US–China scientific research program funded by the US Government (NIH, Defense Threat Reduction Agency [DTRA], and US Agency for International Development [USAID]), coordinated by researchers at EcoHealth Alliance (EHA), but involving researchers at several other US institutions.

For this reason, it is important that US institutions be transparent about any knowledge of the detailed activities that were underway in Wuhan and in the United States. The evidence may also suggest that research institutions in other countries were involved, and those too should be asked to submit relevant information ..."

Sachs and Harrison go on to name a number of U.S. institutions that need to come clean about their work, including the EcoHealth Alliance (EHA), the University of North Carolina (UNC), the University of California at Davis (UCD), the NIH, NIAID and the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID).

All of these agencies and institutions have conducted and/or collaborated on research that may be able to solve the mystery, but instead of transparently sharing their data, they've merely declared that they've "not been involved in any experiments that could have resulted in the emergence of SARS-CoV-2."

Blanket Denials Are Not Good Enough

As noted by Sachs, before we can believe such claims, we need to be able to confirm their veracity, and that requires independent analysis of all the data.

"Blanket denials from the NIH are no longer good enough. Although the NIH and USAID have strenuously resisted full disclosure of the details of the EHA-WIV-UNC work program, several documents leaked to the public or released through the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) have raised concerns," Sachs and Harrison wrote.⁹

"These research proposals make clear that the EHA-WIV-UNC collaboration was involved in the collection of a large number of so-far undocumented SARS-like viruses and was engaged in their manipulation within biological safety level (BSL)-2 and BSL-3 laboratory facilities, raising concerns that an airborne virus might have infected a laboratory worker.

A variety of scenarios have been discussed by others, including an infection that involved a natural virus collected from the field or perhaps an engineered virus manipulated in one of the laboratories."

Suspicious 'Coincidences' Abound

Sachs and Harrison go on to discuss the problem of an unusual furin cleavage site (FCS) in SARS-CoV-2 that makes it more transmissible and pathogenic than related viruses.

While it's not yet known how this feature came to be within SARS-CoV-2, whether by natural evolution or intentional insertion, "We do know that the insertion of such FCS sequences into SARS-like viruses was a specific goal of work proposed by the EHA-WIV-UNC partnership within a 2018 grant proposal ('DEFUSE') that was submitted to the U.S. Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA)," Sachs wrote.

That particular DARPA proposal was never funded, but as noted by Sachs, "we do not know whether some of the proposed work was subsequently carried out in 2018 or 2019, perhaps using another source of funding."

"Information now held by the research team headed by EHA, as well as the communications of that research team with US research funding agencies, including NIH, USAID, DARPA, DTRA, and the Department of Homeland Security, could shed considerable light on the experiments undertaken by the US-funded research team and on the possible relationship, if any, between those experiments and the emergence of SARS-CoV-2," Sachs and Harrison wrote.¹⁰

"We do not assert that laboratory manipulation was involved in the emergence of SARS-CoV-2, although it is apparent that it could have been. However, we do assert that there has been no independent and transparent scientific scrutiny to date of the full scope of the US-based evidence."

In an August 2, 2022, Current Affairs interview,¹¹ Sachs again reiterated that he believes the NIH and allied scientists colluded to impede The Lancet Commission's investigation, for the simple reason that the virus was the result of U.S. research.

Indeed, aside from what Sachs brought up in his PNAS article, there are patents spanning decades to suggest that's true (see "[Patents Prove SARS-CoV-2 Is a Manufactured Virus](#)").

Sachs also opened up about his concerns and misgivings in an August 20, 2022, interview with Robert F. Kennedy Jr. (video above). He admits believing in the zoonotic spillover theory early on, only to, over time, come to change his mind as he realized he was being lied to, over and over again.

Today, he believes the lab-leak theory is the most likely explanation for the pandemic — and that the U.S. government, the NIH, the NIAID and the rest are suppressing the truth for the simple reason that they're responsible for its creation, even if only in part.

Final Thoughts

To circle back to where we started, is it really prudent to reverse engineer the Spanish flu virus, and further tinker with it to make it even more lethal — all in the name of vaccine development?

Think back over the past few years. Mull over the deaths – an estimated 18 million from COVID-19 alone¹² – the suicides (deaths of despair), the lost businesses, lost education years, the loss of freedoms and Constitutional rights, the COVID job injuries, and the massive wealth transfer that has occurred.

All of that may have been because of this kind of mad science. Do we really want to repeat it in the future, but with a far more lethal pathogen? Most sane persons would say no. It's time for legislators to take definitive steps to ensure mankind is not wiped out by scientific hubris.

Sources and References

- [1, 2, 4 Tom Renz Substack August 19, 2022](#)
- [3 Journal of Virology August 4, 2022 DOI: 10.1128/jvi.00728-22](#)
- [5 Vanity Fair March 31, 2022](#)
- [6, 11 Current Affairs August 2, 2022](#)
- [7, 8, 9, 10 PNAS May 19, 2022](#)
- [12 CBS News March 10, 2022](#)