

Twitter Thread by Billy Bostickson ■■■&■ ■



Billy Bostickson ■■■&■ ■

[@BillyBostickson](#)



Wikipedia's current take on lab leak theory

<https://t.co/lfTP7Rn3RY>

Meanwhile the slugs are trying to erase all evidence of their censorship activities

<https://t.co/VFhkbnT4kO>

I do what I can but I am not Jesus, just a Monkey with a Mouse and WiFi

Wuhan lab leak story [edit]

Early in the pandemic, a conspiracy theory emerged that the virus had been [bio-engineered](#) by China at the [Wuhan Institute of Virology](#). One early source of this theory was former Israeli secret service officer Dany Shoham, who gave an interview to *The Washington Times* regarding the lab.^{[28][29]} Later, US politicians began propagating the idea, including Senator [Tom Cotton](#), President [Donald Trump](#), and Secretary of State [Mike Pompeo](#).^[29] One scientist from Hong Kong, [Li-Meng Yan](#), fled China and supported the idea. Many authorities debunked the conspiracy theory, including American biologist [Richard Ebright](#), NIAID director [Anthony Fauci](#), prominent scientists, and the [US intelligence community](#).^[29] The conspiracy theory spread widely on social media, but subsequent scientific investigation showed that the virus [originated in bats](#).^[25]

The Epoch Times, a newspaper affiliated with [Falun Gong](#), refers to the SARS-CoV-2 virus as the "CCP virus", and a commentary in the newspaper posed the question, "is the novel coronavirus outbreak in Wuhan an accident occasioned by weaponizing the virus at that [Wuhan P4 virology] lab?"^{[30][31]}

One popular version of the lab leak story conflates bat-into-swine [cross-species transmission](#) coronavirus research with previous [gain-of-function](#) virus research to promulgate the idea that the virus was of laboratory origin.^[32] The bat-into-swine research at the WIV was "a collaboration among scientists from [EcoHealth Alliance](#), [Duke-NUS Medical School](#), [Wuhan Institute of Virology](#) and other organizations, was (partly) funded by the [NIAID](#), and was published in *Nature*."^[33] Virologist [Angela Rasmussen](#) writes that this is ironic, since in reality such research had enabled scientists to gain a better understanding of the novel virus.^[34]

On February 9, 2021 a team probing the origins of the COVID-19 pandemic for the [World Health Organization](#) said that that the coronavirus "most likely" originated in animals before spreading to humans, and dismissed the lab leak theory as "extremely unlikely" and not needing further study.^{[35][36]}

British Financed Hemiauchenia Slug Festival

search term "Wuhan"

<https://t.co/2RZ770vDly>

<https://t.co/n1zGjuNxG7>

<https://t.co/ttZm1uWVSJ>

Wuhan lab leak [edit]

I normally try to adhere to [WP:CIVIL](#), but following these remarks I'm finding it very difficult to do so in your case: "I honestly don't know what to say other than this shows Arcturus has serious WP:CIR issues when it comes to our reliable sources policy.". It's a bloody source used in medical articles! It's not on the deprecated list, and any reasonable person coming across it would regard it as authentic and reputable - and I've no doubt it is. So if you're such a fucking expert in these matters, what's your background? Infection control expert or virologist, are you? [Arcturus \(talk\)](#) 12:08, 16 January 2021 (UTC)

[@Arcturus](#): When I say [WP:CIR](#), I was referring to the second line:

The ability to read sources and assess their reliability. Editors should familiarize themselves with Wikipedia's guidance on identifying reliable sources and be able to decide when sources are, and are not, suitable for citing in articles.

"Its cited in numerous Wikipedia articles, therefore it is reliable" is such a gross failure of critical thinking and understanding of Wikipedia's [Reliable Sources Policy](#), that I am genuinely flabbergasted to see in such an experienced editor as yourself. Wikipedia is not a reliable source, and the number of times a source is cited on Wikipedia has no bearing on its reliability. I've seen terrible sources that are cited hundreds, even thousands of times across Wikipedia, having barely over 30 uses on Wikipedia in no way indicates reliability. [Hemiauchenia \(talk\)](#) 00:32, 17 January 2021 (UTC)

"Its cited in numerous Wikipedia articles, therefore it is reliable". Did I say that? Actually, I merely pointed out the facts of the matter, proffered my view that it could be, or even probably is, a RS, and asked others to look at it. As to where critical thinking fits into this particular low-level issue, well, I'm at a loss to see. A key element of critical thinking is to see both sides of an argument and come to an unbiased conclusion. I suggest a number of those involved in the current debate around the lab leak theory are sadly lacking in the skill. [Arcturus \(talk\)](#) 16:18, 17 January 2021 (UTC)

Heck, [Russia Today](#) is deprecated, and it's still used in *hundreds* of articles, just because nobody has had the time and energy to expunge them all yet. Thirty-odd citations is nothing. [XOR'easter \(talk\)](#) 01:24, 17 January 2021 (UTC)

Well, there's your next job then. Get going on replacing the RT references. It would be a productive activity and a good use of your time. [Arcturus \(talk\)](#) 16:18, 17 January 2021 (UTC)

Boing! said Zebedee! with a hatchet again!

"I'm collapsing this wall of text to reduce disruption caused by X, who is now blocked for 1 month from this article & its talk page under WP:GS/COVID19 sanctions.

The following discussion has been closed"

<https://t.co/0wUBG8bNy3>

I'm collapsing this wall of text to help make this page a little more readable and reduce the disruption being caused by this editor, who is now blocked for [hide] one month from this article and its talk page under [WP:GS/COVID19](#) sanctions. Boing! said Zebedee (talk) 16:28, 8 June 2020 (UTC)

The following discussion has been closed. Please do not modify it.

This is untrue. I have been removing BIAS from the article that you continue to inject, including a Nature article that you refuse to use because you yourself decided "Nature" is not a valid source. Other users have noticed your bias with the Nature article incident. [LIXIAO9987 \(talk\)](#) 19:38, 5 June 2020 (UTC)

Not ALL leading virologists agree to zoonosis transmission: Professor Nikolai Petrovsky has completed a scientific study, currently undergoing peer review, in conjunction with La Trobe University in Victoria, which found COVID-19 was uniquely adapted for transmission to humans, far more than any other animal, including bats Professor Petrovsky, from the College of Medicine and Public Health at Flinders University who has spent the past 20 years developing vaccines against pandemic influenza, Ebola and animal SARS, said this highly unusual finding left open the possibility that the virus leaked from a laboratory.

>Overall, the data indicates that SARS-CoV2 is uniquely adapted to infect humans, raising questions as to whether it arose in nature by a rare chance event or whether its origins lie elsewhere. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.06199> [↗](#)

So how are ALL scientists agreeing? They are NOT. Why is one ONE SIDE represented? Bias [LIXIAO9987 \(talk\)](#) 19:42, 5 June 2020 (UTC)

MIT postdoc explains the PRRA insert relative to RmYN02 evolution argument. >Conclusion is that "no evidence" either way for whether it's natural or engineered despite the authors of the RmYN02 paper claiming that it demonstrates "natural evolution" <http://archive.is/17ong> [↗](#)

>The 1977-1978 influenza epidemic was probably not a natural event, as the genetic sequence of the virus was nearly identical to the sequences of decades-old strains. While there are several hypotheses that could explain its origin, the possibility that the 1977 epidemic resulted from a laboratory accident has recently gained popularity in discussions about the biosafety risks of gain-of-function (GOF) influenza virus research, as an argument for why this research should not be performed.

More Censorship from the Gang of Slugs

-Thucydides411

"Agree with this, and nice tidy up job"

Britishfinance

<https://t.co/0wUBG8bNy3>

Description of gain-of-function experiments [edit]

The description of gain-of-function experiments should not be alarmist or POV. There is a long-standing debate over the risks/benefits of gain-of-function research, and "leading virologists" do not lie all on one side or the other. Any discussion of this debate in the article should be directly relevant to Shi Zhengli (i.e., she should be explicitly mentioned in the sources), or else it veers off into WP:SYNTH territory. -Thucydides411 (talk) 15:06, 25 April 2020 (UTC)

Agree with this, and nice tidy up job. Britishfinance (talk) 15:33, 25 April 2020 (UTC)

Nature ran an article specifically about Shi Zhengli's experiments. It is absolutely relevant to her work. The fact is, these experiments WERE very alarming to a lot of people, and definitely the article in Nature needs to be included due to relevance and direct link to her work. If you read the original HIV/SARS chimera paper, it goes a little something like this: "Problem statement: SARS coronavirus cannot infect hACE2 cells. Solution: We combined SARS coronavirus with HIV to make it infect hACE2 cells" no mention of application or cure. This was some seriously controversial work. Yes, my personal opinion is that this was a "natural" virus that leaked from her group and that side needs accurate representation instead of continued dismissal into "tin foil hat" territory, because it is a serious question that needs to be answered about the origins of this virus. At the very least, people need to be aware of the facts of her work since so much information is being spinned/suppressed by the CCP. The fact is, she did some very risky things and got a lot of backlash from within the scientific community and the politicians in the US funding her work. LIXIAO9987 (talk) 04:39, 26 April 2020 (UTC)

Concerns over gain-of-function experiments are already mentioned, in the context of the NIH funding moratorium from 2014-2017. I think that level of discussion is sufficient, given how short this article is. We have essentially one sentence for each of Shi Zhengli's major results. Putting in a second sentence about the gain-of-function debate is undue. Discussion of the CCP, the virus supposedly leaking from her group, etc. belongs on an internet discussion forum, not on this Wikipedia page, which is guided by WP:MEDRS. -Thucydides411 (talk) 12:50, 26 April 2020 (UTC)

The fact that it's being underemphasized is more concerning. She may be a controversial person at this time, but that doesn't make criticisms of her work in the past disappear. This page was practically a cheerleading article for this researcher for the past few months—that doesn't reflect reality. She was and is a controversial scientist. This isn't a "general debate" about GoF: the Nature article is specifically talking about Shi's experiments. — Preceding unsigned comment added by LIXIAO9987 (talk • contribs) 19:30, 26 April 2020 (UTC)

@LIXIAO9987: Describing Shi Zhengli's scientific work is not "cheerleading" her. She is not controversial in the scientific community. She has been the target of various conspiracy theorists since the CoVID-19 outbreak, ironically because of the fact that she is one of the leading researchers on SARS-like coronaviruses. But those conspiracy theorists are not WP:MEDRS. -Thucydides411 (talk) 20:26, 26 April 2020 (UTC)

More Slug baiting and collaboration

@Britishfinance: I've followed your suggestion and added some material -Thucydides411

Thucydides411, nice work there and looks good. I think adding that the lab didn't even have SARS-CoV-2 would also be worth it Thanks again. Britishfinance

Maybe we could add some material from the Vox and NPR interviews with virologists to the end of the last paragraph in the "Research" section. It could go after the discussion of the Rogin opinion piece. -Thucydides411 (talk) 15:58, 28 April 2020 (UTC)

I think that makes sense, the VOX/NPR pieces are notable virologists giving counterpoint to the Rogin piece. I think that readers (myself included) reading Rogin would begin to feel that it was a leak, however, the VOX/NPR shows that while it can't be ruled out (can't prove a negative), it still makes it very unlikely. It would be classic Wikipedia value-add imho, and helpful to show casual readers on this subject, that what they think is obvious, may not be? thanks. Britishfinance (talk) 19:15, 28 April 2020 (UTC)

The Nature article discussing her work is RELEVANT INFORMATION about her work, regardless of the current pandemic. You cannot make a Nature article disappear just because it makes her look bad. The article is in no way suggesting her previous work is connected to COVID-19, nor is it near the part of the article discussing COVID-19. For the record, I DO NOT THINK COVID IS ENGINEERED. But that is totally irrelevant, because this isn't about covid, it's about suppressing a valid source and claiming I'm putting a spin that I'm clearly not. There is no reason why people shouldn't have access to one of the highest quality of academic sources discussing the content of her work LIXIAO9987 (talk) 19:20, 26 April 2020 (UTC)

Nobody is suppressing the *Nature* article. It's being included, and everyone here supports at least one sentence about the NIH moratorium on gain-of-function experiments. I'm against over-emphasizing this one aspect of Shi Zhengli's biography versus the other, much more important parts of her biography (such as the several *Nature* and *Science* articles that actually do mention her, unlike the source you want to write two full sentences about). I think the reason why it's being over-emphasized at this moment is rather clear. -Thucydides411 (talk) 19:24, 26 April 2020 (UTC)

More from Thucydides

Speaking of which, I find your musings above to be completely out of place on a Wikipedia talk page.

I find your attempts to personally discredit leading virologists to be really unacceptable. -Thucydides411

- This is a selective quotation to support one position on the subject. Nevertheless, the quotations above only confirm what I said. None of them cites any *evidence* that there was no SARS-CoV-2 in the lab. In brief, according to these sources "A Wuhan lab studied SARS-related viruses. But there's no evidence it discovered or was working on the new virus.". OK, but this is very far from saying "there was no SARS-CoV-2 in the lab based on such and such evidence". Yes, sure, there is no evidence of anything, and possibly will never be. Well, to be honest, what makes me more suspicious are things like that.^[3] Instead of assisting in the inquiry to get clean, the Chinese government threatens Australia by promising economic sanctions - simply for asking to do an international investigation. Sounds pretty much as a self-admission of guilt. [My very best wishes \(talk\)](#) 15:50, 29 April 2020 (UTC)

How is it selective? I quoted the two virologists who addressed the question of whether SARS-CoV-2 was at the institute. Both of them said that it wasn't there.

How you or I interpret Chinese government's reaction to the Australian PM's call for an investigation into China is irrelevant. You see China's rejection of the inquiry as an admission of guilt, others see the call for an inquiry as a political stunt meant to prove Australia is a good American ally. But it doesn't matter, because **this isn't** a political forum, and this is the wrong place to kibbitz about international politics. This is a place to discuss changes to the article. -

Thucydides411 (talk) 16:10, 29 April 2020 (UTC)

Here is the bottom line: there is no any scientific or other *evidence* that SARS-CoV-2 was not in the lab (or evidence that it was in the lab) according to these sources. When Dr. Daszak tells about viruses cultured in Wuhan "that were 20 percent different" from SARS-CoV-2, he apparently refers to viruses described in PLOS, although this is not at all clear from such vague publication. However, if there are any other RS actually explaining *why* he thinks no one in Wuhan lab had SARS-CoV-2 in culture, that would be something for including on this page. As a note of order, Dr. Daszak has a **conflict of interest** as a collaborator of Dr. Shi Zhengli. [My very best wishes \(talk\)](#) 16:47, 29 April 2020 (UTC)

According to your quotation, "Carroll, the former director of USAID's emerging threats division who also spent years working with emerging infectious disease scientists in China, agrees that there's no evidence the Chinese researchers were working with a novel pathogen." What?? All SARS viruses they worked with (and published in PLOS) were potentially new pathogens. That was the entire point of working with them, as Dr. Zhengli and co-authors emphasized in their own publications. The reasoning by Carroll? "here was no chatter prior to the emergence of this virus to a discovery that would have ended up bringing the virus into a lab". What? There was no "**chatter**", and that is his argument? As we know, there were cable and a lot of other actual activity with people visiting China, etc. [My very best wishes \(talk\)](#) 17:12, 29 April 2020 (UTC)

and here comes Boing! Said Fucking Zebedee to rescue Thucydides 411 when he is caught acting maliciously

<https://t.co/0wUBG8bNy3>

Archived:

<https://t.co/GJmX0jhuB6>

"And Horse Eye's Back, please drop the confrontational attitude. Boing! said Zebedee"

None of that is my opinion or understanding. I only cross-verified claims by different sources (see my comments above in this thread). All these sources were written for general public (NPR, Vox, Scientific American, etc.) and do not require an expertise in virology. Are you saying that you are an expert in virology? BTW, we do have page [Viral culture](#). Is that what we (and Dr. Daszak) are talking about? To my knowledge, this page provides sufficiently correct, although very basic info. Am I wrong? [My very best wishes \(talk\)](#) 21:37, 30 April 2020 (UTC)

- During source-digging, I stumbled into this very long commentary[🔗]. Based on this, the virus *might* indeed be lab-made, although author does NOT claim is lab-made. Although not an RS per se, it does provide a lot of useful links to more reliable sources, and frankly, whatever author tells seems to be supported and reasonable to me. But I am not an expert in virology, admitted. So, if you have a better background and can comment anything of *essence* here (as oppose to just saying, "Hey, this is just a blog post, not an RS"), you are welcome. [My very best wishes \(talk\)](#) 02:43, 1 May 2020 (UTC)

Thucydides411, wake up. MVBW has highlighted how Daszak has a conflict of interest AND that false, misleading claims in line with that have been made. Accept it. We have better sources, so we should rely on them unless necessary. I would be astonished if Shi wasn't aware of and significantly involved in covert military research and development. With good sources, if there are any, that'll belong in the article too. But the claims that SARS-CoV-2's origins couldn't have involved the lab, from anyone in the field, needs to be called what they are. Propaganda. We need RS for that, but IIRC, they're out there. And there's a shitload of circumstantial evidence. Prior spillover, the lab was purpose-built and existing for years before its official opening, GoF, military contracts, shenanigans (not that it belongs in *this particular* article). Should be covered if it isn't.--[50.201.195.170 \(talk\)](#) 08:36, 18 December 2020 (UTC)

1. [▲] [Virus Researchers Cast Doubt On Theory Of Coronavirus Lab Accident](#)[🔗]
2. [▲] [Why these scientists still doubt the coronavirus leaked from a Chinese lab](#)[🔗]
3. [▲] [China angered by Australian call for international inquiry into coronavirus origin](#)[🔗]

Boing! Said Zebedee and Thucydides411 acting in a devious tandem slug attack

Paraphrasing Scientific American article [edit]

@CowHouse: I don't think we should write it in any way that implies she believed it could have come from her lab. Diligence and checking of records is one thing, believing that something is plausible is another. She doesn't say the latter in the interview. I would simply write, "In an interview with Scientific American, Shi said that after learning of the outbreak in Wuhan, she verified that the coronavirus seen in patients did not match any of the viruses her team had sampled." -Thucydides411 (talk) 16:48, 31 December 2020 (UTC)

I have included our discussion from your talk page below so others have context, and so I don't have to repeat myself. The source says *If coronaviruses were the culprit, she remembers thinking, "Could they have come from our lab?" and Meanwhile she frantically went through her own lab's records from the past few years to check for any mishandling of experimental materials, especially during disposal.* Both the source and my edit never suggested she thought it was plausible. As I said in our discussion on your talk page, I think it's fine to include as long as it is clear to readers that she only asked herself "could they have come from our lab?" at a time when very little was known about the virus, and before the scientific community knew enough to refute a lab origin. CowHouse (talk) 16:59, 31 December 2020 (UTC)

- Just a suggestion, folks, as I'd rather leave it to you to decide on the wording. But if there's any possible ambiguity, it can be safer to stick to exact quotations and not try to interpret or paraphrase. Boing! said Zebedee (talk) 17:06, 31 December 2020 (UTC)

@CowHouse: Okay, I think we broadly agree. Is my above proposed wording acceptable, or would you add something to it?

@Boing! said Zebedee: Agreed about the dangers of paraphrasing, but I think we can find a wording that is unambiguous. -Thucydides411 (talk) 17:11, 31 December 2020 (UTC)

If we used the exact quotation we would still have to explain the meaning of "they" in the quote "Could they have come from our lab?", which is why I think it's better to paraphrase in this situation. I'm still unclear on what the inferences were that Thucydides411 mentioned on their talk page. My edit followed the source, it did not add any inferences. I agree that direct quotes are better than an ambiguous paraphrase, but I'm not sure what the ambiguity is in this case. We do broadly agree, but I'm unclear on why you want to omit the "Shi initially considered if the virus could have come from her lab" part even when it is contextualised. CowHouse (talk) 17:21, 31 December 2020 (UTC)

Earlier Observations <https://t.co/i1YveYfGlc>

Who the hell is writing these wikipedia articles lately, Peter Daszak?<https://t.co/nlP3rMr7Gxpic.twitter.com/9KE0ORli1V>

— Billy Bostickson \U0001f3f4\U0001f441&\U0001f441 \U0001f193 (@BillyBostickson) November 17, 2020

<https://t.co/uJHcsxla46>

I feel a huge attack of RAGE coming on, does anyone else? <https://t.co/FV6KezEf6U>

— Billy Bostickson \U0001f3f4\U0001f441&\U0001f441 \U0001f193 (@BillyBostickson) February 8, 2021

and a previous thread on wikipedia censorship and collusion
<https://t.co/mSPCWCHNhP>

OMG, this guy deserves a medal for patience
Just watch his crucifixion here<https://t.co/muflVsiL4p>

— Billy Bostickson \U0001f3f4\U0001f441&\U0001f441 \U0001f193 (@BillyBostickson) February 10, 2021

Keep an eye on the French page
<https://t.co/TyPkGPDf3E>

Exposing the Wikipedia Slug Cartels
<https://t.co/JE9B16qVqo> via [@TheSeeker268](#)

Years ago, my friend and I collaborated to write an investigative article on Wikipedia.

The plan was to expose the entrenched gang of Wikipedia editors who earn money by creating and editing Wikipedia pages.

A Bollywood producer helped me with the contact of an agency.
(Thread)

— Soumyadipta (@Soumyadipta) March 4, 2020

WP user, LIXIAO9987. gets slugged to death over the inclusion of a Nature Article

<https://t.co/8XwdULpEPX>

by guess who?

Boing! said Zebedee and Thucydides411 again!

Archived: <https://t.co/lQuOmAxGbM>

Edit-warring at Shi Zhengli [edit]

 Your recent editing history at [Shi Zhengli](#) shows that you are currently engaged in an [edit war](#); that means that you are repeatedly changing content back to how you think it should be, when you have seen that other editors disagree. To resolve the content dispute, please do not revert or change the edits of others when you are reverted. Instead of reverting, please use the [talk page](#) to work toward making a version that represents [consensus](#) among editors. The best practice at this stage is to discuss, not edit-war. See [the bold, revert, discuss cycle](#) for how this is done. If discussions reach an impasse, you can then post a request for help at a relevant [noticeboard](#) or seek [dispute resolution](#). In some cases, you may wish to request temporary [page protection](#).

Being involved in an edit war can result in you being blocked from editing—especially if you violate the [three-revert rule](#), which states that an editor must not perform more than three [reverts](#) on a single page within a 24-hour period. Undoing another editor's work—whether in whole or in part, whether involving the same or different material each time—counts as a revert. Also keep in mind that while violating the three-revert rule often leads to a block, you can still be blocked for edit warring—**even if you don't violate the three-revert rule**—should your behavior indicate that you intend to continue reverting repeatedly. -Thucydides411 (talk) 17:10, 26 April 2020 (UTC)

Please revert your most recent addition: [\[1\]](#)[?]. Ramming text through against other editors' objections is not how things are supposed to work on Wikipedia. Also, please note that accusations of vandalism, such as the one you made in [this edit summary](#)[?], violate [WP:AGF](#). "Vandalism" does not refer to content disputes. -Thucydides411 (talk) 17:14, 26 April 2020 (UTC)

The Nature article is a high quality source referencing her past work. There is no reason to suppress this information beyond bias. LIXIAO9987 (talk) 21:06, 26 April 2020 (UTC)

First of all, nobody is suppressing the *Nature* article. Second of all, even if they were, edit warring is not allowed. You've put essentially the same text into the article more than three times within 24 hours, in violation of [WP:3RR](#). This is a bright line that editors are not supposed to cross. When an editor violates 3RR, it is considered courteous to ask them to undo their own edits, instead of immediately reporting them to [WP:AN/3RR](#). I'm therefore asking you to undo your last addition. You need to discuss your proposed changes on the talk page. Give [WP:BRD](#) a read to see how you should proceed when other editors object to your additions. -Thucydides411 (talk) 21:30, 26 April 2020 (UTC)

You are suppressing this information by including the source with NO mention of the contents of the source. Repeated removals are unwarranted. Britishfinance also agrees it should be added. You're trying to turn this into a debate about coronavirus when the subject is her previous work. The current pandemic bears no relevance on the contents of the Nature article. LIXIAO9987 (talk) 22:25, 26 April 2020 (UTC)

Indian Wikipedia Slug Cartel tactics Investigation archived

<https://t.co/Ps8Wr9JR15>

More of their slug like antics here

<https://t.co/XzWcS8AJRO>

Archived: <https://t.co/L8Ct0YNICF>

and here:

<https://t.co/DAh6UVC34u>

Archived: <https://t.co/PSjtrRaPO3>