Twitter Thread by Gilles Demaneuf

Gilles Demaneuf
@gdemaneuf

This is the $1mln question still without an answer: why were these workers cleaning bat guano from that abandoned mine?

Surprisingly we simply don't know.

China would have all interest in clarifying that point if for instance they were prospecting or selling guano. It did not.

> The miners were tasked with removing bat feces. AFAIK it hasn't been established why they were doing this. Given that EcoHealth was collecting bat fecal samples in the same province around the same time, is it possible these miners were actually collecting guano for EcoHealth?
>
> — The Great Gumbino (@gumby4christ) February 15, 2021

What we know is that EcoHealth + WIV were sampling bat sites in the vicinity at the exact time of the workers being in that mine.

#DRASTIC wrote about this and about other oddities in the official story:
https://t.co/1iJOJz9LYj

@gumby4christ

Maybe it's just one of these coincidences.

Then it gets interesting: about a year after the miners death, Olival & Epstein from EcoHealth Alliance co-authored a paper about the coronavirus risk infection from bat guano collection.

No mention of the mine

https://t.co/Se4y9LcWwk

That paper oddly used some old bat samples collected by DARPA in 2006/7 at the famous Thai bat cave.

It never mentioned that the Thai monks have been doing this every Sunday for many many years without infection.

https://t.co/xECx8W0MRh

But most interestingly it never mentioned the Mojiang mine accident, even if the perfect timing and recycling of old DARPA bat samples seem to point to a likely knowledge of it.

Anyway, the idea was to ask for more money, as you correctly guessed.

https://t.co/g1TBZNQIJl

So here comes a very handy scenario of a major coronavirus outbreak with a very 'scientific' and precise estimate of 96% of risk..

Again, please do not mention that the Thai monks have been doing this every Sunday for ages, you would spoil the fun.

https://t.co/g1TBZNQIJl

Table 1: Probabilities of spillover and epidemic spread for the seven scenarios examined. Percentages marked with an asterisk (*) are significantly different from the base scenario.

SCENARIO	% OF SIMULATIONS WITH SPILLOVER AND EPIDEMIC SPREAD
Base scenario, no interventions	96%
Reduce worker exposure 10x via PPE and hygiene practices	36%*
Reduce workers exposure 100x via PPE and hygiene practices	12%*
Reduce amount of guano harvest by 50%	98%
Reduce amount of guano harvest by 95%	93%
Cull wildlife, increase bat mortality by ~10%	94%
Cull wildlife, increase bat mortality 5-fold	94%

Now that paper co-authored by EcoHealth had Supaporn Wacharapluesadee as main author.

Supaporn conveniently jumped back into the fray a few days ago with a Nature article pointing to batcovs in bats and pangolins in SE Asia:

https://t.co/n3x97oKEm8

Leave these poor pangolins in peace please. The debate is closed there.

As for the bats coronavirus mentioned they are actually fairly distant from SARS-CoV-2, much more than Yunnan ones, and do not bind to hACE2 - so nothing particularly new.

https://t.co/Bn5ygIcJoy

That Thai batcov article ended up being misused in a way that would support the China/Daszak narrative:

https://t.co/uZu90vt7QL

> On the recent paper describing new SARS2-like viruses in Thailand, the big takeaways for me:
>
> The closest relatives to SARS2 are still from inside China whether you count it by genome, RdRp, or Spike RBD.
>
> The ones from Thailand don't use human ACE2.https://t.co/qMR9ZCQRrP
>
> — Alina Chan (@Ayjchan) February 11, 2021

So the more you dig into this, the more the Mojiang mine accident becomes a key element.

Many of the odd silences and odd coincidences all link back to it.

I wish EcoHealth could tell us a bit more about it and their 2013 bat guano epiphany.

A job for @USRightToKnow.

@threadreaderapp compile