

From: "Feith, David" (b)(6)@state.gov>
To: Stilwell, David R (b)(6)@state.gov>
Subject: RE: WIV Document Declass
Date: Tue, 19 Jan 2021 17:32:00 +0000

Yep. Sensible as ever. But demands for access/answers is where we've been for a year. Was crucial to get out the new info, and then demand access/answers about it too...

From: Stilwell, David R (b)(6)@state.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2021 12:24 PM
To: Feith, David (b)(6)@state.gov>
Subject: FW: WIV Document Declass

Just getting to this; here's Beigun's take. (b)(5)

From: Biegun, Stephen E (b)(6)@state.gov>
Sent: Thursday, January 14, 2021 11:00 PM
To: Stilwell, David R (b)(6)@state.gov>
Cc: Palladino, Robert J (b)(6)@state.gov>
Subject: Re: WIV Document Declass

OK. (b)(5)
(b)(5)

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 14, 2021, at 8:59 PM, Stilwell, David R (b)(6)@state.gov> wrote:

Sir
Thank you for your consideration and apologies for adding to the last-minute close-out thrash. We had this ready before Christmas, but it keeps getting pushed.

After POTUS and then S statements on WIV origins in April were savaged by the media, we're very sensitive to the question of credibility. (b)(5)

(b)(5)

(b)(5)

(b)(5)

the goal is

to make clear that any investigation that does not include the most obvious possible origin of the outbreak would be incomplete. The ultimate goal is to prevent this from ever happening again.

Best

Dave

Among scientists, suspicions about the WIV have been ongoing since January—this article lays out the sequence well. It also paints a disturbing picture of supposedly objective scientists actively supporting a theory they know is false:

When word spread in January that a novel coronavirus had caused an outbreak in Wuhan—which is a thousand miles from where the bats that carry this lineage of viruses are naturally found—many experts were quietly alarmed. There was no proof that the lab was the source of the virus, but the pieces fit.

Despite the evidence, the scientific community quickly dismissed the idea. Peter Daszak, president of EcoHealth Alliance, which has funded the work of the Wuhan Institute of Virology and other labs searching for new viruses, called the notion “preposterous,” and many other experts echoed that sentiment.

That wasn’t necessarily what every scientist thought in private, though. “They can’t speak directly,” one scientist told me confidentially, referring to the virology community’s fear of having their comments sensationalized in today’s politically charged environment. “Many virologists don’t want to be hated by everyone in the field.”

This researcher, Alina Chan, was too young and too idealistic to be cowed by the scientific apparatus—her persistence helped change the narrative in the scientific world. Dr Peter Dazsak (that name keeps coming up) tried to undermine her research, but she held her ground and he eventually had to concede.

Our task isn’t to sit in judgment of Fauci or Dazsak or the Virology world. It’s to get them to admit that the WIV was the most likely cause of the pandemic. This article suggests the following outcome:

Antonio Regalado, biomedicine editor of *MIT Technology Review*, put it more bluntly. If it turned out COVID-19 came from a lab, he tweeted, “it would shatter the scientific edifice top to bottom.” That’s a pretty good incentive to simply dismiss the whole hypothesis, but it quickly amounted to a global gaslighting of the media—and, by proxy, the public. An unhealthy absolutism set in: Either you insisted that any questions about lab involvement were absurd, or you were a tool of the Trump administration and its desperation to