

Ronchetti Supported Getting Rid Of The ACA, But Does Not Have A Plan To Replace It

Ronchetti Wanted To Replace Obamacare...

Ronchetti Claimed That “We Need To Replace Obamacare.” “I’m on Obamacare right now because when I left my job, I had to do it. And I’ll tell you what, you pay sky high insurance premiums and you have incredibly high deductibles here. But what hurts us most in these situations is that through Obamacare it is so tight the way the money has to be used, it isn’t used correctly especially in this state. There are states that have tried to get out of some of these restrictions. And in fact the Trump administration has given individual states more flexibility to adjust as they need to here. So we need to replace Obamacare. But beyond that we also have to do here is give people more influence over the money that is spent on their behalf. There’s no reason Medicare, Medicaid or our jobs should determine where our dollars go, we should determine that with individual private plans.” [Vimeo, KSVP TV, 59:25-1:02:05, [5/19/20](#)]

...But Offered No Viable Replacement

Ronchetti’s Campaign Website Offered Generic Talking Points, But No Viable Plan For Health Care

During The Primary, Ronchetti’s Campaign Website Offered Generic Talking Points, But No Viable Plan For Health Care – It Simply Claimed That “Increasing And Improving Access To Healthcare Is Possible By Supporting Policies That Lower Costs While Protecting Quality And Choice.” “Mark supports protecting coverage for those who have pre-existing conditions and making sure they have the care they need. Increasing and improving access to healthcare is possible by supporting policies that lower costs while protecting quality and choice. Every American should be able to pick the healthcare plan that they want, not one the government picks for them.” [MarkRonchetti.com, Issues, accessed [6/3/20](#)]

Despite Ronchetti’s Claims, It is Well Established Fact that Getting Rid of the Affordable Care Act Eliminates Pre-Existing Condition Protections

The ACA Provides Those With Pre-Existing Conditions “Crucial Protections” & Ensures They Can No Longer Denied Coverage For Being Sick

Washington Post: “Before The Affordable Care Act, Insurance Companies Could Consider A Person’s Health Status When Determining Premiums, Sometimes Making Coverage Unaffordable Or Even Unavailable If A Person Was Already Sick.” “Before the Affordable Care Act, insurance companies could

consider a person's health status when determining premiums, sometimes making coverage unaffordable or even unavailable if a person was already sick with a problem that required expensive treatment." [The Washington Post, [6/29/20](#)]

The ACA Provided "Crucial Protections" For Those With Pre-Existing Conditions, Including Prohibiting Insurers From Denying Coverage Of Charging More Based On Health Status, Prohibiting Annual Or Lifetime Limits On Coverage, And Requiring Plans To Cover Essential Health Benefits. "The ACA put in place crucial protections for people with pre-existing health conditions. It prohibits insurers from denying coverage or charging higher premiums based on health status, prohibits annual and lifetime limits on coverage, and requires plans to cover essential health benefits such as prescription drugs, mental health care, and substance use treatment. The Trump Administration has sought various ways around the protections, but the new bill would reverse these actions: * It would reverse the Administration's expansion of short-term health plans. These plans are exempt from the ACA's protections. They can and do deny coverage or charge higher premiums based on health status, exclude key benefits, and impose annual limits. * It would reverse the Administration's expansion of association health plans. These plans are also exempt from many ACA protections. That lets them structure benefits and premiums to attract healthier-than-average firms and individuals, increasing premiums for people with pre-existing conditions who continue to purchase ACA coverage in the individual or small group markets.* It would revoke Administration guidance encouraging states to seek waivers directly and indirectly undermining pre-existing conditions protections. * It would undo Administration changes that weaken standards for what individual market plans have to cover." [CBPP, [3/26/19](#)]

AP: Without the law, people who recovered from COVID-19 and tried to purchase an individual health insurance policy could be turned down... "Without the law, people who recovered from COVID-19 and tried to purchase an individual health insurance policy could be turned down, charged higher premiums or have follow-up care excluded from coverage." [Associated Press, [5/3/20](#)]

Like Ronchetti, Trump Has Claimed That ACA Repeal Won't End Protections for Pre-existing Conditions -- This Has Been Debunked By Fact-Checkers Repeatedly.

Trump, Like Ronchetti, Claimed He Supported Pre-Existing Condition Protections, Which The Washington Post Called A "Bottomless Pinocchio"

HEADLINE: "Bottomless Pinocchio: Trump's Claim That He Will 'Always' Protect Those With Preexisting Conditions." [Washington Post, [6/29/20](#)]

While Trump's Administration Sought To Overturn The ACA In Court, Trump Claimed On Twitter, "I Will Always Protect People With Pre-Existing Conditions, Always, Always, Always!!!" "Now that the very expensive, unpopular and unfair Individual Mandate provision has been terminated by us, many States & the U.S. are asking the Supreme Court that Obamacare itself be terminated so that it can be replaced with a FAR BETTER AND MUCH LESS EXPENSIVE ALTERNATIVE..... Obamacare is a joke! Deductible is far too high and the overall cost is ridiculous. My Administration has gone out of its way to manage OC much better than previous, but it is still no good. I will ALWAYS PROTECT PEOPLE WITH PRE-EXISTING CONDITIONS, ALWAYS, ALWAYS,ALWAYS!!!' — President Trump, in a pair of tweets, June 27, 2020." [The Washington Post, [6/29/20](#)]

The Washington Post: “The Legal Brief Filed By The Justice Department Last Week Belies The President’s Claim. It Says Point Blank That The Entire Affordable Care Act — Including Its Coverage Guarantee For People With Preexisting Conditions — ‘Must Fall.’” “Key provisions of the health-care law prohibit insurers from denying coverage to people who are already sick, or who have ‘preexisting conditions.’ Trump has claimed nearly 100 times since he took office that he will ‘always protect people with preexisting conditions,’ but the legal brief filed by the Justice Department last week belies the president’s claim. It says point blank that the entire Affordable Care Act — including its coverage guarantee for people with preexisting conditions — ‘must fall.’” [The Washington Post, [6/29/20](#)]

CNBC: “President Donald Trump’s promise to protect pre-existing conditions coverage, perhaps the most popular Affordable Care Act provision, rings hollow. That’s because his administration is backing a lawsuit that would scrap it.” “President Donald Trump’s promise to protect pre-existing conditions coverage, perhaps the most popular Affordable Care Act provision, rings hollow. That’s because his administration is backing a lawsuit that would scrap it. As Republicans face midterm election pressure from an energized Democratic base over their efforts to repeal Obamacare, the president tweeted Thursday that ‘all Republicans support people with pre-existing conditions’ or ‘will after I speak to them’ if they do not already. He added that ‘I am in total support.’ His administration’s actions suggest otherwise. The Justice Department has declined to defend the health care law in court against a suit from 20 GOP-led states challenging Obamacare’s constitutionality. They argue the rest of the law does not hold up after Republicans rolled back its individual mandate provision last year. By doing so, the Trump administration tacitly supported the suit, which could roll back Obamacare’s coverage guarantees for people with pre-existing conditions if it succeeds.” [CNBC, [10/19/18](#)]

While The Trump Administration Has Not Succeeded In Fully Repealing The ACA, It Has Sabotaged The Law, Including Provisions Protecting Those With Pre-Existing Conditions

The Trump Administration Sought Various Ways To Undermine The Pre-Existing Conditions In The ACA, Including By Expanding Short-Term And Association Health Plans, Which Are Exempt From ACA Protections. “The ACA put in place crucial protections for people with pre-existing health conditions. It prohibits insurers from denying coverage or charging higher premiums based on health status, prohibits annual and lifetime limits on coverage, and requires plans to cover essential health benefits such as prescription drugs, mental health care, and substance use treatment. The Trump Administration has sought various ways around the protections, but the new bill would reverse these actions: * It would reverse the Administration’s expansion of short-term health plans. These plans are exempt from the ACA’s protections. They can and do deny coverage or charge higher premiums based on health status, exclude key benefits, and impose annual limits. * It would reverse the Administration’s expansion of association health plans. These plans are also exempt from many ACA protections. That lets them structure benefits and premiums to attract healthier-than-average firms and individuals, increasing premiums for people with pre-existing conditions who continue to purchase ACA coverage in the individual or small group markets.* It would revoke Administration guidance encouraging states to seek waivers directly and indirectly undermining pre-existing conditions protections. * It would undo Administration changes that weaken standards for what individual market plans have to cover.” [CBPP, [3/26/19](#)]

The Trump Administration Weakened Standards For What Individual Market Plans Needed To Cover And Encouraged States To Seek Waivers That Would Undermine Pre-Existing Conditions Protections In The ACA. “The ACA put in place crucial protections for people with pre-existing health conditions. It prohibits insurers from denying coverage or charging higher premiums based on health status, prohibits annual and lifetime limits on coverage, and requires plans to cover essential health benefits such as prescription drugs, mental health care, and

substance use treatment. The Trump Administration has sought various ways around the protections, but the new bill would reverse these actions: * It would reverse the Administration’s expansion of short-term health plans. These plans are exempt from the ACA’s protections. They can and do deny coverage or charge higher premiums based on health status, exclude key benefits, and impose annual limits. * It would reverse the Administration’s expansion of association health plans. These plans are also exempt from many ACA protections. That lets them structure benefits and premiums to attract healthier-than-average firms and individuals, increasing premiums for people with pre-existing conditions who continue to purchase ACA coverage in the individual or small group markets.* It would revoke Administration guidance encouraging states to seek waivers directly and indirectly undermining pre-existing conditions protections. * It would undo Administration changes that weaken standards for what individual market plans have to cover.” [CBPP, [3/26/19](#)]

Washington Post: The Trump Administration Issued New Rules Promoting “The Use Of Low-Quality, Short-Term Plans That Were Prohibited Under Obamacare,” Which “Typically Don’t Have The Same Protections For People With Existing Health Conditions, Allowing Insurance Companies To Deny Coverage Or Charge Higher Prices.” “The Trump administration also has issued new rules that promote the use of low-quality, short-term plans that were prohibited under Obamacare. These plans typically don’t have the same protections for people with existing health conditions, allowing insurance companies to deny coverage or charge higher prices. (A number of states, mainly Democratic-leaning, have acted to prohibit or limit these Trump plans.)” [The Washington Post, [6/29/20](#)]

Ronchetti Supported Efforts Of The Trump Administration To Sabotage The ACA, Which Has Included Undermining The Protections The Law Created For Those With Pre-Existing Conditions

Ronchetti Supported The Trump Administration After It Eliminated The “Restrictions” In The ACA, Claiming, “The Trump Administration Has Given Individual States More Flexibility To Adjust As They Need.” “I’m on Obamacare right now because when I left my job, I had to do it. And I’ll tell you what, you pay sky high insurance premiums and you have incredibly high deductibles here. But what hurts us most in these situations is that through Obamacare it is so tight the way the money has to be used, it isn’t used correctly especially in this state. There are states that have tried to get out of some of these restrictions. And in fact the Trump administration has given individual states more flexibility to adjust as they need to here. So we need to replace Obamacare. But beyond that we also have to do here is give people more influence over the money that is spent on their behalf. There’s no reason Medicare, Medicaid or our jobs should determine where our dollars go, we should determine that with individual private plans.” [Vimeo, KSVP TV, 59:25-1:02:05, [5/19/20](#)]

Ronchetti Is A Staunch Trump Supporter Who Stated He Supports Trump’s Agenda, Including On TV

In A TV Advertisement, Ronchetti Said He Stands With President Trump. “I stand with President Trump.” [Ronchetti for Senate TV Ad, Youtube, [5/12/20](#)]

Ronchetti’s Campaign Website Listed Support For Trump As His Top Issue. Ronchetti’s campaign website issue section listed support for President Trump as Ronchetti’s top issue, followed by ‘Jobs and the Economy.’

Issues

President Trump

Mark Ronchetti is a proud conservative who supports President Trump, because his policies are improving the lives of New Mexicans. As a result of those policies, unemployment rates are at historic lows, our military has been rebuilt which directly impacts New Mexico's bases and labs, and new oil and gas revenue has led to a massive state surplus. Most importantly, the Trump administration is sending federal resources to help tackle the crime epidemic in New Mexico. Unfortunately, our congressional delegation is so blinded by partisanship they refuse to work across the aisle, even when doing so would benefit New Mexicans.

Mark believes you should never hate your political opponents more than you love New Mexico. We must elect a U.S. Senator who will always put the people of New Mexico first.

[Mark Ronchetti for Senate, accessed [2/14/20](#)]

Ronchetti's Campaign Website Cited Trump's Policies As The Reason For Ronchetti's Support Of Trump.

"Mark Ronchetti is a proud conservative who supports President Trump, because his policies are improving the lives of New Mexicans." [Mark Ronchetti for Senate, accessed [2/14/20](#)]

Ronchetti Launched Facebook Ads Pledging His Support For Trump's Agenda. "I will support President Trump's agenda and fight for conservative values in D.C."

 About social issues, elections or politics

 **Mark Ronchetti**
Sponsored • Paid for by Mark Ronchetti for New Mexico

YOU CAN VOTE TODAY! I am a principled conservative that wants our borders secure, crime low, and our economy booming. I will support President Trump's agenda and fight for conservative values in Washington DC. Click below to find a polling location!



BERNCO.GOV
Find Your Voting Site
Click Here to Vote for Mark Ronchetti

 Amount spent (USD): <\$100

 Potential Reach: 10K - 50K people

[Facebook Ad Library, accessed [5/22/20](#)]

Ronchetti Launched A Facebook Ad Claiming He Will Stand With Trump. “If you want a political outsider that will represent your conservative [sic] and stand by President Trump, click below to find your voting site and vote ‘Mark Ronchetti’ for US Senate!”



[Facebook Ad Library, accessed [5/22/20](#)]

If The ACA Were Repealed, New Mexico’s Uninsured Rate Would Skyrocket, Harming The 860,000 Residents With Pre-Existing Conditions, And The State Would Suffer Major Economic Harm

Repealing The Affordable Care Act Would Cause The Number Of People In New Mexico Without Insurance To Increase By 136 Percent & 266,000 People In The State To Lose Their Insurance

Repealing The Affordable Care Act Would Cause The Number Of People In New Mexico Without Insurance To Increase By 136 Percent. “Across the country, 29.8 million people would lose their health insurance if the Affordable Care Act were repealed—more than doubling the number of people without health insurance. And 1.2 million jobs would be lost—not just in health care but across the board. [...] New Mexico The number of people without insurance would jump by 136%. 266,000 people would lose their health insurance.” [Economic Policy Institute, accessed [7/8/20](#)]

Repealing The Affordable Care Act Would Cause 266,000 People In New Mexico To Lose Their Health Insurance. “Across the country, 29.8 million people would lose their health insurance if the Affordable Care Act were repealed—more than doubling the number of people without health insurance. And 1.2 million jobs would be

lost—not just in health care but across the board. [...] New Mexico The number of people without insurance would jump by 136%. 266,000 people would lose their health insurance.” [Economic Policy Institute, accessed [7/8/20](#)]

If The Affordable Care Act Is Repealed, Coverage For 860,000 New Mexicans With Pre-Existing Conditions Would Be Put In Jeopardy

Up To 862,000 People In New Mexico Have Pre-Existing Conditions, And Repealing The ACA Could Jeopardize Their Health Care. According to the Burrell Institute For Health Policy And Research, “The ACA prohibits insurers from denying someone coverage because he or she has a ‘pre-existing condition.’ Repeal of this provision is of serious concern for New Mexicans: Up to 862,000 people in New Mexico, including up to 122,000 children, have pre-existing conditions such as asthma, cancer, or diabetes. Without the protection of the pre-existing conditions clause, they will once again have to worry about being denied coverage or charged higher prices because of their health status or history.” [Burrell Institute For Health Policy And Research, [2017](#)]

Repealing The ACA Would Have A “Devastating” Impact On The Economy – Total Employment In New Mexico Would Drop By 3.9 Percent And 31,853 Jobs Would Be Lost

Repealing The ACA Would Have A “Devastating” Impact On The Economy, With The Economic Policy Institute Finding That Total Employment In New Mexico Would Drop By 3.9 Percent And 31,853 Jobs Would Be Lost. “Losing health insurance would also be devastating for family finances and hurt the economy. By helping pick up the tab for individual insurance and expanding coverage on Medicaid, the ACA has helped millions of Americans afford their care. If this support were withdrawn, people would have less money to spend on other basic necessities like food and rent. Fewer dollars spent at grocery stores and other businesses means 1.2 million jobs would be lost. [...] New Mexico: Total employment in New Mexico would drop by 3.9%, 31,853 jobs in New Mexico would be lost. This would eliminate 38.6 out of every 1,000 jobs. New Mexico would lose \$2.3 billion in federal health care dollars.” [Economic Policy Institute, accessed [7/8/20](#)]

Economic Policy Institute: Repealing The ACA Would “This Would Eliminate 38.6 Out Of Every 1,000 Jobs” In New Mexico And The State “Would Lose \$2.3 Billion In Federal Health Care Dollars.” “Losing health insurance would also be devastating for family finances and hurt the economy. By helping pick up the tab for individual insurance and expanding coverage on Medicaid, the ACA has helped millions of Americans afford their care. If this support were withdrawn, people would have less money to spend on other basic necessities like food and rent. Fewer dollars spent at grocery stores and other businesses means 1.2 million jobs would be lost. [...] New Mexico: Total employment in New Mexico would drop by 3.9%, 31,853 jobs in New Mexico would be lost. This would eliminate 38.6 out of every 1,000 jobs New Mexico would lose \$2.3 billion in federal health care dollars.” [Economic Policy Institute, accessed [7/8/20](#)]

The Affordable Care Act Decreased The Likelihood That A Rural Hospital Would Close

The Medicaid Expansion Included In The ACA Substantially Lowered The Likelihood Of Rural Hospital Closure. “Comprehensive research in the journal Health Affairs was recently published looking at the effect of state Medicaid expansions on hospital closures. Focusing on especially rural hospitals, the authors conducted a comprehensive and sophisticated analysis, finding: ‘[T]he ACA’s Medicaid expansion was associated with improved hospital financial performance and substantially lower likelihoods of closure, especially in rural markets and counties with large numbers of uninsured adults before Medicaid expansion.’” [Georgetown University Health Policy Institute Center for Children and Families, [1/12/18](#)]

Trump Lied About The Dangers Of COVID-19

Trump Knew Of The Risks Of COVID-19 In Early February. “President Trump acknowledged to the journalist Bob Woodward that he had knowingly played down the coronavirus earlier this year even though he was aware it was ‘deadly’ and vastly more serious than the seasonal flu. ‘This is deadly stuff,’ Mr. Trump said on Feb. 7 in one of a series of interviews Mr. Woodward conducted with the president for his upcoming book, ‘Rage.’ The Washington Post and CNN were given advance copies of the book and published details on Wednesday. CNN also provided audio of some of Mr. Trump’s exchanges with Mr. Woodward.” [New York Times, [9/11/20](#)]

Trump Publicly Denied The Risks Of COVID-19. “That was a vastly different story than Mr. Trump was telling the public. In early March the president was suggesting on Twitter that the virus was less deadly than the flu. ‘I wanted to always play it down,’ Mr. Trump told Mr. Woodward on March 19. ‘I still like playing it down, because I don’t want to create a panic.’” [New York Times, [9/11/20](#)]

Ronchetti Praised Trump’s Response To The COVID-19 Pandemic

Ronchetti Praised Trump’s Response To The COVID-19 Pandemic

Ronchetti Said Trump’s Response To The Pandemic Was “Very Good.” Well, we’re able to bend the curve back down, we did not run out of beds, we did not run out of ventilators. And now we’re in a situation where we do have hospital room for the people who need it. In fact, we have excess hospital room and starting to ramp back up elective surgeries again. So I think our response and the President’s response was very good. But we also going forward now know, we don’t have a good faith factor on the other side in China, but we’ve known that before. So we have to move forward knowing that we don’t have the best information. While not at the start. We definitely got ourselves to a point where it was very well dealt with.” [Vimeo, KSVP TV, 59:25-1:02:05, [5/19/20](#)]

Thousands Of Deaths Could Have Been Prevented By An Earlier Response To The COVID-19 Pandemic

August 14, 2020: At Least 167,298 Have Died From Coronavirus. “At least 167,298 people have died in the US from coronavirus, Johns Hopkins University reported Friday.” [CNN, [8/14/20](#)]

An Analysis From Columbia University Concluded That The U.S. Could Have Prevented Roughly 36,000 Covid Deaths And Reduced Infections By 700,000 If Broad Social Distancing Measures Had Been Put In Place Just One Week Earlier In March. NPR reported, “The U.S. could have prevented roughly 36,000 deaths from COVID-19 if broad social distancing measures had been put in place just one week earlier in March, according to an analysis from Columbia University. Underlining the importance of aggressively responding to the coronavirus, the study found the U.S. could have avoided at least 700,000 fewer infections if actions that began on March 15 had actually started on March 8.” [NPR, [5/21/20](#)]

Ronchetti Spread False Rumors About The Coronavirus Pandemic

Ronchetti Spread False Rumors About The Coronavirus

Ronchetti Spread The Theory That COVID-19 Originated In A Chinese Lab

May 5, 2020: Ronchetti Spread The Theory That COVID-19 Originated In A Chinese Lab, Tweeting That “Evidence Was Mounting” That The Virus May Have Escaped From The Wuhan Institute Of Virology Studies. According to a video Ronchetti posted to Twitter, “Number one: how did this virus end up spreading in Wuhan? Increasing evidence is mounting that the virus may have escaped from a lab. The Wuhan Institute of Virology studies coronaviruses, and has been flagged for poor protective measures by visiting U.S. researchers. If COVID-19 did escape from the lab, we need to know that. The world deserves to know the truth one way or another.” [Twitter, @MarkRonchettiNM, [5/5/20](#)]

Ronchetti Spread The Theory That COVID-19 Would Disappear In Warm Weather

In March 2020, Meteorologist Ronchetti Shared On Twitter His Speculation That Temperature Would Have A “Significant Role On The Spread Of COVID-19.” According to a tweet from Ronchetti, “This is very interesting analysis from @RyanMaue. Temp will likely have a significant role on the spread of Covid-19. It’s simplified yes but some future clues to what may unfold can be found.” [Twitter, @MarkRonchettiNM, [3/14/20](#)]

The Original Tweet Was From Meteorologist Ryan Maue, Who Speculated That Rising Temperatures Could Contribute To A Decrease In Covid Cases. [Twitter, @RyanMaue, [7/2/20](#)]

Leading Experts Repeatedly Dismissed The Theory That COVID-19 Originated In A Chinese Lab

Fauci Dismissed The Possibility That COVID-19 Escaped From A Lab. “If you look at the evolution of the virus in bats and what’s out there now, [the scientific evidence] is very, very strongly leaning toward this could not have been artificially or deliberately manipulated ... Everything about the stepwise evolution over time strongly indicates that [this virus] evolved in nature and then jumped species,” Fauci says. Based on the scientific evidence, he also doesn’t entertain an alternate theory—that someone found the coronavirus in the wild, brought it to a lab, and then it accidentally escaped.” [National Geographic, [5/4/20](#)]

In Both April And May Of 2020, Fauci Went On Record To Dismiss The Theory That The Coronavirus Originated In A Lab In Wuhan. CBS News reported, “Dr. Anthony Fauci, the nation’s top infectious disease expert, again dismissed the idea that a lab in Wuhan, China, was the original source of the coronavirus. In an interview with National Geographic published Monday, Fauci cited scientific evidence that shows the virus was not man-made. Fauci, who is on the White House Coronavirus Task Force, told the wildlife magazine that COVID-19 likely originated in an animal and then transmitted to humans. He made similar comments last month during a White House briefing. ‘If you look at the evolution of the virus in bats and what’s out there now, [the scientific evidence] is very, very strongly leaning toward this could not have been artificially or deliberately manipulated ... Everything about the stepwise evolution over time strongly indicates that [this virus] evolved in nature and then jumped

species,' said Fauci, the director of the U.S. National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases.” [CBS News, [5/5/20](#)]

Fauci Pushed Back On Theories That The Novel Coronavirus Came From A Laboratory. “At the daily White House press briefing, a reporter asked: ‘Mr. President, I wanted to ask Dr. Fauci: Could you address these suggestions or concerns that this virus was somehow manmade, possibly came out of a laboratory in China?’ ‘There was a study recently that we can make available to you, where a group of highly qualified evolutionary virologists looked at the sequences there and the sequences in bats as they evolve. And the mutations that it took to get to the point where it is now is totally consistent with a jump of a species from an animal to a human,’ Fauci replied.” [Business Insider, [4/18/20](#)]

Nature Medicine: SARS-CoV-2 Is Not A Laboratory Construct Or A Purposefully Manipulated Virus. “We offer a perspective on the notable features of the SARS-CoV-2 genome and discuss scenarios by which they could have arisen. Our analyses clearly show that SARS-CoV-2 is not a laboratory construct or a purposefully manipulated virus.” [Nature Medicine, [3/17/20](#)]

Experts Concluded That Warm Weather Would Not Control The Coronavirus

New York Times: A Working Paper Concluded That “Warm Weather Alone Will Not Control The Virus In America Or Abroad” And That “Weather On Its Own Cannot Meaningfully Reduce Infections.” The New York Times reported, “For many people living with the crushing consequences of Covid-19, the summer offers a tantalizing possibility: If the coronavirus behaves like the seasonal flu, warm weather could substantially weaken the virus and allow normal life to resume. President Trump predicted exactly this outcome in February, claiming the virus would ‘miraculously’ go away by April as temperatures rose. A new working paper tries to put that speculation to rest by tracking how weather and other environmental conditions, such as pollution, affect the virus’s spread around the world. The forecast from researchers is grim: Warm weather alone will not control the virus in America or abroad. Here are the results for the United States, showing weather on its own cannot meaningfully reduce infections to the rate of 1 new case per every infected person, the point by which the number of infections falls continuously.” [New York Times, [5/21/20](#)]

Harvard Medical School Assistant Professor & Coauthor Of A Study On The Impact Of Weather On Covid-19 Transmission: “At The End Of The Day, This Whole Effect From Weather And Pollution Is Still Pretty Minor. [...] No Government Should Rely On The Effect Of The Weather.” The New York Times reported, “For many people living with the crushing consequences of Covid-19, the summer offers a tantalizing possibility: If the coronavirus behaves like the seasonal flu, warm weather could substantially weaken the virus and allow normal life to resume. President Trump predicted exactly this outcome in February, claiming the virus would ‘miraculously’ go away by April as temperatures rose. A new working paper tries to put that speculation to rest by tracking how weather and other environmental conditions, such as pollution, affect the virus’s spread around the world. [...] ‘At the end of the day, this whole effect from weather and pollution is still pretty minor,’ said Mohammad Jalali, an assistant professor at Harvard Medical School and one of the study’s authors. ‘No government should rely on the effect of the weather.’” [New York Times, [5/21/20](#)]