

Genetically modified people: what could go wrong?

by

Jon Rappoport

on

[Jon Rappoport](#)



Genes, genes, genes: hype, hype, hype

Notes on Brave New World, against which freedom is the prime option

Freedom to refuse

Notes on Brave New World, against which freedom is the prime option

Freedom to refuse-

I'll get to genetically modified people; but first, the background on the grand gene hype and propaganda operation—

Cancer.

The war against cancer has painted a picture of hope: genetic solutions.

This, despite the fact that there are no successful genetic treatments, across the board, for any form of human cancer.

The focus on genes is a diversion from obvious causes of cancer in the environment: industrial chemicals, pollutants, pesticides, food additives, and even pharmaceuticals.

This futile human gene-fix has a direct parallel in food crops: modify plants so they can grow despite drenching them with toxic pesticides.

However, massive GMO crop failures, reduced nutritive value of such crops, and the rise of super-weeds are three reasons why the gene model fails.

So it is with human cancer: "let's modify the genes of people and they will be impervious to the environmental assault of chemicals that cause cancer."

In other words, the fantasy proposes that someday, humans will be able to live in a toxic soup created by mega-corporations, and even thrive, because they have been genetically altered.

There is no reason under the sun to believe this.

"Trust us. Even if environmental toxins trigger gene mutations that bring about cancer, we can just cancel out those mutations through better human engineering."

Preposterous.

This is like saying you can cure diseases caused by germs even though people's immune systems are severely and chronically compromised.

The entire cancer industry exists to protect the corporations that are manufacturing products that cause cancer.

I've made these points during radio interviews, and I make them here again, because major media news outlets are silent; they are part of the cancer industry and are beholden to the cancer-causing corporations that buy huge blocks of advertising.

In the so-called research community, scientists can spin their wheels and obtain grant monies to do experiments with genes and mice and "cell lines" (*) forever and never emerge with results that will save lives. (*) (Note: by the way, did you know there is a huge, general scandal with "cell lines"? More on that here.)

These scientists and their corporate masters can herald minor tumor reductions. But nothing changes. The war on cancer is a war on people.

Assuming gene damage can cause cancer, the triggering event can occur as a result of coming into contact with environmental toxins. In other words, the toxic effects on genes will continue apace, no matter how much research is done on the composition and disposition of the genes themselves.

Much cancer research does, in fact, discover toxic causes—and it is in the interest of companies that spew those compounds out into the world to cover up their criminal guilt. What better way to achieve that than by asserting: "cancer is all in the genes."

Look at the giant biotech companies like Monsanto, Bayer, DuPont, Syngenta. In one way or another, they are all involved in chemical AND genetic research and production.

So they are in a prime position to deflect the chemical destruction they are wreaking by pushing "the frontiers of gene research."

"It's all about the genes."

Hype. Hype. Hype.

Dr. Samuel Epstein, who devoted a major part of his life to the research of environmental toxins, wrote:

"We are losing the war against cancer. The prohibition of new carcinogenic products, reduction of toxins in use, and right-to-know laws – these are among the legislative proposals which could reverse the cancer epidemic."

But that would be bad for business. The solution? Promote endlessly the notion that genes and only genes are at the root of cancer.

The big picture? The big con? Imagine a world drowning in pollution of all kinds, and top (bought-off) scientists saying: "Don't worry, when it comes to cancer we've got it covered. Tweak this gene, tweak that gene, and poof, cancer never has a chance. Or if you get cancer, we can go in there and re-position crucial genes and knock out the disease. See, you can live in a chemical soup and never feel adverse effects..."

Genes. High-level, high-flying, high-minded, high-tech answers for the problems we face.

What? The science isn't solid? The propaganda is wall-to-wall? The shills are everywhere? Don't worry, be happy. The best minds will come up with solutions. Just wait and see. The great discoveries are right around the corner.

And I have condos for sale on Jupiter.

Step right up.

Autism.

You can see the same kind of gene-hustle when it comes to autism, which many researchers, based on no real evidence, claim is "surely a genetic disease."

This assertion covers up the fact that happy and healthy children, soon after receiving a vaccination, experience devastating neurological damage, leading to a diagnosis of autism.

But don't go there, don't look there, don't talk about vaccines. No, instead, listen to the ascendant experts, who say it was just a coincidence that a vaccine was given and a child's life was destroyed. You see, what really happened was: an errant gene response kicked in at the same moment as the shot of vaccine. A grand coincidence. Nothing to do with the vaccine. Certainly not.

In actuality, the dominant paradigm of this world's power structure is: float cover stories.

Sell big cover stories and keep selling them. Use them to conceal ongoing crimes.

"It's the genes" is the latest and greatest cover.

Some of the biggest, best-educated liars on the planet deploy it every day.

Vaccines.

Here is the next big thing: genes injected, functioning as vaccines. The hype is over the top. Of course, scientists admit that these injected genes will incorporate themselves in the body and alter its genetic makeup permanently.

If you like and trust that idea, I have condos in the core of the sun for sale. Bargain prices.

The reference is the New York Times, 3/9/15, "Protection Without a Vaccine." It describes the frontier of research. Here are key quotes that illustrate the use of synthetic genes to "protect against disease," while changing the genetic makeup of humans. This is not science fiction:

"By delivering synthetic genes into the muscles of the [experimental] monkeys, the scientists are essentially re-engineering the animals to resist disease."

"'The sky's the limit', said Michael Farzan, an immunologist at Scripps and lead author of the new study."

"The first human trial based on this strategy — called immunoprophylaxis by gene transfer, or I.G.T. — is underway, and several new ones are planned."

"I.G.T. is altogether different from traditional vaccination. It is instead a form of gene therapy. Scientists isolate the genes that produce powerful antibodies against certain diseases and then synthesize artificial versions. The genes are placed into viruses and injected into human tissue, usually muscle."

Here is the punchline: "The viruses invade human cells with their DNA payloads, and the synthetic gene is incorporated into the recipient's own DNA. If all goes well, the new genes instruct the cells to begin manufacturing powerful antibodies."

Read that again: "the synthetic gene is incorporated into the recipient's own DNA." Alteration of the human genetic makeup. Not just a "visit." "Permanent residence."

The Times article taps Dr. David Baltimore (Nobel laureate and chair of the organizing committee for the Second International Summit on Human Genome Editing — which just concluded in Hong Kong) for an opinion:

"Still, Dr. Baltimore says that he envisions that some people might be leery of a vaccination strategy that means altering their own DNA, even if it prevents a potentially fatal disease."

Yes, some people might be leery. If they have two or three working brain cells.

Let's take this further. Under the cover of preventing disease (note: all good covert ops float a laudatory goal to conceal their true intent), vaccines are ideal carriers for all sorts of genes that would be permanently incorporated into the human structure.

The enormous tonnage of propaganda about vaccines, and the resultant mandatory laws that enforce vaccination (without fear of liability), create a powerful channel along which re-engineering is eminently possible.

Synthetic genes injected into billions of humans would form a grand experiment to create an altered species.

This grand experiment could be compartmentalized. For example, secretly, genes 1-6 will be injected into Group A in geo-location I. Genes 7-12 will be injected into Group B in location II. And so on.

Vaccine recipients will be subjected to ongoing surveillance to gauge the results. On various pretexts, members of these groups will be brought into clinics for exams and tests, to discover markers that purportedly reveal their bodies' responses to the genetic alterations.

Are these people stronger or weaker? Do they exhibit signs of illness? Do they report behavioral changes? Through surveillance and testing, all sorts of information can be compiled.

Of course, there is no informed consent. The human guinea pigs have no knowledge of what is being done to them.

And what would be the objectives of this lunatic research program? They would vary. On a simplified level, there would be two. Create weaker and more docile and more obedient and more dependent humans. On the other side, create stronger and healthier and more intelligent and more talented humans. Obviously, the results of the latter experiments would be applied to the "chosen few." And

clearly, some of this research will be carried on inside the military. Secrecy is easier to maintain, and the aim to produce "better soldiers" is a long-standing goal of the Pentagon and its research arm, DARPA.

A global vaccine experiment of the type I'm describing here has another bonus for the planners: those people who fall ill or die can be written off as having suffered from various diseases and disorders which "have nothing to do with vaccines." This is already SOP (standard operating procedure) for the medical cartel.

The numbers of casualties, in this grand experiment, would be of no concern to the Brave New World shapers. As I've documented extensively, the US medical system is already killing 2.25 million people per decade ([a conservative estimate](#)), as a result of FDA-approved drugs and mistreatment in hospitals. Major media and government leaders, aware of this fact, have done nothing about it.

Genetically modified people.

Here is a quote from Princeton molecular biologist, Lee Silver, the author of *Remaking Eden*. It gives you a window into how important geneticists are thinking about an engineered future:

"The GenRich—who account for ten percent of the American population—[will] all carry synthetic genes. All aspects of the economy, the media, the entertainment industry, and the knowledge industry are controlled by members of the GenRich class...

"Naturals [unaltered humans] work as low-paid service providers or as laborers. [Eventually] the GenRich class and the Natural class will become entirely separate species with no ability to crossbreed, and with as much romantic interest in each other as a current human would have for a chimpanzee.

"Many think that it is inherently unfair for some people to have access to technologies that can provide advantages while others, less well-off, are forced to depend on chance alone, [but] American society adheres to the principle that personal liberty and personal fortune are the primary determinants of what individuals are allowed and able to do.

"Indeed, in a society that values individual freedom above all else, it is hard to find any legitimate basis for restricting the use of repro[grammed]-genetics. I will argue [that] the use of reprogenetic technologies is inevitable. [W]hether we like it or not, the global marketplace will reign supreme."

Here is another gem, from Gregory Stock, former director of the program in Medicine, Technology, and Society at the UCLA School of Medicine:

"Even if half the world's species were lost [during genetic experiments], enormous diversity would still remain. When those in the distant future look back on this period of history, they will likely see it not as the era when the natural environment was impoverished, but as the age when a plethora of new forms—some biological, some technological, some a combination of the two—burst onto the scene. We best serve ourselves, as well as future generations, by focusing on the short-term consequences of our actions rather than our vague notions about the needs of the distant future."

"Ethics."

Notice that these two well-known scientists are speaking about "ethics". It's important to realize that a significant number of such experts have their own extremely peculiar (to say the least) version of what is right and wrong.

With vaccines that permanently alter human genetic makeup on the horizon, and given the corporate and government-agency penchant for secrecy, we are already inhabiting the Brave New World. It's not a distant prospect.

Every genetic innovation is aimed at bringing us closer to a stimulus-response world, and further



away from freedom.

Which is why the defense of freedom becomes ever more vital.

That struggle comes down to who controls, yes, the philosophy and the science. Is each human merely and only a system waiting to be re-engineered, or is he something far, far more, inhabiting a physical form?

We already know what the vast majority of brain researchers and geneticists believe, as well as the governments and corporations and universities and foundations that make important decisions.

Of course, these days, the college faculty department considered to be the least important, the most useless, a mere appendage waiting for those with wisdom to put it out of its misery and kill it off...is the philosophy department.

That leaves us to take up the argument and the resistance.

Not Lee Silver at Princeton or Gregory Stock or Bill Gates or George Soros or David Rockefeller or the Pope or Stephen Hawking or Monsanto or Dow or PBS or FOX or socialists or Communists or liberals or conservatives or some wackadoodle at Harvard or MIT or UCLA.

Us.

Us.