

In China they are eating babies, in Loma Linda, they are — Harvesting Organs

The following is excerpted from an article in the January 1996 issue of Rutherford, the official journal of the Rutherford Institute (Charlottesville, VA). We have added subheads.

When reports of Chinese citizens eating human fetuses for health reasons surfaced in Hong Kong last year, many dismissed them as fiction . . . , but when *Eastweek* and *Eastern Express*, two English-language publications based in Hong Kong, investigated, the reporters were in for a shock.

DISCOVERY IN CHINA

One investigator feigned illness and asked a Shenzhen hospital doctor for fetuses. Holding up a fist-sized glass bottle stuffed with ten thumb-sized unborns, the doctor said, “[They were] all aborted this morning. You can take them. We are a state-run hospital and don’t charge anything.” A private hospital spokesman offered to sell the reporters full-term unborn, which he claimed “contain the best healing qualities.”

Zou Qin, a doctor who claimed to have aborted several hundred unborn and eaten 100 fetuses herself, said, “People normally prefer [fetuses from] young women, and even better, the first boy and a male.”

She justifies the practice: “They are wasted if we don’t eat them . . . Zou Qin has fed fetuses to her sister’s children. “I wash them with clear water until they look transpar-

ent white and then stew them. Making soup is best.” A photo depicts Zou Qin smiling, holding up a tiny fetus which hasn’t made it to her bowl yet.

WHAT DO WE DO HERE?

The stories are gruesome and almost unreal. Eating babies? But that, of course, is China, we say. In America, we abort babies, but we don’t eat them.

Or do we?

The ongoing American debate over using fetuses in medicine bears some striking parallels to China. One big difference is that America better understands the importance of “spin” and proper marketing techniques . . .

Donating one’s own organs, or even allowing a loved one’s untimely death to take on added meaning by permitting doctors to use her organs to help another, has a long and respectable history. But by interweaving the taking of life with the giving of life, medicine and science begin to confuse their mission. A quick mention of the aborted fetus, and then on to the happy ending, the discovery, the patient’s cure, the family’s joy!

Real life isn’t that simple.

FETAL RESEARCH IN AMERICA

The history of fetal research is inextricably linked to the 1973 *Roe v. Wade* decision legalizing abortion on demand in America. Other than a very few failed experiments around mid-century, little fetal research had

been done before the 1970s. *Roe* and its progeny placed the preborn human’s body into legal limbo. Thus it became possible to observe the incredible irony of using the body parts of an allegedly non-human fetus to treat specifically human ailments. The heart might still beat, and the [unborn] child feel pain, but the fetus was now considered a “product.”

And like most products, “The fresher, the better.” Deterioration of brain tissue, as well as other bodily organs, commences almost immediately after death. So it became important to create an efficient assembly line which would seamlessly take the baby from the warm womb to deep frozen sterility . . .

Finnish and American scientists did an experiment in 1973, described in *Newsweek*:

“[The team] decapitated a dozen human fetuses, each aborted live through hysterotomy, and kept the heads alive artificially for study. The ghoulish experiment—partially funded by the National Institute of Health—was designed to measure fetal metabolism. At about the same time, another research team kept a batch of aborted fetuses alive in saline solution in order to find out if they could absorb oxygen. One fetus survived for nearly a day.”

STILL BEING DONE TODAY

In 1974, responding to public censure of such science, Congress banned the federal funding of research on aborted fetuses, and tightened those restrictions in 1985.

This did not, however, forbid private institutions from conducting fetal research, since the fetus is not protected by law in the U.S. And the restrictions on [federal] funding were not total: Fetal tissue transplant research, which to this day remains the most medically and monetarily promising “use” for the unborn, was sponsored by the NIH until 1988, when President Reagan’s administration imposed a moratorium on such funding.

Much fetal tissue research remained unaffected by the moratorium, which continued under the Bush administration. The *National Committee for a Human Life Amendment* observed:

“Since the Moratorium took effect, NIH has spent more than \$23.4 million to support 295 research projects involving human fetal tissue.”

As the old reporters’ saw goes, “Follow the money.” During the 1980s and early 90s, research pressed on in a number of areas.

ONE OF THE MOST CONTROVERSIAL: AT LOMA LINDA UNIVERSITY

One of the most controversial programs of the 1980s was that of Loma Linda University Medical Center, who chose to “harvest” the organs of [live] infants with some or most of their brains missing.

The harvesting did, of course, cause the death of such infants; but, since these infants did not in Loma Linda’s opinion qualify for person-

hood, their organs were considered fair game. In 1988 the University gave up the program—but not for moral reasons: The transplants didn’t work.

LOMA LINDA RESEARCH CONTINUES

Loma Linda’s, and other American, fetal research does have a Chinese connection. As Loma Linda’s Medical Center notes in an Internet post:

“A fetal brain bank has been established at Hua Shan Hospital, where fetal brain tissue is held in cryogenic [super cold] preservation as part of a long range basic sciences research program. Parkinson’s is only one of many potential uses for the tissue samples.”

The [LLU] Internet post goes on to note that, for qualified doctors, “potential withdrawals” are available from the Chinese “brain bank.”

In addition, seven North American Parkinson’s sufferers were taken to China between 1989 and 1991 for fetal transplants. [About this project of theirs, the LLU post notes:]

“Success was impressive, but the long standing ban on [aborted] fetal tissue research made this kind of surgery impractical in the U.S.”

And Dr. Z.S. Tang, a fetal tissue research pioneer from China’s Shanghai Medical University and Hua Shan Hospital, was a visiting professor at Loma Linda University Medical Center during the summer and fall of 1992.

A Loma Linda doctor, Robert P. Iacono, returned Tang’s visit by doing fetal tissue graft implants in China.

Back in the U.S., in only the third day of his presidency, Bill Clinton repealed the Reagan/Bush ban in order, he said, to “free science and medicine from the grasp of politics” . . .

WHY THE INDUSTRY WANTS PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTIONS

But the industry has continued to research and develop their “pro-

duct.”

Though many pro-lifers have heard about the newest abortion method, the so-called “D&X” [dilation and extraction, more commonly known as partial-birth abortion], few know that the method is often touted as a superior way to obtain “undamaged” viable fetal tissue. Former abortionist Bernard Nathanson described the technique as used by Swedish doctors harvesting unborns’ brain tissue for treating Parkinson’s disease:

“Pregnant women at 13 to 18 weeks are placed on an operating table, the cervix is dilated, the bag of water is broken, the fetal head is guided into position just above the open cervix, the fetal skull is drilled open and a suction device is placed into the brain . . . the brain substance is then suctioned out and placed immediately on ice to preserve its viability, then the fetus is aborted.”

Similar processes, according to Nathanson, are used in procuring fetal pancreas, fetal liquid and fetal thymus . . .

WHERE WE ARE HEADED

And finally, the runway is being smoothed for full-blown research on living, fertilized embryos, including those artificially inseminated in the laboratory. If embryos, why not grow fetuses in the lab as well? Scientists could then replace laboratory rats with a superior “product” more closely related to the human species.

When, in late 1994, an NIH panel recommended giving the green light to embryo experimentation, *First Things* observed:

“We are confident that most people, to the extent that they are aware of the Panel’s recommendation, experience an immediate and strong revulsion. This is not to be dismissed as an irrational reaction. It signals a deep, intuitive awareness of lines that must not be crossed if we are to maintain our sometimes fragile hold upon our own humanity.”

Between 7 and 14 million abortions are performed in China each year.

When this story first broke, the major news media in America refused to mention it.

China receives \$11-12 million annually from the UN Population Fund and International Planned Parenthood Federation, both of which receive major yearly support from the U.S. Government.

Killing the babies soon means there are more old people than younger ones. China is becoming top-heavy in elderly people. Killing the old ones will be the next step.

Getting Rid of Crop Seed

Sounds pretty ominous. It is.

A new technology has been developed, by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, that could potentially sterilize the seed produced by all crops, preventing the seed from being replanted.

The Rural Advancement Foundation International (RAFI), dedicated to protecting the rights of farmers and growers, calls the new technology the "Terminator." Others call it "the neutron bomb of agriculture."

At this juncture, you might ask, "Why would anyone wish to get rid of seed?" The answer is simple enough: There is a lot of money to be made by controlling the food supply.

Hybridization was one step in this direction; Terminator will complete the process.

Hybridization occurs when two varieties are crossed to produce a plant with certain desirable characteristics. These improved varieties have certain advantages to farmers, such as increased yield and vigor. But commercially bred hybrids do not produce offspring that is of the same quality of the first generation. This forces the farmer to buy higher-priced commercial seed every year. So it has both advantages and disadvantages.

But the new *Terminator* technology was solely developed to control seed supply; it does not improve the seed or the plant in any way! It was designed to make money for big business. This, of course, will place everyone—farmers who grow the crops and the rest of us who buy and eat those crops—at the mercy of a few powerful cartels.

Edward Hammond, program officer at RAFI-USA in Pittsboro, North Carolina, says the new technology is far more advanced than the standard plant hybridization that has been practiced for years. "This new technology is aimed solely at preventing the germination of anything that is grown in the farmer's field. There's no agronomic benefit in exchange for the technology," Hammond declares.

The new Terminator technology

was developed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) in partnership with Delta & Pine Land Company, a large commercial seed breeder. On March 3, 1998, Delta & Pine announced it had been awarded a patent on the invention.

At the present time, only cotton and tobacco seeds are under the new patent, but a much broader range of crops is expected to be under potential Terminator control by the year 2000.

While hybrid seed produces plants with inferior second generation seed, the Terminator has the ability to switch the plant's reproductive processes on and off.

Rice, wheat, sorghum, and soybeans are primary targets for Terminator because it is difficult to hybridize them. Any seed which cannot be controlled, cannot be patented, and the big agribusiness breeders cannot make money on it. But Terminator will change all this.

In order to avoid intervention from the U.S. Congress, the Terminator-patented versions of previously open-pollinated crops will at first be sold by the agribreeders only in third world nations.

Those poor farmers have for thousands of years been breeding, saving, and replanting their seed. But that is going to change.

Hammond, of RAFI-USA, says "The sole purpose of Terminator is to sterilize seed." He is deeply disturbed that the USDA is helping to develop the process, and that the immediate target is control over seed in the hunger-plagued third world.

But the reason is "agronomics." Sounds scientific, doesn't it? But the word just means devising ways to make more money on crops.

If third world staple crops, such as rice and wheat, can be locked up by Terminator, investors will pour money into commercially bred seed that farmers will have to buy year after year. Until now, business interests were not interested in developing seeds for such markets.

Developers of Terminator maintain that it is a harmless development, and that local farmers can choose to plant regular—not Terminator—seed. But that is not true.

Camila Montecinos, an agronomist with the Chilean organization, CET, says crop geneticists have told them that it is likely that crops carrying the Terminator trait will infect the fields of farmers who reject or cannot afford it. Their crop will not reveal the defect—until the next year, when they attempt to plant the seed saved—and discover, too late, that it is sterile. If the technology is transmitted through recessive genes, irregular harvests could produce dramatic declines in crop production in ever widening areas.

Half the world's farmers are too poor to buy commercial seed every year. They feed 100 million in Latin America, 300 million in Africa, and 1 billion in Asia. Not only would half the world's farms face extinction, so would the 1.4 billion people fed by them.

Now you can see why it is called Terminator.

Control the food and you control the people. "Food is power. We use it to change behavior. Some may call it bribery. We do not apologize," exclaimed Catherine Bertini, Executive Director of the World Food Program at the Beijing Woman's Conference, in September 1995.

Throughout Africa, during his recent trip, Clinton told the people that the U.S. had plans for them: "We must build classrooms and companies, increase the food supply, save the environment, and prevent disease. The United States is ready to help you." So were representatives of multi-national corporations who comprised a major part of Clinton's 700-member delegation.

Surely, we are nearing the end. Signs all point to it. The threat of this new fearful device, the terminator, recalls to my mind God's promise that He will soon have to destroy the destroyers of the earth (*Revelation 11:18*).

—vf

The Adventist Church and Americans United

In 1847, Archbishop John Hughes, of New York, had organized a church political party, to obtain government financial subsidies of Roman Catholic schools in New York State. The Vatican anticipated that success there would be followed by government subsidies of Catholic schools all over America.

The next step would be additional church-state entanglements, enabling the church to gradually take control of the government.

But there was a strong anti-Catholic sentiment back then, and Hughes' proposition was defeated at the polls. His party disintegrated and New York State wrote, into its constitution, some of the strictest prohibitions on the use of public funds for church schools that are to be found in any such document.

So the archbishop told his associates they would have to build their own school system.

A hundred years later, Roman Catholic leaders felt the time had come to demand recognition and state financial support of their schools—which, by that time, numbered 4 million students at the elementary and secondary levels.

In 1947, Priest W.E. McManus, head of the educational division of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, appeared before a House subcommittee and demanded financial aid.

On November 21, 1948, U.S. Catholic bishops issued an official statement, attacking the Supreme Court doctrine enunciated in the *McColum* case, which barred religious schools from receiving public subsidies. They declared it was “an establishment of secularism” which must be abolished.

This unchanging Catholic position, that the State must support the Church, was reflected the next year

in Cardinal Spellman's public attack on Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, because she had opposed government subsidy to religious schools.

In 1960, he expressed anger that John F. Kennedy, first Catholic to be elected to the U.S. presidency, refused to obey the Vatican on this issue. (Those of you who were alive when Kennedy was shot may recall, as I do, that Herbert Hoover said it occurred because Kennedy got into trouble with his church.)

As soon as World War II was over, representatives of a group of Protestant organizations gathered. Their objective was to found an organization which could oppose Roman Catholic encroachments. Dr. Rufus W. Weaver, a prominent Baptist living in Washington, D.C., was the first to see the need for such an organization. Working closely with Dr. Joseph Dawson, director of the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, and Elder C.S. Longacre, a prominent religious liberty leader at the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, they convened a meeting at a D.C. hotel on September 19, 1946.

Among those who attended a second meeting on February 5, 1947, was Dr. Charles Ormond Williams, president of the National Education Association; Elmer Rogers, editor of the Scottish Rite magazine, *The New Age*; H.H. Votaw, editor of *Liberty Magazine*; Elder C.E. Longacre; Dr. Clyde Taylor, secretary of the National Association of Evangelicals; and several others.

On January 29, 1948, their new organization, *Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State*, was chartered in the District of Columbia. Glen L. Archer was selected as the one who would lead the new organization, a position he assumed in July of that year. POAU later changed its name to Americans United for Separation of Church and State (AU). (The POAU

and AU names had been selected because the NEA, Scottish Rite, our General Conference, and several others did not want it known that they were working together.)

From that point onward, AU opposed Catholic efforts to get government money. It also countered efforts, by other denominations, to do it also.

For decades, our General Conference heavily subsidized the work of AU. The present writer attended a lecture by Glen Archer, at the St. Helena, California, Church in the summer of 1957. Noting that Archer walked with a limp, I was told it was the result of a beating he had earlier received from Catholic thugs. Little wonder; because of his efforts, the Catholic Church in America lost millions in special benefits and subsidies.

In early summer, 1969, I heard a prominent non-Adventist AU staff member (an Italian), in a speech at Sligo Church in Takoma Park, tell the audience that the General Conference was his “boss.”

But a conflict of interest occurred in the 1970s; when, as a result of bitter controversy between our Religious Liberty Department, our colleges, and universities, church leaders voted to begin accepting government funding for those schools, as nearly all the other denominations were doing.

But AU was also changing as, in the 1980s, secularists and atheists gained control. Ultimately in the 1980s, the General Conference severed ties. This year (1998), AU filed an *amicus* brief with the court against Loma Linda Medical School, in an employment discrimination case.

AU has changed from being a church-state separation organization to one which is controlled by humanists, initiating attacks against anything and everything religious. It ranks with the ACLU, and works hand-in-hand with it. —vf