

The Making of a Monster: We're All Lab Rats in the Government's Secret Experiments

By John W. Whitehead

Global Research, March 28, 2019

The Rutherford Institute 26 March 2019

Region: <u>USA</u> Theme: <u>Intelligence</u>

"But these weren't the kind of monsters that had tentacles and rotting skin, the kind a seven-year-old might be able to wrap his mind around—they were monsters with human faces, in crisp uniforms, marching in lockstep, so banal you don't recognize them for what they are until it's too late." — Ransom Riggs, Miss Peregrine's Home for Peculiar Children

The U.S. government, in its pursuit of so-called monsters, has itself become a monster.

This is not a new development, nor is it a revelation.

This is a government that has in recent decades unleashed untold horrors upon the world—including its own citizenry—in the name of global conquest, the acquisition of greater wealth, scientific experimentation, and technological advances, all packaged in the guise of the greater good.

Mind you, there is no greater good when the government is involved. There is only greater greed for money and power.

Unfortunately, the public has become so easily distracted by the political spectacle coming out of Washington, DC, that they are altogether oblivious to the grisly experiments, barbaric behavior and inhumane conditions that have become synonymous with the U.S. government.

These horrors are being meted out against humans and animals alike.

It's heartbreaking enough when you hear about police shooting family dogs that pose no threat—beloved pets that are <u>"guilty" of little more than barking, or wagging a tag, or racing towards them in greeting</u>—at an alarming rate somewhere in the vicinity of 500 dogs a day.

What I'm about to share goes beyond heartbreaking to horrifying.

For instance, did you know that the U.S. government has been buying hundreds of dogs and cats from "Asian meat markets" as part of a gruesome experiment into food-borne illnesses? The cannibalistic experiments involve killing cats and dogs purchased from Colombia, Brazil, Vietnam, China and Ethiopia, and then feeding the dead remains to laboratory kittens, bred in government laboratories for the express purpose of being infected with a disease and then killed.

It gets more gruesome.

The Department of Veterans Affairs has been <u>removing parts of dogs' brains to see how it</u> <u>affects their breathing</u>; applying electrodes to dogs' spinal cords (before and after severing them) to see how it impacts their cough reflexes; and implanting pacemakers in dogs' hearts and then inducing them to have heart attacks (before draining their blood). All of the <u>laboratory dogs are killed</u> during the course of these experiments.

It's not just animals that are being treated like lab rats by government agencies.

"We the people" have also become the police state's guinea pigs: to be caged, branded, experimented upon without our knowledge or consent, and then conveniently discarded and left to suffer from the after-effects.

Back in 2017, FEMA "inadvertently" <u>exposed nearly 10,000 firefighters</u>, <u>paramedics and other responders to a deadly form of ricin</u> during simulated bioterrorism response sessions. In 2015, it was discovered that an Army lab had been "mistakenly" shipping deadly anthrax to labs and defense contractors for a decade.

While these particular incidents have been dismissed as "accidents," you don't have to dig very deep or go very back in the nation's history to uncover numerous cases in which the government deliberately <u>conducted secret experiments on an unsuspecting populace</u>—citizens and noncitizens alike—making healthy people sick by spraying them with chemicals, injecting them with infectious diseases and exposing them to airborne toxins.

At the time, the government reasoned that it was legitimate to experiment on people who did not have full rights in society such as prisoners, mental patients, and poor blacks.

In Alabama, for example, 600 black men with syphilis were allowed to suffer without proper medical treatment in order to study the natural progression of untreated syphilis. In California, older prisoners had testicles from livestock and from recently executed convicts implanted in them to test their virility. In Connecticut, mental patients were injected with hepatitis.

In Maryland, sleeping prisoners had a pandemic flu virus sprayed up their noses. In Georgia, two dozen "volunteering" prison inmates had gonorrhea bacteria pumped directly into their urinary tracts through the penis. In Michigan, male <u>patients at an insane asylum were exposed to the flu</u> after first being injected with an experimental flu vaccine. In Minnesota, 11 public service employee "volunteers" were injected with malaria, then starved for five days.

In New York, <u>dying patients</u> had cancer cells introduced into their systems. In Ohio, over 100 inmates were <u>injected with live cancer cells</u>. Also in New York, prisoners at a reformatory prison were also split into two groups to determine how a deadly stomach virus was spread: the first group was made to swallow an unfiltered stool suspension, while the second group merely breathed in germs sprayed into the air. And in Staten Island, <u>children with mental retardation were given hepatitis orally and by injection</u> to see if they could then be cured.

As the Associated Press reports,

"The late 1940s and 1950s saw huge growth in the U.S. pharmaceutical and health care industries, accompanied by a boom in prisoner experiments funded by both the government and corporations. By the 1960s, at least half the states allowed prisoners to be used as medical guinea pigs ... because they

were cheaper than chimpanzees."

Moreover.

"Some of these studies, mostly from the 1940s to the '60s, apparently were never covered by news media. Others were reported at the time, but the focus was on the promise of enduring new cures, while glossing over how test subjects were treated."

Media blackouts, propaganda, spin. Sound familiar?

How many government incursions into our freedoms have been blacked out, buried under "entertainment" news headlines, or spun in such a way as to suggest that anyone voicing a word of caution is paranoid or conspiratorial?

Unfortunately, these incidents are just the tip of the iceberg when it comes to the atrocities the government has inflicted on an unsuspecting populace in the name of secret experimentation.

For instance, there was the U.S. military's <u>secret race-based testing of mustard gas on more than 60,000 enlisted men</u>. As *NPR* reports,

"All of the World War II experiments with mustard gas were done in secret and weren't recorded on the subjects' official military records. Most do not have proof of what they went through. They received no follow-up health care or monitoring of any kind. And they were sworn to secrecy about the tests under threat of dishonorable discharge and military prison time, leaving some unable to receive adequate medical treatment for their injuries, because they couldn't tell doctors what happened to them."

And then there was the CIA's <u>MKULTRA program in which hundreds of unsuspecting American civilians and military personnel were dosed with LSD</u>, some having the hallucinogenic drug slipped into their drinks at the beach, in city bars, at restaurants. As *Time* reports,

"before the documentation and other facts of the program were made public, those who talked of it were frequently dismissed as being psychotic."

Now one might argue that this is all ancient history and that the government today is different from the government of yesteryear, but has the U.S. government really changed?

Has the government become any more humane, any more respectful of the rights of the citizenry?

Has it become any more transparent or willing to abide by the rule of law? Has it become any more truthful about its activities? Has it become any more cognizant of its appointed role as a guardian of our rights?

Or has the government simply hunkered down and hidden its nefarious acts and dastardly

experiments under layers of secrecy, legalism and obfuscations? Has it not become willer, more slippery, more difficult to pin down?

Having mastered the Orwellian art of Doublespeak and followed the Huxleyan blueprint for distraction and diversion, are we not dealing with a government that is simply craftier and more conniving that it used to be?

Consider this: after revelations about the government's experiments spanning the 20th century spawned outrage, the <u>government began looking for human guinea pigs in other countries</u>, where "clinical trials could be done more cheaply and with fewer rules."

In Guatemala, prisoners and patients at a mental hospital were infected with syphilis, "apparently to test whether penicillin could prevent some sexually transmitted disease." In Uganda, U.S.-funded doctors "failed to give the AIDS drug AZT to all the HIV-infected pregnant women in a study... even though it would have protected their newborns." Meanwhile, in Nigeria, children with meningitis were used to test an antibiotic named Trovan. Eleven children died and many others were left disabled.

The more things change, the more they stay the same.

Case in point: back in 2016, it was announced that scientists working for the Department of Homeland Security <u>would begin releasing various gases and particles on crowded subway platforms</u> as part of an experiment aimed at testing bioterror airflow in New York subways.

The government insisted that the gases released into the subways by the DHS were nontoxic and did not pose a health risk. It's in our best interests, they said, to understand how quickly a chemical or biological terrorist attack might spread. And look how cool the technology is—said the government cheerleaders—that scientists can use something called DNATrax to track the movement of microscopic substances in air and food. (Imagine the kinds of surveillance that could be carried out by the government using trackable airborne-microscopic substances you breathe in or ingest.)

Mind you, this is the same government that in <u>1949 sprayed bacteria into the Pentagon's air handling system</u>, then the world's largest office building. In 1950, special ops forces <u>sprayed bacteria from Navy ships off the coast of Norfolk and San Francisco</u>, in the latter case exposing all of the city's 800,000 residents.

In 1953, government operatives <u>staged "mock" anthrax attacks on St. Louis, Minneapolis, and Winnipeg</u>using generators placed on top of cars. Local governments were reportedly told that "'invisible smokescreen[s]' were being deployed to mask the city on enemy radar." Later experiments covered territory as wide-ranging as Ohio to Texas and Michigan to Kansas.

In 1965, the government's experiments in bioterror took aim at Washington's National Airport, followed by a 1966 experiment in which <u>army scientists exposed a million subway NYC passengers to airborne bacteria that causes food poisoning</u>.

And this is the same government that has taken every bit of technology sold to us as being in our best interests—GPS devices, surveillance, nonlethal weapons, etc.—and used it against us, to track, control and trap us.

So, no, I don't think the government's ethics have changed much over the years. It's just taken its nefarious programs undercover.

The question remains: why is the government doing this? The answer is always the same: money, power and total domination.

It's the same answer no matter which totalitarian regime is in power.

The mindset driving these programs has, appropriately, been <u>likened to that of Nazi doctors</u> <u>experimenting on Jews</u>. As the Holocaust Museum <u>recounts</u>, Nazi physicians "conducted painful and often deadly experiments on thousands of concentration camp prisoners without their consent."

The Nazi's <u>unethical experiments</u> ran the gamut from freezing experiments using prisoners to find an effective treatment for hypothermia, tests to determine the maximum altitude for parachuting out of a plane, injecting prisoners with malaria, typhus, tuberculosis, typhoid fever, yellow fever, and infectious hepatitis, exposing prisoners to phosgene and mustard gas, and mass sterilization experiments.

The horrors being meted out against the American people can be traced back, in a direct line, to the horrors meted out in Nazi laboratories. In fact, following the second World War, the U.S. government recruited many of Hitler's employees, adopted his protocols, embraced his mindset about law and order and experimentation, and implemented his tactics in incremental steps.

Sounds far-fetched, you say? Read on. It's all documented.

As historian Robert Gellately <u>recounts</u>, the Nazi police state was initially so <u>admired</u> for its efficiency and order by the <u>world powers</u> of the day that Herbert Hoover, then-head of the FBI, actually sent one of his right-hand men, Edmund Patrick Coffey, to Berlin in January 1938 at the invitation of Germany's secret police, the Gestapo.

The FBI was so impressed with the Nazi regime that, according to the *New York Times*, in the decades after World War II, the FBI, along with other government agencies, aggressively recruited at least a thousand Nazis, including some of Hitler's highest henchmen.

All told, thousands of Nazi collaborators—<u>including the head of a Nazi concentration camp, among others</u>—were given secret visas and brought to America by way of Project Paperclip. Subsequently, they were hired on as spies, informants and scientific advisers, and then camouflaged to ensure that their true identities and ties to Hitler's holocaust machine would remain unknown. All the while, <u>thousands of Jewish refugees were refused entry visas</u> to the U.S. on the grounds that it could threaten national security.

Adding further insult to injury, <u>American taxpayers have been paying to keep these ex-Nazis on the U.S. government's payroll</u> ever since. And in true Gestapo fashion, <u>anyone who has dared to blow the whistle on the FBI's illicit Nazi ties has found himself spied upon, intimidated, harassed and labeled a threat to national security.</u>

As if the government's <u>covert</u>, <u>taxpayer-funded employment of Nazis after World War II</u> wasn't bad enough, U.S. government agencies—the FBI, CIA and the military—have since fully embraced many of the Nazi's well-honed policing tactics, and have used them repeatedly against American citizens.

It's certainly easy to denounce the full-frontal horrors carried out by the scientific and medical community within a despotic regime such as Nazi Germany, but what do you do when it's your own government that claims to be a champion of human rights all the while allowing its agents to engage in the foulest, bases and most despicable acts of torture, abuse and experimentation?

When all is said and done, this is not a government that has our best interests at heart.

This is not a government that values us.

Perhaps the answer lies in <u>The Third Man</u>, Carol Reed's influential 1949 film starring Joseph Cotten and Orson Welles. In the film, set in a post-WW II Vienna, rogue war profiteer Harry Lime has come to view human carnage with a callous indifference, unconcerned that the diluted penicillin he's been trafficking underground has resulted in the tortured deaths of young children.

Challenged by his old friend Holly Martins to consider the consequences of his actions, Lime responds, "In these days, old man, nobody thinks in terms of human beings. <u>Governments don't</u>, so why should we?"

"Have you ever seen any of your victims?" asks Martins.

"Victims?" responds Limes, as he looks down from the top of a Ferris wheel onto a populace reduced to mere dots on the ground. "Look down there. Tell me. Would you really feel any pity if one of those dots stopped moving forever? If I offered you twenty thousand pounds for every dot that stopped, would you really, old man, tell me to keep my money, or would you calculate how many dots you could afford to spare? Free of income tax, old man. Free of income tax — the only way you can save money nowadays."

As I make clear in my book <u>Battlefield America: The War on the American People</u>, this is how the U.S. government sees us, too, when it looks down upon us from its lofty perch.

To the powers-that-be, the rest of us are insignificant specks, faceless dots on the ground.

To the architects of the American police state, we are not worthy or vested with inherent rights. This is how the government can justify treating us like economic units to be bought and sold and traded, or caged rats to be experimented upon and discarded when we've outgrown our usefulness.

To those who call the shots in the halls of government, "we the people" are merely the means to an end.

"We the people"—who think, who reason, who take a stand, who resist, who demand to be treated with dignity and care, who believe in freedom and justice for all—have become obsolete, undervalued citizens of a totalitarian state that, in the words of Rod Serling, "has patterned itself after every dictator who has ever planted the ripping imprint of a boot on the pages of history since the beginning of time. It has refinements, technological advances, and a more sophisticated approach to the destruction of human freedom."

In this sense, we are all Romney Wordsworth, the condemned man in Serling's *Twilight Zone* episode "The Obsolete Man."

"The Obsolete Man" speaks to the dangers of a government that views people as expendable once they have outgrown their usefulness to the State. Yet—and here's the kicker—this is where the government through its monstrous inhumanity also becomes obsolete. As Serling noted in his original script for "The Obsolete Man," "Any state, any entity, any ideology which fails to recognize the worth, the dignity, the rights of Man...that state is obsolete."

How do you defeat a monster? You start by recognizing the monster for what it is.

*

Note to readers: please click the share buttons below. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

The original source of this article is <u>The Rutherford Institute</u> Copyright © John W. Whitehead, The Rutherford Institute, 2019

Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page

Become a Member of Global Research

Articles by: John W. Whitehead

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca