

05/22/23 • [BIG FOOD](#) › [VIEWS](#)

Are Foods Being Turned Into Bioweapons?

Just as medicine is being hijacked by the biotech industry, so is our food supply. President Biden recently signed an executive order that makes biotechnology a key focus of every federal agency, including the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

By [Dr. Joseph Mercola](#)

Miss a day, miss a lot. [Subscribe to The Defender's Top News of the Day. It's free.](#)

Story at a glance:

- Dr. Peter Lurie, president of the Center for Science in the Public Interest (CSPI), and Beth Ellikidis, vice president of agriculture and environment at the Biotechnology Innovation Organization (BIO), argue for the genetic engineering of food. Both are connected to Bill Gates and other Great Resetters that are pushing to replace all-natural foods with patentable, genetically modified foods.
- BIO, the world's largest GMO (genetically modified organism) trade organization, represents more than 1,000 pesticide, pharmaceutical, and biotech companies in more than 30 countries. BIO claims genetic engineering is the solution to heal, fuel and feed the world, and to that end, it lobbies 15 different policy areas, including food, agriculture, and healthcare policy.
- In 2004, BIO launched BIO Ventures for Global Health (BVGH), a nonprofit organization that “develops and manages programs across the for-profit and non-profit sectors to accelerate research and development for poverty-related diseases.” BVGH was launched with a \$1 million start-up grant from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.
- In 2018, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation spun off a nonprofit subsidiary to the foundation called the Bill & Melinda Gates Medical Research Institute (Gates MRI), which develops biotechnologies to address health problems in poor countries.
- BIO is partnered with the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD), and the DOD specifically funds and provides technology transfers for the diseases that Gates MRI and BVGH are focused on: malaria, tuberculosis and Ebola.

In an April 17, opinion piece in [STAT News](#), Dr. Peter Lurie and Beth Ellikidis argue for the genetic engineering of food, claiming “newer technologies can make highly targeted changes at the base-pair level — one specific rung on the DNA ladder — enhancing precision and reducing the likelihood of ‘off-target effects’ in which the base pairs are unintentionally added to or deleted from the genome.”

While targeted genetic engineering is indeed possible, and modern technology lowers the likelihood of unintentional additions or deletions, this precision does not guarantee there won't be adverse effects.

One of the reasons for this is that [many genes are multifunctional](#) and can have multiple downstream effects.

By altering a [single gene](#), you can inadvertently affect the expression of hundreds of others. What's more, the multifunctionality of genes is rarely intuitive.

So, while it may seem convenient to [genetically engineer cows without horns](#) to prevent injury to other cows and farmhands, as suggested by Lurie and Ellikidis, there's no telling what that tweak might do to internal organs or biological pathways.

In turn, there's no guarantee that cascading effects will not alter the nutrition of the meat or dairy that comes from that cow. Maybe it'll be fine, maybe it won't. The problem is that, oftentimes with [genetically engineered foods](#), safety testing is minimal or absent.

Who do Lurie and Ellikidis answer to?

When assessing the trustworthiness of people, it can be worthwhile to look at their funding and various partnerships.

In the case of Lurie and Ellikidis, both are in league with [Bill Gates](#) and other "great resetters" that are pushing to replace all-natural foods with patentable, genetically modified foods.

Lurie — a former U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) associate commissioner — is the president of the [Center for Science in the Public Interest](#). In the summer of 2020, Lurie launched a comprehensive campaign to put Mercola.com out of business by sending the FDA and the Federal Trade Commission after us based on bogus charges.

CSPI is funded by the [Rockefeller Foundation](#), the Rockefeller Family Fund, Bloomberg Philanthropies and other billionaire-owned foundations. It's also partnered with the Cornell Alliance for Science, a "global communications initiative" whose primary funding comes from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

Greg Jaffe, who heads up [CSPI's Biotechnology Project](#), is also the associate director of legal affairs at Alliance for Science.

Considering those ties, the CSPI's long history of promoting industry science and propaganda is not surprising in the least. They supported artificial sweeteners, trans fats, GMOs, fake meat and the low-fat myth. They've also actively undermined transparency in labeling efforts.

Ellikidis, meanwhile, is the vice president of agriculture and environment at the BIO. She's leading the "policy and market access strategies for [BIO's Agriculture and Environment](#) section, which includes member companies developing and producing breakthrough technologies in food and agriculture."

BIO, the world's largest [GMO trade organization](#), represents more than 1,000 pesticide, pharmaceutical and biotech companies in more than 30 countries, as well as industry groups, academic institutions, state biotechnology centers and other related organizations.

According to BIO, genetic engineering is the solution to heal, fuel and feed the world. To that end, it has lobbying committees dedicated to influencing 15 different policy areas, including food, agriculture, healthcare policy, technology transfer and finance.

According to [Open Secrets](#), BIO spent \$13,250,000 on “[pharmaceutical and health products](#)” lobbying in 2022. For reference, only Pfizer and the lobbying group Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America spent more.

How Gates sets himself up for success

In 2004, BIO launched [BVGH](#), a nonprofit organization that “strategically develops and manages programs across the for-profit and non-profit sectors to accelerate research and development (R&D) for poverty-related diseases.”

BVGH was launched with a \$1 million start-up grant from the [Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation](#).

In 2005, the BVGH received another \$5.4 million to expand the biotech industry’s role in the fight against neglected diseases. The Rockefeller Foundation is also funding the group.

Fast-forward to 2018, and the [Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation](#) spun off a nonprofit subsidiary to the foundation called Gates MRI.

[Gates MRI](#), funded with a \$273 million, four-year grant from the Gates Foundation, is focused on developing biotechnologies to address health problems in poor countries.

It’s a convenient setup to say the least.

On the one hand, Gates is funding the R&D of biotech products through Gates MRI, and on the other, he’s funding the acceleration, coordination and management of private-public biotech programs through BVGH.

One key area where the BVGH is being inserted to manage private-public programs is the “[Cancer Moonshot](#)” program, launched in 2016 by then-Vice President Joe Biden.

Biden “reignited” and highlighted the program in 2022.

As reported in a [White House fact sheet](#):

“Working with African Access Initiative (AAI) partners, BIO Ventures for Global Health (BVGH) will implement cancer research projects that are determined and led by African oncologists and conducted in collaboration with U.S. cancer experts.

“Through its African Consortium for Cancer Clinical Trials (AC3T) program, BVGH will facilitate five research projects, build capacity to conduct rigorous clinical research at 50 African sites, promote African primary investigator’s research interests on the AC3T platform, and coordinate the implementation of observational clinical studies.

“In addition to building AC3T sites’ research capacity, BVGH will map the regulatory pathway in five AAI countries. All clinical studies involving cancer drugs will include development of market access pathways by BVGH.”

Gates MRI, in turn, intends to “apply new understanding of the human immune system learned from [cancer research](#) to prevent infectious disease.”

Conveniently, he's got the inside track to all of that through the BVGH.

Biowarfare partners

59:43

As it so happens, BIO is also [partnered with the DOD](#), and the DOD specifically funds and provides technology transfers for the diseases that Gates MRI and [BVGH](#) are focused on: [malaria, tuberculosis and Ebola](#).

Not surprisingly, the DOD is also seeking to develop and adopt more mRNA-based therapeutics against other emerging [biological threats](#) — products that can be manufactured and deployed quickly.

One of the obvious hazards of public-private partnerships becoming more and more intertwined, as we see now, is that the government becomes less and less inclined to ensure the safety of these co-developed, co-owned products.

In a June 2022 BIO webinar, Ian Watson, deputy assistant secretary of defense for chemical and biological defense, specified that the agency will “safeguard” its industrial partners from various threats, including “foreign economic aggression and inherent marketplace vulnerability that are specific to biotechnology and biopharmaceuticals.”

Does “market vulnerability” also include legal action by people injured by biopharmaceuticals that have been brought to market at warp speed?

Judging by what we've seen during the [COVID-19](#) pandemic, it sure seems the U.S. government is doing everything it can to hide and suppress evidence of harm, so why would we expect any different in the future?

Are foods being turned into bioweapons?

Getting back to the issue of food, just as medicine is being hijacked by the biotech industry, so is our food supply. Indeed, President Biden recently signed an executive order that makes [biotechnology](#) a key focus of every federal agency, including the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA).

The transhumanist agenda is clear for everyone to see, and it's being pushed on us from every angle, through food, medicine and national security.

It recently came to light that the swine industry in the U.S. and Canada has been using customizable [mRNA "vaccines"](#) on herds since 2018, and to this day, there's no research to prove the meat is safe for consumption in the long term and won't affect the genetics of those who eat it.

Based on our experiences with the mRNA COVID-19 shots, which more and more experts are starting to refer to as bioweapons, it's not farfetched to wonder whether the use of mRNA in livestock might be a form of biowarfare against the public as well, this time through the food supply.

As reported by [Dr. Peter McCullough](#), Chinese researchers have demonstrated that food can indeed be turned into a vaccine (or a bioweapon, depending on the antigen):

"The nation's food supply can be manipulated by public health agencies to influence population outcomes ... Now an oral route of administration is being considered specifically for COVID-19 vaccination using [mRNA in cow's milk](#).

"Zhang and colleagues have demonstrated that a shortened mRNA code of 675 base pairs could be loaded into phospholipid packets called exosomes derived from milk and then using that same milk, be fed to mice.

"The mice gastrointestinal tract absorbed the exosomes and the mRNA must have made it into the bloodstream and lymphatic tissue because antibodies were produced in fed mice against SARS-CoV-2 Spike protein (receptor binding domain) ...

"Given the damage mRNA vaccines have generated in terms of injuries, disabilities, and deaths, these data raise considerable ethical issues. The COVID States project has shown that 25% of Americans were successful in remaining unvaccinated. This group would have strong objections to mRNA in the food supply, particularly if it was done surreptitiously or with minimal labelling/warnings ...

"These observations lead me to conclude that mRNA technology has just entered a whole new, much darker phase of development. Expect more research on and resistance to mRNA in our food supply. The Chinese have just taken the first of what will probably be many more dangerous steps for the world."

Say no to mRNA in your food

Moving forward, it's going to be extremely important to stay on top of what's happening to our food supply. Many of us were surprised to realize mRNA shots have been used in swine for several years already.

Some cattle may get these customizable mRNA shots as well, which could affect both beef and

soon, cattle may get these customizable mRNA shots as well, which could affect both beef and dairy products.

For now, I strongly recommend [avoiding pork products](#). In addition to the uncertainty surrounding these untested mRNA “vaccines,” pork is also very high in [linoleic acid](#), a harmful omega-6 fat that drives chronic disease.

Hopefully, [cattle ranchers](#) will realize the danger this mRNA platform poses to their bottom line and reject it. If they don't, finding beef and dairy that has not been “gene therapied” could become quite the challenge.

Ultimately, if we want to be free, and if we want food safety and food security, we must focus our efforts on building a decentralized system that connects communities with farmers who grow real food in sustainable ways and distribute that food locally.

Legislative efforts are also needed. Bills that would be helpful in steering us in the right direction include the following:

- **The Processing Revival and Intrastate Meat Exemption (PRIME) Act** — This bill was introduced in 2017 and hasn't moved since its introduction in the House. The [PRIME Act](#) would allow farmers to sell meat processed at smaller slaughtering facilities and allow states to set their own meat processing standards.

Because small slaughterhouses do not have an inspector on staff — a requirement that only large facilities can easily fulfill — they're banned from selling their meat. The PRIME Act would lift this regulation without sacrificing safety, as random USDA inspections could still occur.

- **The Interstate Milk Freedom Act of 2021** — This bill was introduced at the end of July 2021 as an amendment to the 2018 Farm Bill.
- **Missouri House Bill 1169**, which would require labeling of products, including food, that might “impact, alter or introduce genetic material or a genetic change” into the consumer.

Originally published by [Mercola](#).

The views and opinions expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of Children's Health Defense.

SUGGEST A CORRECTION



Dr. Joseph Mercola

Dr. Joseph Mercola is the founder of [Mercola.com](#).

[Sign up](#) for free news and updates from Children's Health Defense. CHD focuses on legal