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Doctors Against Forced Organ Harvesting
As medical doctors, we value ethical principles as they guide us through uncharted territory. Free, voluntary and informed consent and ‘do-no-harm’ are arguably the two most important pillars of ethics when we strive for best practices in patient care.

When *The Epoch Times* first reported the practice of organ harvesting of living Falun Gong practitioners in Chinese detention camps in March of 2006, the medical community was incredulous. The alleged crime, the killing of prisoners of conscience for profitable transplantation, was beyond what the international community could fathom—much like the disbelief held by officials around the world when, on June 1, 1942, the Liberty Brigade in Warsaw reported on the use of gas chambers in Nazi concentration camps. If the act is too brazen to be believed, and the atrocity so abhorrent that it exceeds our capacity to acknowledge it for the crime that it is, we succumb to willful blindness. Moreover, when a crime occurs with the knowledge and active participation of so many medical professionals, as we witnessed during WWII and now see with China, the incredulity of the illicit act is that much greater. Without being able to see what is right in front of us, our willingness to engage in critical thinking and objective observation is compromised. The evidence of China’s forced organ harvesting is clear. We just need to open our eyes. Only by doing so can we change the course of events in China.
After March 2006, independent investigators gathered data and information that provided evidence of China's transplantation crimes. The Kilgour/Matas report in July 2006 established the first credible investigative document by presenting recorded phone calls with staff in Chinese hospitals. Other reports, including an updated analysis by Kilgour, Gutmann and Matas in 2016, and numerous articles in medical journals followed.

In 2019, we reached a critical mass of information when the China Tribunal, chaired by Sir Geoffrey Nice, KC, reviewed the available evidence and concluded: Forced organ harvesting from living people has occurred and continues to occur in China, with Falun Gong, a spiritual discipline in the tradition of Buddhist principles, being a main target. When speaking about evidence, journalists and legislators frequently ask for ‘hard evidence.' What would be considered hard evidence? The alleged perpetrator, China, would likely counter that a recorded video of a relevant scene in an operating room was staged or that a ‘doctor witness’ was an actor. Since the organ ‘donor’ is killed through the process, there is little chance to have a victim as witness.

The bar to produce hard evidence on forced organ harvesting is often set unreasonably higher than in criminal cases. When was it ever mandatory to provide the court with a video recording of a murderer in the act of committing a crime? When was it ever mandatory to have an eyewitness? On top of that, we are not even at the stage of a court hearing but simply in a holding pattern, waiting for long-overdue official, independent inspections to investigate claims first made 16 years ago. Yet despite the substantial amount of inferential and deduced evidence that has been collected over these years, parliamentarians and journalists often impose the requirement of hard evidence on those who report on forced organ harvesting in China. Considering that a totalitarian regime like the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) will utilize all means to cover up this crime, the available amount of information and evidence is overwhelming. We have to ask ourselves: do we in the free world want to find out the truth about forced organ harvesting from living people in China, or are we afraid we will unveil more evidence of this inconvenient truth? What does a silent, passive stance and stubborn unwillingness to face the truth reveal about us?

Before 1999, it was known that China harvested organs from executed prisoners. Provisions under the name Temporary Rules Concerning the Utilization of Corpses or Organs from the Corpses of Executed Criminals were adopted in 1984. But neither the harvesting of organs from executed prisoners, nor commercial organ trafficking can be compared with the exploitation and killing of living, non-convicted prisoners of conscience for their organs.

Taking into perspective the number of annual transplants, the fast-growing transplant infrastructure, and the state-apparatus that provides transplant organs in record time, it is no exaggeration to state that forced organ
harvesting in China has reached industrial levels. The nation’s state-organized, large-scale forced organ harvesting infrastructure is unique—nothing like it has been observed in any other country.

As much as it is impossible to talk about the Holocaust without mentioning Nazi Germany and the Jewish people, is it equally impossible to talk about forced organ harvesting without mentioning communist China and Falun Gong practitioners. It is not our intention to single out China, but it is inevitable to speak about China when the issue of state-organized, forced organ harvesting from living people is being addressed.

Therefore, the suggestion that addressing China’s transplant crimes is political needs to be dismissed outright, otherwise one would create the precedent that any violation of human rights committed by a state is immune because of its falsely alleged political nature. In the same sense, China’s assertion that, when challenged, the international community is interfering with the government’s ‘internal affairs’ must be absolutely dismissed, as criminal behavior that rises to the level of crimes against humanity or genocide cannot be tolerated in a compassionate and civil world. Who would sign a statement today that the Holocaust was an ‘internal affair’ of Nazi Germany? If forced organ harvesting is specifically tied to China, it is appropriate to ask: What kind of socio-political environment would contribute to such depravity? In a healthy society with checks and balances, forced organ harvesting would not be able to exist, let alone grow to industrial levels.

In contrast, the Chinese government as an authoritarian, communist regime controls and coerces the populace. People are told what to believe and what they can and cannot do. In such a normalized environment, it is perceived as inevitable for the government to pursue coerced forced organ procurement with the pretense of benevolent intentions. For example, Chinese officials justify using organs from death row prisoners with the claim that these prisoners want to redeem themselves by donating their organs and supporting their country. This manipulation was perceived as ‘normal,’ but rejected by the World Medical Association.

In January 2017, the Financial Times quoted the President of the Chinese Supreme Court saying that the CCP is above Chinese law. In other words, the CCP can declare that forced organ harvesting is an acceptable procedure, regardless of what is written in the nation’s constitution. The global community was, and continues to be, unprepared in facing such a blatant denial of international ethical standards.

Similarly, the global community was also unprepared to respond to the proliferation of China’s ‘wolf warrior’ diplomats, who exerted coercion not only on foreign governments but also on universities and hospitals in the West.

China’s transplant business took off after 1999, the year CCP chairman Jiang Zemin resorted to an unlawful and unfounded ban
of the spiritual discipline Falun Gong. More than 70 million people were ostracized in one day, i.e., more than 70 million Chinese were dehumanized and became potential subjects for forced organ harvesting.

As per CCP rule, a societal ban coincides with the government’s total power over an individual’s life. Jiang demanded: “destroy [the Falun Gong] physically.” Torture in detention centers and labor camps, in many instances resulting in death, was possible only because practitioners were considered sub-human and worthless, stripped of any basic rights. Known for their good health, vital organs from Falun Gong became a commodity, and forced organ harvesting contributed to the CCP’s ‘final solution’ against Falun Gong to destroy the practice and its adherents.

The persecution of Falun Gong has been described as a ‘cold’ genocide, a concealed, slow motion, protracted attack intended to destroy practitioners and the practice itself. When China announced its public organ donation program in 2013, many in the medical field were relieved, as China indicated a desire to comply with Western standards. Nothing would be further from the truth. On the contrary, it has been shown that China has manufactured its organ donation numbers and organ sourcing. We have previously described this mechanism as a Deception Protocol.

The CCP’s pursuit of absolute control by coercion of its citizens—as is the case with forced organ harvesting from living persons—is achieved in large part through deception, both domestically and internationally, and is an essential component in driving the government’s actions. While abominable crimes against humanity are committed, the global community is misled and deceived to prevent detection. The same mechanism is found in China’s IT theft, the Thousand Talent recruitment program, business espionage and the Belt & Road Initiative. In short, the motivation and methods driving forced organ harvesting can be replicated in many other areas of society. It concerns all of us.

The subject of forced organ harvesting from living people on an industrial scale, paired with the declared goal to destroy the primary victim group, is unprecedented in history. Because the medical profession is involved in these unethical and criminal transplant practices, it is the duty of every physician to demonstrate courage, pursue truth and exhibit the compassion laid out in the Hippocratic oath to help end this medical crime.

Torsten Trey, MD, PhD
Executive Director
Doctors Against Forced Organ Harvesting (DAFOH), a non-profit organization founded by medical doctors in 2006, provides the medical community and general public with objective information about forced organ harvesting from living people.

Defined as the coerced procurement of organs from living people without consent and killing the ‘donor’ through the process, forced organ harvesting is not only unethical, but also criminal in nature.

The practice has only been observed, and could only be possible, in an authoritarian environment where the rule of law and legal prosecution of the crime is absent. This aspect has given rise to the phenomenon of a concealed ‘state-organized’ or ‘state-sponsored’ practice, where the state is responsible but denies its existence.

This might explain why over the past 16 years we have found that forced organ harvesting from living people on an industrial scale has
only been reported to occur in the People’s Republic of China.

An analysis of data that encompasses annual transplant numbers, organ supply, organ donation numbers, wait times, societal circumstances and witness testimonies has contributed to the following observations:

- There is a discrepancy between transplant numbers and organ supply in China, with a clear pattern of transplant numbers outpacing the actual organ supply;

- Forced organ harvesting from living people has occurred and continues to occur unabated in China;

- The primary victims of forced organ harvesting are prisoners of conscience, including large numbers of persecuted, detained Falun Gong practitioners who are ostracized and dehumanized;

Forced organ harvesting is a method deployed by the CCP to destroy Falun Gong, the largest spiritual movement in China.

In our analysis we find that there is a diverse, heterogeneous set of benefits behind forced organ harvesting. While financial incentives for medical doctors and other beneficiaries provide a self-propelling mechanism that ensures the continuation of this criminal practice, the government of China engages in a brutal 20-year persecution and eradication campaign against the main victims. The regime uses forced organ harvesting as a final solution to destroy Falun Gong, delegating execution to the operating room. In this context, forced organ harvesting becomes an instrument to pursue a cold genocide, secretive and insidious over decades.

Understanding forced organ harvesting as the ultimate solution to silence the victims and destroy their religious practice not only reflects an appreciation of the victim group, but is also critical for identifying solutions to bring this abusive practice to a halt.
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Forced organ harvesting from living people has occurred and continues to occur in the People’s Republic of China as this report will show. This unprecedented evil, the state-sanctioned, large-scale killing of vulnerable prisoners of conscience committed by a totalitarian regime, is not only a crime against humanity, but also a threat to humankind. The Chinese government has weaponized the transplant discipline for the destruction of Falun Gong practitioners. This should trigger a massive response from medical professionals to uphold and enforce their medical oath.

The primary victims of forced organ harvesting in China are Falun Gong practitioners, persecuted since 1999. Humankind is also a victim of this horrendous atrocity: The international community has not taken the necessary steps to put an end to this crime against humanity, allowing the Chinese government to commit mass murder through organ procurement for over two decades. What impact does this have on our morality, civil society and civilization?

The Chinese government has weaponized the transplant discipline for the destruction of Falun Gong practitioners.

By remaining silent on forced organ harvesting, world leaders and officials in positions of significant influence signal to the Chinese government that forced organ
harvesting and the intended destruction of Falun Gong, in whole or in part, can proceed without repercussions. Those who have chosen to remain silent embolden the CCP to continue killing its citizens. The failure of the international community to respond to China’s transplantation crimes has enabled China to carry out similar crimes against House Christians, Tibetans, Uyghurs and other Muslim groups. Furthermore, global negligence on China’s transplant crimes has allowed the Chinese government to commit horrendous medical malfeasance that has caused millions of COVID deaths and severely damaged economies around the world.

Forced organ harvesting is not only trafficking of human bodies. It is also an unacceptable disgrace to medical professionals who are the acting culprits in China and the inactive, complicit observers outside of China.

Forced organ harvesting is a final solution in China’s agenda to destroy the practice of Falun Gong in particular by killing its practitioners. It is a nefarious attempt to drag transplant tourists into the role of accomplices and serves to undermine and tear down a principled, ethical system that has set international standards of good medical practice for decades.

When confronted with this crime against humanity—scorning the existence and sanctity of human life—one cannot remain inactive. The purpose of this report is to inform and to inspire those who wish to relinquish their role as bystanders and become active participants in saving lives and promoting human dignity.

Every day, dozens of people are killed for their organs. Every day, we can save a life by raising awareness and discouraging perpetrators from committing transplant crimes. Every day counts.

By remaining silent on forced organ harvesting, world leaders and officials in positions of significant influence signal to the Chinese government that forced organ harvesting and the intended destruction of Falun Gong, as a whole or in part, can proceed without repercussions.

Take action. Today. Here is a short list of proposed actions:

1. Ask your legislator to introduce legislation that would press the Chinese government to stop forced organ harvesting of the primary victim group of Falun Gong practitioners.

2. Decouple your national transplant field from China’s transplant market in all
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5. Sign the Universal Declaration on Combating and Preventing Forced Organ Harvesting to express your support. By combining our voices, our call to stop this transplant abuse and crime against humanity will be heard.

3. Defeat the Chinese government’s agenda to silence Falun Gong. The CCP has invested a great deal of capital to prevent both the domestic and international public from learning about Falun Gong’s peaceful practice of truthfulness, compassion and tolerance. By lending your voice to Falun Gong and supporting adherents’ right to practice their faith, you defeat the CCP’s intent to silence this spiritual group and thereby eliminate the CCP’s motivation to commit mass murder through forced organ harvesting.

4. Share information on China’s illicit transplant practices on your social media. Keeping people informed and preventing collusion is the first step in ending China’s crimes.

The following report will elaborate on forced organ harvesting and the factors that led to the proposal of each of the action items above. Each of these actions are important and they can reflect your wish to live in a more ethical world.

Sign the Universal Declaration on Combating and Preventing Forced Organ Harvesting
2. Origin of the Allegation of Forced Organ Harvesting
The allegation that organs were harvested from living Falun Gong practitioners in Chinese detention camps was first reported by The Epoch Times in March, 2006.

In that same month, a Chinese journalist with the pseudonym Peter reported that in the city of Sujiatun, China, organs were harvested from Falun Gong practitioners and used for transplantation.

Shortly afterwards, a woman with the pseudonym Annie disclosed that her former husband, a surgeon at the Sujiatun hospital, confessed to her that he removed corneas from 2,000 Falun Gong practitioners.

A third source, an anonymous veteran military doctor, wrote a letter to The Epoch Times in which he provided more details about the logistics behind the practice.
2. Origin of the Allegation of Forced Organ Harvesting

The hospital in northeastern China, mentioned by two whistleblowers, where forced organ harvesting from Falun Gong practitioners took place in the early 2000s. (minghui.org)

He stated that there were 36 concentration camp-style detention centers with one of them alone detaining 14,000 Falun Gong practitioners.

He further stated that the written consent used for transplantations were counterfeits, often with the same handwriting, and that he had seen about 60,000 of such counterfeits.

In May 2006, the Vice-President of the European Parliament, Edward McMillan-Scott, went to China to meet with two Chinese citizens who told him that they had seen the corpse of a friend who was a Falun Gong practitioner and that the corpse had holes in parts of the body where organs would have been, suggesting that organs had been removed.

In July 2006, two Canadian investigators, David Kilgour and David Matas, published an investigative report which included transcripts of telephone calls that the investigators held with doctors in Chinese hospitals. In more than a dozen cases, the doctors in the Chinese hospitals admitted that they used organs from Falun Gong practitioners because they were ‘fresh organs.’

In July 2006, DAFOH’s Executive Director, Torsten Trey, MD, PhD, attended the World Transplant Congress in Boston, USA. His conversations with Chinese doctors revealed that the Tianjin Hospital had conducted about 2,000 liver transplants in 2005.

At that time China did not have a public organ donation system that could explain the origin of the donor organs. When asked about the source of the transplant organs, another Chinese doctor replied that they were taken from Falun Gong practitioners.

It is worth noting that in the five months after the news broke in March 2006, the persons who made public the allegations that organs were harvested from Falun Gong practitioners were not themselves adherents of the spiritual group. Without a conflict of interest, the allegation that Falun Gong practitioners were specially subjected to forced organ harvesting gained credibility.

Read “Bloody Harvest,” an investigative report by Matas and Kilgour

It is worth noting that in the five months after the news broke in March 2006, the persons who made public the allegations that organs were harvested from Falun Gong practitioners were not themselves adherents of the spiritual group. Without a conflict of interest, the allegation that Falun Gong practitioners were specially subjected to forced organ harvesting gained credibility.
After making an allegation, requesting evidence to corroborate the claim is a justified response. However, the expectations of what forensic evidence entails might be unrealistic. Would it be reasonable to expect that the Nazi regime would have permitted unscheduled, independent inspections of concentration camps and gas chambers? Is it reasonable to deny the possibility of concentration camps and gas chambers because no one is permitted to inspect them?

It is helpful to have a common understanding about the meaning of evidence. The Legal Information Institute at Cornell Law School defines evidence as an “item or information proffered to make the existence of a fact more or less probable. Evidence can take the form of testimony, documents, photographs, videos, voice recordings, DNA testing, or other tangible objects.”

Evidence makes a fact more or less probable, but the reverse—the absence of a piece of evidence—does not make a fact less probable. This is a fallacy that has been widely applied, as the absence of an eyewitness of forced organ harvesting and the absence of photos or videos from the operating rooms where forced organ harvesting occurred has often been used to dismiss the allegations.

Evidence does not succumb to the passing of time, as previously found information can still be valid years later. Small or apparently minor pieces of information are no less relevant, though pieces of evidence might vary in their degree of importance.
3. Evidence

It is important to keep in mind that it is very difficult to gather sensitive information in a totalitarian-run country like China. A wide range of evidence, gathered over a long period of time, might help to counter this difficulty. The evidence that is presented in this report shall demonstrate that state-sanctioned, forced organ harvesting of Falun Gong practitioners has occurred in China and continues to occur unabated.

**China’s Annual Transplant Numbers**

If the allegation is that organs were unethically procured without consent, and forced organ harvesting occurs on a significant scale, it is reasonable to expect that an extra supply of organs would be reflected in China’s annual transplant numbers.

To test this hypothesis, we examined China’s annual transplant numbers from 2000-2021 (Chart 1), as listed on the Global Observatory on Donation and Transplantation (GODT). When plotted, the course of the official annual transplant numbers could be described as a ‘mountain and valley’ pattern.

The rapid increases lead one to question where the sudden supply of organs came from, while the 10-year plateau between 2006 and 2015 raises the question of why the exponential increase of organs in 2004 did not continue, but instead stagnated.

Our hypothesis that an extra supply of organs would also be reflected in an increase of transplant numbers could be correct for the time between 2003 and 2006, but the
zero growth of transplant numbers between 2006 and 2015 does not support it.

After 2016, there is another steep increase in transplant numbers.

Due to the absence of transparency, it is impossible to verify whether the official annual transplant numbers from China are correct or manipulated. If the data are manipulated, the reported number of organs may not be correct and may even reveal the manipulation.

The GODT also collected transplant numbers from other countries and we compared this data with numbers from China. Chart 2 shows the annual transplant numbers from the USA, the UK, Spain, France, Turkey, Italy and South Korea.

When plotted, the course of the annual transplant numbers of these countries could be described as a ‘steady, gradual increase’ pattern.

In Chart 3, we combined the annual transplant numbers of each of the eight countries. The official annual transplant numbers from China follow a course that stands in stark contrast with other countries over the entire 20-year period.

Sudden increases followed by a decade long standstill contrast with the steady increase in other countries where transplants are based on altruistic organ donation programs.

While the annual transplant numbers in China increased exponentially by about 250% between 2000 and 2004, the average increase of transplant numbers in other countries during the same time period was about 10-15%.

At that time, China did not have a public organ donation program.

An Abundance of Organs

The increase in the number of annual transplants suggests that organs were available for transplantation in large numbers. The abundance of available transplant organs can be demonstrated in two ways: either vertically, as a large number

For more details, please visit the following websites:

- China Organ Harvest Research Center
- Examining China's Organ Transplantation System
- Bloody Harvest/The Slaughter: An Update, 2016
- A Hospital Built for Murder
of organs at a given time, or horizontally, as short wait times for organs over a period of time.

On April 28, 2006, the Hunan Provincial People’s Hospital advertised in the Hunan Xiaoxiang Morning Herald, the Changsha Evening Post, and the Hunan Economics television station that it would give away twenty liver or kidney transplants free of charge.

Given the short 24-48 hour survival window of organs after procurement, the advertisement suggested a sudden spike of available organs.

The unusual measure of advertising transplant organs via public media also indicated that there was no public organ allocation system in place.

In 2004, the Tianjin First Central Hospital performed 44 liver transplants in one week and 24 liver and kidney transplants in a single day.

The key aspect of this finding is not the capability of the hospital to conduct this many transplants but the fact that this many organs were available within a short period of time.

Between 1999 and 2000, the number of liver transplants grew tenfold and then tripled by 2005.

Various investigations have documented that organs were available in China in large quantities, and that the transplant infrastructure, an indicator of confidence in sustained availability of transplant organs, also grew exponentially.

Before 1999, about 150 hospitals offered transplant surgeries, but in just seven years the number had increased to 600 transplant centers.

The availability of organs in large numbers stands out. Even more revealing is a look at the wait times for the transplants.

In 2008, a transplant patient of Jacob Lavee, MD, Director of the Heart Transplantation Unit and Deputy Director of the Department of Cardiac Surgery at the Leviev Heart Center of the Sheba Medical Center in Israel, announced that he was scheduled to receive his heart transplant in China on a particular day with 14 days advanced notice. He received the heart transplant exactly on the scheduled day.

Former deputy minister of health in China Dr. Huang Jiefu planned to conduct a liver transplantation in 2005 and ordered two matching donor livers as a backup, which he received within 24 hours.

Read about suspiciously short wait times for COVID patients who received lung transplants
In 2009, Prof. Chen Zhonghua from the Tongji Hospital, China, described the situation of voluntary organ donors in China. He stated that “only about 130 people on the mainland have signed up to donate their organs since 2003.” This number would be insufficient to explain the annual transplant numbers that China reported.

Asian countries are known for a reluctance to donate organs, as it correlates with the belief that a body should remain intact and undisturbed at the time of passing. This traditional understanding, coupled with the fear that one’s life could be put in jeopardy by a corrupt health system where economic incentives could influence whether or not CPR and life support are provided, has contributed to a very limited number of registered organ donations in China.

In 2001, Dr. Wang Guoqi from China testified before a U.S. Congressional Committee that China harvests organs from executed prisoners. The Chinese embassy denied his claims the following day and called him a liar. Four years later, in 2005, Huang Jiefu admitted that organs were harvested from executed prisoners. Yet it is implausible that death sentences would be handed out in proportions large enough to explain the volume of annual organ transplants and the short wait times on demand.

After eight years of pressure calling for investigation of China’s organ transplant ethics, in December 2014, Huang Jiefu announced that China would stop using executed prisoners for transplant organs.

In 2016, a Canadian citizen received an organ transplant in China within three days. Several lung transplants on COVID patients were performed in China in March 2020. The wait times for the donor lungs ranged from one day to a few days.

In the fall of 2017, the Korean television network Chosun filmed inside the Tianjin hospital with a hidden camera. The team pretended that a relative needed a kidney transplant. A nurse told them on video that the regular wait time for a matching organ is 14 days, but for an extra payment to the hospital in the amount of $10,000, one could find a matching donor kidney within two days.

The Discrepancy Between Organ Transplants and Organ Supply Before 2013

China did not have a public organ donation program before 2013 when it launched the China Organ Transplant Response System (COTRS), a computerized organ allocation system, which critics have described as a whitewashing mechanism to blur the traceability of donor organs. China started its public organ donation program around the same time.

In 2009, Prof. Chen Zhonghua from the Tongji Hospital, China, described the situation of voluntary organ donors in China. He stated that “only about 130 people on the mainland have signed up to donate their organs since 2003.” This number would be insufficient to explain the annual transplant numbers that China reported.

Asian countries are known for a reluctance to donate organs, as it correlates with the belief that a body should remain intact and undisturbed at the time of passing. This traditional understanding, coupled with the fear that one’s life could be put in jeopardy by a corrupt health system where economic incentives could influence whether or not CPR and life support are provided, has contributed to a very limited number of registered organ donations in China.

In 2001, Dr. Wang Guoqi from China testified before a U.S. Congressional Committee that China harvests organs from executed prisoners. The Chinese embassy denied his claims the following day and called him a liar. Four years later, in 2005, Huang Jiefu admitted that organs were harvested from executed prisoners. Yet it is implausible that death sentences would be handed out in proportions large enough to explain the volume of annual organ transplants and the short wait times on demand.

After eight years of pressure calling for investigation of China’s organ transplant ethics, in December 2014, Huang Jiefu announced that China would stop using executed prisoners for transplant organs.
As of today, however, there is no record that China ever revoked the 1984 provisions, leaving the legal framework permitting the continuation of organ harvesting from executed prisoners in place.

Testing transplant numbers, wait times and on-demand organ availabilities against plausibility, it is evident that the official source of organs—executed prisoners and a few organ donors—would not be sufficient to explain the large number of organ transplants each year. After the launch of its public organ donation program, the source of organs remained implausible.

The Discrepancy Between Organ Transplants and Organ Supply After 2013

With the launch of China’s public organ donation program, the previous observation that China’s annual transplant data departed from typical transplant data observed in most other countries repeated. China’s publicly accessible organ registration data show irregularities on the last day in 2015 and the last week in 2016. Within one day in 2015, and one week in 2016, the number of organ donor registrations spiked.

The organ registration numbers have also been the subject of investigation. A 2019 forensic statistical analysis of China’s organ donation program analyzed the donor numbers in two systems that track organ donors in China – COTRS and the Red Cross Society of China.

The authors show, among multiple other data anomalies, that the 2017 Red Cross Society of China numbers fit a simple quadratic formula ($y = a \times 2$, where $a = 108.0$) with a single parameter, ‘a’. In other words, the organ registration numbers followed an intentional pattern and were manufactured.

The man-made aspect is also supported by the fact that exactly 25,000 people apparently signed up as organ donors within one day on December 31, 2015 (Chart 4).

This shows that China’s announcement in December 2014 that the country would rely on voluntary organ donations is not a supportable claim. The result of the forensic statistical analysis casts doubt on the credibility of China’s organ donation program.
Evidence and raises questions about the veracity of the purported voluntary and altruistic nature of the program.

When comparing organ donor numbers among various countries (Chart 5), we find another implausible aspect of China's organ registration numbers: the output of organ donors in relation to the size of the pool of registered organ donors.

To assess the productivity of the organ donation programs, we compared the donor numbers of the programs in China, the USA and UK in respective years. China had significantly fewer registered organ donors than the USA or UK, which is plausible as the public organ donation program in China was only created a few years prior. However, the number of organ donors in 2017 was relatively large. When the actual organ donors of the year are looked at in relation to the number of registered organ donors, the output of actual organ donors by the organ donation program in China would be 200 times more productive than the organ donation programs in the USA and UK. It would also mean that China achieved this high a yield from a program that was only four years old.

To illustrate the stark contrast, we can apply reverse engineering to the comparison. If we assume that the natural death rate in countries is comparable, and that the subsequent availability of donor organs in an altruistic organ donation program is comparable, then the output ratio of 0.00007 observed in the USA and UK could also be applied to China.

At that rate, China could only yield about 26 actual organ donors from its organ donor pool of 375,000 in 2017. The inferred 26 organ donors is far below the officially reported 5,146 organ donors, which would imply that 5,120 organ donors were unaccounted for in 2017. This model aims at illustrating the scope of unexplained organ sources and the inherent discrepancies of transplant and donor numbers from China.
It is worth noting that over the course of the past 20 years, the wait times for organ transplants were consistently short and significantly shorter than in countries with altruistic, public organ donation programs. China’s characteristic ‘organ-on-demand’ transplant model was never an episodic phenomenon, but was consistently observed over the years.

Another critical paper, “Execution by organ procurement: Breaching the dead donor rule in China,” was published in the American Journal of Transplantation in 2022. The researchers used computational text analysis to sift through over 124,000 Chinese language articles and found articles that describe organ procurement for heart and lung transplants.

The complex analysis found 71 publications that show that organs had been procured without determining brain death, i.e., organs were removed while the person was still alive. This result erodes the credibility of proper, ethical practices in China’s transplant market.

**China’s Practice of Harvesting Organs From Prisoners**

Legal provisions adopted in 1984 explicitly permit the harvesting of organs from executed prisoners in China. To this day, there is no public record indicating that these provisions have been revoked, which would suggest that the practice remains legal.

In 2001, Dr. Wang Guoqi testified before the U.S. Congress that China harvests organs from prisoners. Although the Chinese government immediately accused him of lying, Chinese officials later admitted in 2005 that transplant organs were indeed procured mainly from executed prisoners.

According to the Dui Hua Foundation, the estimated number of executions of convicted prisoners declined from about 15,000 in 2000 to 4,000 in 2011. Huang Jiefu, China’s former Deputy Health Minister, also claimed that the number of executions of convicted prisoners declined by 10% per year after 2000.

Despite the absence of a voluntary, public organ donation program, annual transplant numbers in China increased at least threefold between 1999 and 2004, with the officially reported number of transplants reaching over 12,000 in 2004.

In Chart 6, the increase in transplants is juxtaposed with the decrease in executions of convicted prisoners. If executed prisoners were the source of organs, one would expect a simultaneous increase of transplants and executions. Chinese officials have never provided a plausible explanation of how the number of transplants increased to this degree while the number of executions—the alleged source of over 90% of transplant organs—declined.
Add to this discrepancy the evidence of short wait times for donor organs—two days to two weeks on average—and it becomes even less plausible that executions of convicted criminals were the only source. Researchers began to investigate accusations that were later confirmed: large numbers of living prisoners of conscience had become a year-round, on-demand organ source fueling China’s exponential increase in transplants.

Several independent sources, including numerous testimonies and witness reports by Falun Gong practitioners who survived detention, established that prisoners of conscience were subject to unsolicited, coerced medical exams and blood testing while detained. They were also threatened by guards that their organs could be harvested if they did not comply.

To hide this sinister reality, China has obscured transplant data, providing incomplete or even fabricated numbers and creating confusion for those attempting to obtain a complete picture of transplantation in China. While national transplant figures are published annually, China has never published the number of transplants conducted at each individual transplant center, making it difficult to verify the national numbers.

This lack of transparency is not simply an omission of data but is a defining characteristic of how the CCP publicizes disinformation related to transplantation.

Between 2006 and 2015, China reported less than 10,000 transplants per year. With about 160 transplant hospitals in operation, however, each transplant hospital would have only generated an average of about 60 transplants per year. Researchers estimate that the Tianjin First Central Hospital alone performed several thousand transplants each year during that period. There are no reported figures for most of the other 160 hospitals, making it impossible to verify the officially reported national number of annual transplants. The opaqueness is no coincidence; it prevents scrutiny.

The WHO Guiding Principles on Human Cell, Tissue and Organ Transplantation include the principles of traceability and transparency. Especially in transplant medicine which involves three parties—an organ recipient, an organ donor and a doctor—transparency is a gold standard for ethical treatment.

Before 2006, transplant candidates from Malaysia who went to China for transplantation received a discharge report for their local doctors. After the news of
forced organ harvesting broke in 2006, transplant patients returned home to Malaysia without such a discharge report, which made it difficult to trace the procedure and name of the surgeon who conducted the transplantation.

China’s method of obscuring critical information related to the nation’s transplantation infrastructure is a deliberate strategy to cover up, conceal and mislead. While some information, i.e., the number of annual transplants, is revealed, the transplant numbers for each transplant center are not provided, and the information is insufficient for a successful vetting process. The partial information conveys a sense of normalcy while at the same time paints a deceptive picture of transplant medicine in China.

It is also questionable how many of the organ donors living under China’s repressive regime registered freely and voluntarily, or may have been coerced. It appears that the implementation of the public organ donation program occurred mainly to appease the international medical community with a cover story for China’s transplant volume.

In its *Statement on Organ and Tissue Donation*, the World Medical Association warned against organ procurement from prisoners in jurisdictions where the death penalty is practiced, because there are no adequate safeguards in place to protect against coercion in all cases. This warning also applies to Falun Gong prisoners of conscience. Witnesses have reported that detained Falun Gong practitioners were given the choice to either sign a form to ‘voluntarily donate’ their organs and have a painless death, or be brutally tortured to death. This illustrates how deceptive a so-called organ donor program can be in a totalitarian country, and how crimes against humanity can be camouflaged from the outside world.

The lack of transparency and traceability is part of China’s strategy to cover up and conceal.

A similar tactic was used in figures reported by the public organ donation program, where organ donors have been added in unusual, unseen and non-organic patterns. This was exposed in an academic publication on a forensic statistical analysis of organ donor numbers showing that donor numbers were man-made and manufactured instead of following a natural course of organ donation.

This mechanism of providing some amount of information to convey normalcy, but not enough information to risk exposure, is part of an agenda to cover up ethical violations through a cascade of deceptive steps, which has been described by DAFOH as a “Deception Protocol.”

The better we understand this protocol of deceptive measures that the CCP notoriously applies to hide its atrocities and violations of ethics, the better we can respond.
The Deception Protocol

Deception is a surreptitious act that attempts to persuade others to believe something that is factually not true. In many cases, deception is used to gain some type of advantage or benefit.

Methods of deception are deeply ingrained in communist systems. In the context of forced organ harvesting of living people in China, we have observed a pattern of misleading and fraudulent actions with three goals: profit, expansion of China’s influence in transplant medicine globally and eradication of the spiritual discipline of Falun Gong.

In order to respond to the misleading information, avoid falling victim to the deception, and restore free and objective judgement, it is important to understand the mechanism of the deception protocol.

“Deception is a surreptitious act that attempts to persuade others to believe something that is factually not true.”

1. Violations

The deception protocol is put into motion by acts that violate ethical standards. Contemporary ethical standards first established in ancient Europe and practiced in most regions of the world today are often disregarded in authoritative or totalitarian societies, including communist systems, where human rights and civil liberties are given little to no value.

The President of China’s Supreme Court indicated in 2017 that the CCP is above the Chinese Constitution and Chinese laws; it is self-evident that the CCP also sees itself as above international ethical standards. Deviation from international ethical standards is not considered a violation of ethics in China but normal under communist rule.

With China’s society being controlled by the CCP and every person being compelled to comply with its dictates and norms, there is little to no room for individual doctors and medical professionals to adhere to international ethical standards. Hence, we have to understand that China’s transplant industry is not in a position to recognize or abide by the Western concept of transplant ethics. If the CCP says that forced organ harvesting of living prisoners of conscience is legitimate, then it becomes the norm.

This reality is a sober rebuttal to the hopes of Western transplant institutions to educate Chinese transplant surgeons in medical ethics: Doctors who came from China for medical and ethical training will find themselves in a communist controlled environment upon return to China, where ethical standards are subdued by Party rule.
2. Denial

Whenever an unethical act is noticed and decried by the international community, the Chinese government first responds by denying that the act has occurred. The denial occurs swiftly like a reflex; it immediately shields against criticism in order to maintain a favorable status in the eyes of the public, while allowing unethical or illicit acts to continue behind closed doors.

Denial can include publicly rejecting responsibility for reprehensible acts or issuing false statements of reassurance, which help to create a fictional narrative of innocence and good will. When public perception is manipulated, authoritarian regimes are emboldened to consolidate and intensify power, both domestically and internationally.

Denial aims to stifle whistleblowers, independent experts and medical professionals from raising awareness of actual and potential problems.

3. Cover Up

After denial has occurred, the next step is to hide or cover-up the unethical act in order to protect against further investigation. This includes the active suppression and destruction of information that could expose the lies used to construct a false narrative.

The CCP uses different tactics to generate self-censorship within international news media and medical institutions, and this self-censorship plays an important role in the cover-up and in the next step of the deception protocol, disinformation.

4. Disinformation

Disseminating disinformation about the initial, unethical act is a necessary component in the deception protocol. State-operated news agencies are deployed to whitewash traces of wrongdoing. Disinformation is circulated to divert public scrutiny and instigate division within the international community.

Disinformation campaigns include the widespread promulgation of propaganda, with false and misleading information circulated by national and international media and via social media. Professional organizations are infiltrated and experts are influenced with an intent to disseminate disinformation to intergovernmental organizations and governments.

The disinformation, often a mix of truth and lies, impacts critical governmental decisions by creating confusion and blocking access to accurate data.
### DECEPTION PROTOCOL

#### VIOLATIONS
Intentionally causing harm to public welfare and violating internationally accepted medical and ethical guidelines, including China’s state-sponsored crimes against humanity of forced organ harvesting from living persons for profit.

#### DENIAL
Publicly denying responsibility for reprehensible acts; issuing false statements of reassurance to manipulate a false narrative, while preventing whistleblowers, independent experts and professionals from raising awareness about actual and potential problems.

#### COVER UP
Actively suppressing and destroying information which, if made public, could help to save lives during the initial phases of medical tragedies; issuing false rebuttals against any leaked information that describes the true scale or severity of the tragedies.

#### DISINFORMATION
Promulgating a widespread disinformation campaign of false and misleading information through national and international media, social media, and reports to intergovernmental organizations in order to gain political leverage and suppress international scrutiny.

#### PROFITEERING
Gaining from medical tragedies by prioritizing profits over human rights and dignity; manipulating the actions of global medical organizations and professionals to foster commercial profit through false claims of expertise; manipulation of stock, currency and shortfalls in global economic markets.
3. Evidence

**TRUTH THROUGH COURAGE**

**FINDING TRUTH**
Deception aims to separate people from the truth. When we reconnect with truth, deception loses its influence, and its control evaporates. With access to true information and the courage to reject the CCP’s lies, we regain our freedom. Truth is the most important catalyst to end forced organ harvesting from living prisoners of conscience.

**ENDING WILLFUL BLINDNESS**
China uses propaganda to suppress independent thinking and exert control. We have to reject state-guided disinformation. The evidence of the CCP’s industrial-scale transplant market and forced organ harvesting is irrefutable. It takes courage to recognize that state-sanctioned mass killing for organs is a reality in China.

**UNDERSTANDING INCENTIVES**
The CCP benefits financially, ideologically and politically from forced organ harvesting and delegates the process of annihilation of Falun Gong to transplant doctors. This approach is not only a concealed form of mass elimination of the unwanted but is also financially attractive to the perpetrators.

**PARTING FROM SELF-CENSORSHIP**
Through bribery, intimidation and bullying, the CCP manipulates governments, corporations and NGOs to silence themselves on sensitive topics. To avoid angering China, one relinquishes freedom of expression. After reversing our willful blindness, we need the courage to part from the invisible contract of self-censorship.

**EXPOSING CRIMES**
To free oneself from the shackles of self-censorship, one has to bring the CCP’s crimes against humanity to the light of day, creating a ripple effect of awareness. We can expose how it has weaponized and distorted information to hide these crimes. We must find the courage to overcome our silence and speak up!
Moreover, disinformation is used to build up an authoritarian regime’s status so that others will turn to the regime for guidance and expertise.

The disinformation process also includes misleading explanations of leaked information, such as information that describes the true scale and severity of the government’s transplant abuses. The CCP reacts defensively to negative attention; any concerns raised are met with hostile bullying and mockery and are never addressed with openness or transparency.

The protocol makes clear that totalitarian regimes like the CCP are in fact disincentivized to comply with international standards as they turn the violation of such standards to their own benefit. Therefore, we cannot expect that China will end its practice of forced organ harvesting of living prisoners of conscience of its own accord.

These forms of aggressive communication aim to amplify disinformation through gaslighting, so the other side is intimidated into accepting the disinformation provided.

This is a form of conditioning in which the outside world is forced to accept the disinformation as a factual state of affairs.

5. Profiteering

The last step in the cascade of the deception protocol is pursuing profit and other benefits from the initial unethical act. Forms of profiteering and financial gain from forced organ harvesting include transplant surgeries to foreign patients, as well as use of plastinated bodies of prisoners of conscience in anatomy classes, body exhibits and medical research.

Profiteering can manifest as capitalizing on the manipulation of global medical organizations and professionals.

The mechanism of this deception protocol is obvious: through a set of pre-programmed steps that function like a cascade of actions, the CCP-controlled government is able to deflect and deter criticism of its practices and continue these practices unabated without the need to abide by international rules and standards.

The protocol makes clear that totalitarian regimes like the CCP are in fact disincentivized to comply with international standards as they turn the violation of such standards to their own benefit. Therefore, we cannot expect that China will end its practice of forced organ harvesting of living prisoners of conscience of its own accord.

Decoupling From the Deception Protocol

When we fall victim to the deception protocol, we lose access to true information
3. Evidence

We need to understand that China benefits financially, ideologically and politically from transplant tourism, transplant medicine and forced organ harvesting. Doctors and others involved in China’s transplantation infrastructure are offered significant financial incentives. In the last 23 years, the Chinese government has garnered a massive profit from harvesting the organs of living Falun Gong practitioners and other prisoners of conscience. Financial gains fuels the continuation of the practice.

Another important incentive driving China’s transplantation crimes is the suppression of Falun Gong itself. The CCP has persecuted practitioners of this spiritual discipline since 1999, and a profitable use of their organs for transplantation is a self-propelling, self-rewarding mechanism where doctors participate in the destruction of the group. Indeed, as noted earlier in this report, the primary aim of the Chinese government is not to make a profit from these organs but to achieve the ultimate destruction and silencing of Falun Gong.

The CCP reacts defensively to negative attention; any concerns raised are met with hostile bullying and mockery and are never addressed with openness or transparency.

Through a process of untangling ourselves from the deception, we can regain our freedom for critical and objective thinking. To do so, we need to understand the cascade of deceptive steps and the mental imprisonment that comes with it, and then begin to reverse the cascade, step by step.

1. Understanding Incentives

We need to understand that China benefits financially, ideologically and politically from transplant tourism, transplant medicine and forced organ harvesting. Doctors and others involved in China’s transplantation infrastructure are offered significant financial incentives. In the last 23 years, the Chinese government has garnered a massive profit from harvesting the organs of living Falun Gong practitioners and other prisoners of conscience. Financial gains fuels the continuation of the practice.

Another important incentive driving China’s transplantation crimes is the suppression of Falun Gong itself. The CCP has persecuted practitioners of this spiritual discipline since 1999, and a profitable use of their organs for transplantation is a self-propelling, self-rewarding mechanism where doctors participate in the destruction of the group. Indeed, as noted earlier in this report, the primary aim of the Chinese government is not to make a profit from these organs but to achieve the ultimate destruction and silencing of Falun Gong.
Through ceaseless awareness raising efforts aimed at stopping the CCP’s brutal persecution campaign against Falun Gong, adherents of the practice have also helped the Chinese people and the global community better understand the CCP’s crimes against humanity. Consequently, the CCP perceives the practice as an ideological threat to its own domestic control and global dominance. Mass murder through state-organized forced organ harvesting is not only financially advantageous but is a convenient and efficient means to eliminate this peaceful group of meditators.

2. Ending Willful Blindness

Information, both factually correct and false, is readily available in our interconnected world. Access to information is hardly an obstacle, but choosing which information to believe and how to respond is up to us.

There is no room for free will in communist societies and China under the current regime is no exception. Through corruption and propaganda, people are manipulated into ‘choices’ that benefit the regime. China has attempted to export this use of propaganda to prevent those beyond its border from taking action to stop forced organ harvesting. We, as free-thinking people not living under the iron fist of a communist regime, have a choice of whether to accept or reject the fallacies given by the CCP. This choice amounts to either choosing to be willfully blind or choosing to open our eyes and see China’s transplant industry for what it is: a state-organized, industrial-scale transplant market of mass murder through forced organ harvesting of living prisoners of conscience.

We can decide to reject the fake, manipulated reality of disinformation and see “the emperor’s new clothes” for what they are. Organs are either procured in an altruistic, ethical manner or procured under coercion and force. Independent researchers have made it perfectly clear that China follows the latter. It takes courage to open our eyes and face this inconvenient truth.

3. Parting From Self-Censorship

The CCP’s tactics of bullying and mockery have pushed us to self-censorship and silence. It has intimidated us into curtailing our own free expression.

The goal of the deception protocol is to separate people from the truth. When we reconnect with the truth, the deception loses its influence, and the CCP cannot control us.

The CCP has conditioned the Western populace to remain silent and withhold criticism against the CCP or face a barrage of scathing attacks, bullying and termination of benefits. We have quietly agreed to censor ourselves on an individual level as well as on an institutional and professional level. Media has also succumbed to CCP pressure...
under threat of exclusion from events like the Olympic Games or medical conferences in China.

An essential pillar of freedom is to have a voice and to express that voice. We sacrifice the precious gift of free thought and free speech if we succumb to communist pressure. Thus, after reversing our willful blindness, we must develop the courage to part from the invisible contract of self-censorship.

4. Exposing Crimes

Once we have mustered our courage, we can bring the CCP's violations of ethics and crimes against humanity to the light of day by talking about them and creating a ripple effect of awareness. This includes exposing and articulating the methods that the CCP deploys to subdue and deceive people.

We can inform ourselves and others about the way the CCP weaponizes “information” to deceive people and as an initial step to limit and destroy freedom of thought. Why else would communist governments always spend large financial resources on propaganda ministries and media control? We have to find the courage to speak up!

5. Finding Truth

The goal of the deception protocol is to separate people from the truth. When we reconnect with the truth, the deception loses its influence, and the CCP cannot control us.

Having access to information and the courage to expose the misleading nature of the CCP opens the door to understanding the reality of what is happening in China. With public awareness, the CCP will have nowhere to hide and can be held accountable. Truth is the most important catalyst to end forced organ harvesting from living Falun Gong practitioners and other prisoners of conscience. We need to reconnect with the truth.

We have a choice. We do not have to live in a prison of mental disinformation. We can choose freedom, step out of willful blindness and self-censorship and, with courage, choose truth.

“Truth is the most important catalyst to end forced organ harvesting from living Falun Gong practitioners and other prisoners of conscience.”

“We have a choice. We do not have to live in a prison of mental disinformation. We can choose freedom, step out of willful blindness and self-censorship and, with courage, choose truth.”
Witnessing a violation of ethical practices or a crime is a very important factor in the chain of response. A witness can report the trespassing of law and help to either end an ongoing crime or contribute evidence that can later be used in the prosecution of the perpetrator. Depending on the circumstances or the country where the violation of ethics or crime occurs, a witness can be in greater or lesser jeopardy, or because of surveillance and state control, the witness may not even be able to testify.

In the case of the totalitarian system of the People’s Republic of China, it is extremely difficult and dangerous to come forth as a witness, or even impossible when the victim, who may be the last person witnessing the forced removal of his or her organs, will be killed in the process of organ harvesting. The personnel committing the organ removal will be under tight control and less likely to incriminate themselves in the crime of forced organ harvesting.

The expectation for witness testimony needs to be adjusted to the circumstances in China. It would be extremely rare, or impossible, for a witness to present the perfect piece of evidence with photo, video, etc. Instead, we need to strongly consider the small bits and pieces of testimony of what victims or bystanders have witnessed. Some victims were able to leave or escape, and their testimonies are critical to understanding the greater picture. The least we can do to stand by the victims and witnesses who have the heart and courage to step forward is to
provide a platform so that their stories can be told.

This report wishes to honor those who were killed for their organs, away from public attention, by giving them a voice.

**Testimony by a Chinese Doctor — A Rare Glimpse Into Organ Harvesting After Execution**

*Dr. Wang Guoqi*

*Excerpts of a testimony presented to the United States House of Representatives Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, June 27, 2001*

“**My name is Wang Guoqi and I am a 38-year-old physician from the People’s Republic of China. In 1981, after standard childhood schooling and graduation, I joined the People’s Liberation Army. By 1984, I was studying medicine at the Paramilitary Police Paramedical School. I received advanced degrees in Surgery and Human Tissue Studies.**

My work required me to remove skin and corneas from the corpses of over one hundred executed prisoners, and, on a couple of occasions, victims of intentionally botched executions. It is with deep regret and remorse for my actions that I stand here today testifying against the practices of organ and tissue sales from death row prisoners.

In order to secure a corpse from the execution grounds, security officers and court units were given ‘red envelopes’ with cash amounting to anywhere between 200-500 RMB [$20-50] per corpse. Then, after execution, the body would be rushed to the autopsy room rather than the crematorium, and we would extract skin, kidneys, livers, bones and corneas for research and experimental purposes.

“**Nowhere on these papers was there any mention of voluntary organ donation, and clearly the prisoners did not know how their bodies would be used after death.**

*Dr. Wang Guoqi*

Section Chief Xing would notify us of upcoming executions. We would put an order in for the number of corpses we’d like to dissect, and I would give him 300 RMB [$30] per cadaver. The money exchange took place at the Higher People’s Court, and no receipts or evidence of the transaction would be exchanged.

Once notified of an execution, our section would prepare all necessary equipment and arrive at the Beicang Crematorium in plain clothes with all official license plates on our vehicles replaced with civilian ones. This was done on orders of the criminal investigation section.
Before removing the skin, we would cut off the ropes that bound the criminals’ hands and remove their clothing. Each criminal had identification papers in his or her pocket that detailed [their] name, age, profession, work unit, address and crime. Nowhere on these papers was there any mention of voluntary organ donation, and clearly the prisoners did not know how their bodies would be used after death.

“
I have worked at execution sites over a dozen times, and have taken the skin from over one hundred prisoners in crematoriums. Whatever impact I have made in the lives of burn victims and transplant patients does not excuse the unethical and immoral manner of extracting organs.

Dr. Wang Guoqi
”

Because this system allowed us to treat so many burn victims, our department became the most reputable and profitable department in Tianjin. Huge profits prompted our hospital to urge other departments to design similar programs. The urology department thus began its program of kidney transplant surgeries. The complexity of the surgery called for a price of 120,000-150,000 RMB [$12-15K] per kidney.

In the first case of kidney transplantation in August 1990, I accompanied the urology surgeon to the higher court and prison to collect blood samples from four death-row prisoners. The policeman escorting us told the prisoners that we were there to check their health conditions; therefore, the prisoners did not know the purpose for their blood samples or that their organs might be up for sale. Out of the four samplings, one basic and sub-group blood match was found for the recipient, and the prisoner’s kidneys were deemed fit for transplantation.

In the morning, the donating prisoner had received a heparin shot to prevent blood clotting and ease the organ extraction process.

Once the hand-cuffed and leg-ironed prisoner had been shot, a bailiff removed the leg irons. Xing Tongyi and I had 15 seconds to bring the executee to the waiting ambulance. Inside the ambulance, the best urologist surgeons removed both kidneys, and rushed back to the waiting recipient at the hospital.

Although I performed this procedure nearly a hundred times in the following years, it was an incident in October 1995 that has tortured my conscience to no end... .

Before execution, I administered a shot of heparin to prevent blood clotting to the prisoner. A nearby policeman told him it was a tranquilizer to prevent unnecessary suffering during the execution. The criminal responded by giving thanks to the government.
4. Witnesses

... Either because the executioner was nervous, aimed poorly, or intentionally misfired to keep the organs intact, the prisoner had not yet died, but instead lay convulsing on the ground.

I was forced to submit a pledge that I would never expose their practices of procuring organs and the process by which the organs and skin were preserved and sold for huge profits.

Dr. Wang Guoqi

We were ordered to take him to the ambulance anyway where urologists Wang Zhifu, Zhao Qingling and Liu Oiyou extracted his kidneys quickly and precisely. When they finished, the prisoner was still breathing and his heart continued to beat.

The execution commander asked if they might fire a second shot to finish him off, to which the country court staff replied, ‘Save that shot. With both kidneys out, there is no way he can survive’ ... After this incident, I have had horrible, reoccurring nightmares.

I have worked at execution sites over a dozen times, and have taken the skin from over one hundred prisoners in crematoriums. Whatever impact I have made in the lives of burn victims and transplant patients does not excuse the unethical and immoral manner of extracting organs.

I resolved to no longer participate in the organ business, and my wife supported my decision. I submitted a written report requesting reassignment to another job. This request was flatly denied on the grounds that no other job matched my skills. I began to refuse to take part in outings to execution sites and crematoriums, to which the hospital responded by blaming and criticizing me for my refusals.

I was forced to submit a pledge that I would never expose their practices of procuring organs and the process by which the organs and skin were preserved and sold for huge profits. They threatened me with severe consequences, and began to train my replacement. Until the day I left China in the spring of 2000, they were still harvesting organs from execution sites.”

Annie—The Whistleblower From March 2006

Nurse in the accounting department of Sujiatun Hospital, China, who was married to a neurosurgeon who removed the corneas of 2,000 Falun Gong practitioners

Excerpts from an interview with David Kilgour and from a public speech

“My name is Annie. I used to work for Liaoning Province Thrombosis Treatment Center of Integrated Chinese and Western Medicine. I have exposed a concentration
At the time, a lot of public security bureaus and hospitals in many areas were detaining many Falun Gong practitioners. A lot of people working at the hospital, including me, were not Falun Gong practitioners. So, we didn't pay attention.

If it were not for what happened in 2003, when I found my ex-husband was directly involved in it, I probably wouldn't be interested in this at all.

My ex-husband was a surgeon in that hospital. I'm sorry that I am not able to attend today's press conference. I have been escaping from the danger of assassination for the past few years. When my ex-husband decided to stop removing organs from Falun Gong practitioners, he was nearly assassinated by an organization in China… .

My ex-husband and I worked in this hospital from 1999 and 2004. [He removed] corneas of around 2,000 people … from the end of 2001 to October 2003.

In July 2001 … on the receipts I noted sharp increases in the food supplies. Also, the people in charge of the logistics were delivering meals to the facilities where Falun Gong practitioners were detained.

From the receipts, the medical equipment supplies also sharply increased … After several months, the consumption of food and other supplies gradually decreased.

The person in charge of … sending food to Falun Gong practitioners detained told me that there were about 5,000 to 6,000 practitioners.

If it were not for what happened in 2003, when I found my ex-husband was directly involved in it, I probably wouldn't be interested in this at all.

In 2003, I learned that Falun Gong practitioners had been transferred to the underground complex and other hospitals, because our hospital couldn't hold so many people.
During the years of 2001–2002, I didn’t know anything about organ harvesting. I only knew the detention of these people. ... The operations started in 2001. Some were done in our hospital, and some were done at other hospitals in the region.

Usually, these Falun Gong practitioners were injected with a shot to cause heart failure. During the process these people would be pushed into operation rooms to have their organs removed.

On the surface the heart stopped beating, but the brain was still functioning, because of that shot ... These people were pushed to other operation rooms for removals of heart, liver, kidneys, etc.

During one operation when he collaborated with other doctors, he learned they were Falun Gong practitioners, that their organs were removed while alive, and that it was not just cornea removal—they were removing many organs.

In the later period of time, when these doctors cooperated together, they started doing the operations together. At the beginning, fearing information could leak out, 

At the beginning, fearing information could leak out, different organs were removed by different doctors in different rooms. Later on, when they got money, they were no longer afraid anymore. They started to remove the organs together.

Annie, The Whistleblower

At the beginning [my ex-husband] also did the operations, but he did not know they were Falun Gong practitioners. He was a neurosurgeon. He removed corneas...

Because our hospital was not an organ transplant hospital—it was only in charge of removal—how these organs were transplanted, he didn’t know.

At the end of 2001, he started to operate, but he didn’t know these live bodies were Falun Gong practitioners. He got to know that in 2002.

Some of the staff in this hospital knew about it ... Many surgeons participated in such organ removal surgeries secretly. Some other staff members dared not reveal the secret even when they knew about it. They avoided talking about it because they didn’t want to be killed.

Annie, The Whistleblower
different organs were removed by different doctors in different rooms. Later on, when they got money, they were no longer afraid anymore. They started to remove the organs together.

In the year 2002, [my] neighbor had a liver transplant. It cost 200,000 yuan. The hospital charged a little bit less for Chinese than foreigners. ... [My ex-husband] was asked to help out in other hospitals.

However, every time when he did such a favor, or provided this kind of help, he got lots of money, and cash awards—several dozen times his normal salary. ... Paid in Chinese yuan. Equivalent to hundreds of thousands of U.S. dollars.

[My ex-husband] heard ... that people were detained underground. If three operations were done every day, after several years of operation, for the 5,000–6,000 people, not many people would be left. This whole scheme and the trading of organs were organized by the government healthcare system. The doctors’ responsibility was simply to do what they were told to do.

The bodies would be sent to the crematorium near the Sujiatun area ... Usually the reasons were “the heart stopped beating,” “heart failure.”

When these people were rounded up and detained, nobody knew their names or where they were from. So, when they were sent to the crematorium, nobody could claim their bodies.

Later, when [my ex-husband] wanted to quit, someone did try to kill him. He submitted his resignation letter ... In February 2004, after his resignation was granted, the last month of working in the hospital ... we received phone threats at home. Someone said to him, ‘You watch out for your life.’

One day we got off work in the afternoon. There were two people walking toward us trying to assassinate him ... I pushed him aside and took the stab. Men do not have very good sixth senses, so he kept walking.

When I realized the two people were going to pull the knife to stab him, I pushed him aside ... Many people came over and I was sent to the hospital. These two men ran away

Because the Chinese Communist government’s state policy authorizes killing Falun Gong practitioners without any legal consequences, the death of Falun Gong practitioners in China’s penal system is nothing.

Annie, The Whistleblower

There was no proper procedure or paperwork for this kind of operation. So, there was no way to count the number of operations in the normal way.
... I learned that they were thugs hired by the government health authorities.

Some of the staff in this hospital knew about it ... Many surgeons participated in such organ removal surgeries secretly. Some other staff members dared not reveal the secret even when they knew about it. They avoided talking about it because they didn’t want to be killed.

My ex-husband told me, ‘You have no idea of my agony. These Falun Gong practitioners were alive. It would be okay if we removed organs from dead bodies, but these people were truly alive.’ These things were done in secret ... The intern doctors used Falun Gong practitioners’ bodies for experiments. Some doctors felt very painful after they had done it.

Annie, The Whistleblower

The majority of the Falun Gong practitioners were transferred from Dabei Prison, Masanjia Forced Labor Camp and other prisons in Shenyang. Others were kidnapped from parks or their homes. They were kidnapped because they refused to give up their belief in Falun Gong.

The police didn’t have any search warrant and their families didn’t know it when they were arrested. Because the Chinese Communist government’s state policy authorizes killing Falun Gong practitioners without any legal consequences, the death of Falun Gong practitioners in China’s penal system is nothing.

I knew about this at the end of 2003. At the time, my husband had become absent-minded and trance-like. He had been doing it for years, but he had never told me about it. He kept it as a secret. He often had terrible nightmares at night and woke up shrieking and terrified. He stared blankly at the TV. When the kid or I touched him, he would shriek. I found him becoming abnormal. My ex-husband told me, ‘You have no idea of my agony. These Falun Gong practitioners were alive. It would be okay if we removed organs from dead bodies, but these people were truly alive.’ These things were done in secret ... The intern doctors used Falun Gong practitioners’ bodies for experiments. Some doctors felt very painful after they had done it.

My ex-husband had the habit of keeping a diary. There is an entry in his diary. When a patient lost her conscience, he cut open her clothes with a scissor. A package fell out of her pocket. My husband opened it and found a small box inside. Inside the box, there were a lucky charm with Falun Gong symbol and a note. It says, ‘Mommy Happy Birthday.’
I am not a Falun Gong practitioner. I am not speaking here with the same high level of morality as Falun Gong practitioners.”

**Accounts From Family Members of Victims of Forced Organ Harvesting**

The method of disposing of the bodies of forced organ harvesting victims varies by region, detention facility and hospital. In some cases, family members are told after the fact that their loved ones have died and were cremated without their consent. Sometimes family members are permitted to see the bodies before cremation, and it is in these cases that the organs had been removed from the bodies of their relatives. The Kilgour/Matas Report includes five cases of “Falun Gong Practitioners with Their Organs Removed Without Consent of Families” and others have been recorded in the years since.

**Han Yu**

*Falun Gong practitioner whose father was killed and believed to have been organ harvested while wrongly imprisoned in Beijing*

*Testimony given at DAFOH press conference at the Harvard Club, September 2019*

“On May 4, 2004, my father died in the Fangshan District Detention Center. The police claimed that an autopsy was needed because the cause of death was unclear. However, my stepmother told me that she did not sign the consent form, and I did not see any documents requesting the consent of autopsy from the family members.

Eventually, the Public security personnel conducted the autopsy without family consent and even forbid our family members from seeing the body ... they did not provide us any results of the post-mortem examination.

Only on the day of cremation for my father’s body, the authorities printed a report on-site and ... claimed that my father died of a heart attack.

On June 18, 2004, more than a month after my father’s death, the police allowed our family to see the remains ... The Fangshan police branch dispatched a lot of police cars and personnel to closely monitor the site.

We were not allowed to bring cameras—only the immediate family members were allowed to see the remains, two persons in each turn, and under the close watch of policemen on-site.

When I saw my father’s body, I still couldn’t believe that it was real. My father was lying there with countless scars. ... There were stitches in the throat area, using very thick black threads. The incision extended down until covered by the clothes. I stepped closer and wanted to unbutton the clothes and examine the wounds. Though I was able
to open up two buttons, the police on-site immediately stopped me, and forced my family out of the facility.

Then, our other relatives including my uncle went in. They tore up my father’s clothes when the policemen were unprepared. They found that the incision was all the way from the throat to the abdomen.

When they pressed the abdomen, they found that his abdomen was stuffed with hard ice. My uncle was very angry and questioned the police [about] what they had done [to] my father, so that he died without a complete body.

The police just said that this was due to autopsy. My uncle rushed out and asked my stepmother why she agreed the autopsy. My stepmother cried and said she did not sign.”

Yanchao Zhang

Family of Falun Gong victim of forced organ harvesting from Heilongjiang Province

Testimony included in the Kilgour/Matas Report, July 2007

“At the Huangshanzuizi Crematory in Harbin City, Mr. Zhang’s family members saw his body, which had been brutalized beyond recognition and was appallingly
disfigured. One of his legs was broken. One of his eyeballs was missing and the socket was caved in, leaving a gaping hole. There was virtually no skin on his head, face, and most parts of his body, and there was not a single tooth left in his lower jaw, which was shattered. His clothes were also gone.

Bruises and wounds could be seen everywhere on his body. There was a long cut on his chest, which had obviously been sewn up later. His chest was also caved in, his skull was opened, and a part of his brain was removed. His internal organs were missing.

More than 60 armed policemen were present in the crematorium during the visit of Zhang’s family. They declared that whoever appealed for Zhang Yanchao would be arrested immediately and handled as a ‘counterrevolutionary.’

"My father was ... kidnapped into a brainwashing center, and then transferred to Chongqing City Xishanping Labor Camp for one year. On January 27, 2009, at about 3:00 p.m., my elder sister, brother, niece and I went together to visit my father in that labor camp. My father’s health condition was normal at the time of visit.

""
On January 28, 2009, at 2:40 p.m., the labor camp called and told us that our father passed away and told us to hurry to the hospital in the labor camp. At 7:00 pm ... [we] arrived in Chongqing city ... The police said that we need to wait for the arrival of clerks from the police, prosecutor office, and court house.

Eventually, the police cars took us to the Shijialiang Funeral Home and we arrived there after 10pm. The Funeral home was guarded by the armed police from the Beiji District of Chongqing City, and there were many cars including police cars in the parking lot there.

At the funeral home, we were informed that we could only see the head of my father for 5 minutes, without any recording or photography. And everyone had to go through body search before entering.

My elder sister and her husband went in first. My father’s body was placed in the middle drawer of the second layer of a freezer. They pulled out the drawer, only exposing my father’s head. My big sister called out my father’s name and touched his face. She found that his philtrum was still warm.

She was shocked and screamed: ‘My father is still alive!’ Hearing her screams, we rushed into the room, and pulled drawer half-way out, and then we touched his chest, and found that his chest was indeed still warm, still had a body temperature.

Then, we pulled my father’s body completely out of the freezer and put it on the ground. We immediately questioned them: ‘My father is not dead yet why put him in the freezer?’ My brother also questioned: ‘How come my father’s body was still warm if he died more than seven hours ago and kept in the freezer for so long. You can come and touch it.’ However, a female staff there told us while holding a death certificate: ‘Anyway, we have a hospital’s death certificate!’

Bruises and wounds could be seen everywhere on his body. There was a long cut on his chest, which had obviously been sewn up later. His chest was also caved in, his skull was opened, and a part of his brain was removed. His internal organs were missing.

Yanchao Zhang

We requested to measure the body temperature again, but the plainclothes police rejected. While we were about to undress my father to do a further check-up and then conduct a CPR, a group of four or five people forcefully dragged us out of the funeral home and ordered us to sign
the consent form to cremate my father. We sternly rejected and told them that we would not sign as my father was still alive.

On January 29, my elder sister and I went to Chongqing public security bureau. ... to report this case and seek legal support. [They] viciously told us that they could still cremate the body without the consent from the family.

Later, we were clearly informed by Director Bolin Zhou from the Chongqing Municipal Prosecutor’s Office that my father’s organs were removed to be made into medical specimen and the remains were cremated, although we did not sign the consent to cremate my father’s body. The autopsy report stated that there were bruises in his chest and the crooks of both arms, and his 4th, 5th, and 6th ribs were broken.

On May 13, 2009, we hired two lawyers, Li Chunfu and Zhang Kai from Beijing ... However, more than 100 people from Jiangjin District Public Security Bureau, 610 office, Political and Legal Commission, Jijiang police station, and other local government offices, besieged our home ... beating up the two lawyers ...

Their mobile phones and computers were robbed, hands were handcuffed. Zhang Kai, Li Chunfu and Jiang Hongbin were then kidnapped and locked into the Jijiang police station.

In July 2013, the Public Security Bureau in Jiangjin District Chongqing city sent representatives to Shanghai to offer me private settlement on my father’s case again. They said that any settlement deal could be agreed by them, as long as I gave up my father’s case and stop the appealing. I refused and told them that I would go all the way to the end to seek justice for my father’s case.”

Accounts of Falun Gong Victims Who Were Medically Tested While Imprisoned

The singling out of Falun Gong practitioners for medical exams while in Chinese detention are not isolated occurrences, but widespread and numerous. They trigger alarm because they are unusual and without a reasonable purpose. The torture of Falun Gong detainees contradicts the normal health intervention purpose of a medical exam and exploitation via forced labor contradicts the high expense of the medical exams. The high volume of exams is atypical and the forced nature of the exams is unsettling, especially in light of the fact that the types of exams reported are consistent with evaluation of organ health and data collection to establish transplant matching.

The Kilgour/Matas Report includes 34 witness statements from those
who underwent medical testing while incarcerated.

The reports\(^8\) of blood and DNA samples being forcibly taken from detained Falun Gong practitioners continue to surface.

Minghui.org, a media site which publishes firsthand accounts from Falun Gong practitioners in China, collected 129 cases of blood and DNA samples being taken in the first half of 2021 and multiple reports have been made of Falun Gong practitioners being subjected to forced blood draws in their homes either prior to arrest or without arrest.

**Ning Shi**

*Falun Gong practitioner from Shandong Province now living in the USA who was wrongfully arrested in China on twenty occasions and underwent medical exams indicative of forced organ harvesting preparations*

Testimony given at the 2022 Inaugural Nurses Summit on Combatting and Preventing Forced Organ Harvesting, November 2022

"In 2007, I was in several prisons. The doctors and nurses gave me a lot of medical examinations during that time. It made me feel abnormal and worried, because they tortured me so badly and did not care if I died. They did not take care of my injuries or illnesses.

Falun Dafa practitioners in jail were separated from the other criminal prisoners, but only before they examined them. They had the examination many times, much more than others or criminal prisoners.

They drew my blood at least once a month during the time I was in the jail hospital."

“**In 2007, I was in several prisons. The doctors and nurses gave me a lot of medical examinations during that time. It made me feel abnormal and worried, because they tortured me so badly and did not care if I died. They did not take care of my injuries or illnesses.**

**Ning Shi**

Falun Dafa practitioners in jail were separated from the other criminal prisoners, but only before they examined them. They had the examination many times, much more than others or criminal prisoners.

They drew my blood at least once a month during the time I was in the jail hospital.”
Zhongfeng Tian

Falun Gong practitioner now living in the USA who was wrongfully incarcerated in China during which time she was handcuffed to a hospital bed presumably on stand-by to have her organs harvested

Testimony given in The Epoch Times article “Chinese Refugee Once ‘Kept Like an Animal For Harvest,’” February 2015

“One day 10 guards came for me in the labor camp, put a black hood over my eyes and shoved me in a police car ... when they took the hood off I found I was in a hospital room. They put me onto a bed and cuffed me to it by the hands and feet.

[A] doctor came in, tested her health, and said to the police before leaving ‘everything is normal,’ Tian said. She was cuffed again ...

Police kept watch over her 24 hours a day ...

Every morning a Chinese woman ... dressed in a white smock and a white hat, would come in and test her blood pressure, heart function, and health. ... This doctor again said ‘everything is normal’ when leaving.

One day she overheard a conversation between a female police officer and what sounded like a male voice on the telephone ... she responded ‘I’m in the heart disease ward.’ Tian remembered being confused and shocked, thinking to herself: ‘So this is the heart disease ward? What on earth am I doing in here?’

Her strangest experience was probably when she awoke to find a man in her room, walking back and forth in front of her bed, apparently sizing her up. ‘Who are you?’ she asked. He was surprised, and said ‘I ... I’m a nurse. I’m here looking after my family.’

She began telling him that she was a Falun Gong practitioner that had been detained, sent to forced labor camp, and now somehow wound up in a hospital room.

A police guard burst in and loudly told her to shut up and the man to leave. The two went onto the balcony and she heard the police woman say: “Her body is especially good, it’s just that her brain has been knocked around.

Tian remembers thinking to herself: ‘They’re obviously talking about me; why is that strange man so interested in me?’
Tian recalls that as the man left, he looked at her with the queerest of expressions, ‘like he was looking at an object, not a person.’ [I] remembered … the stories that had just come out about Falun Gong practitioners at the Sujiatun hospital in northeast China being killed for their organs. And I also recalled how I knew a young, healthy Falun Gong practitioner named Li Mei, 28, who mysteriously died after being arrested. When her family saw her body, it had incisions beginning under her chin. And then, no one knew why, her body was forcefully cremated.

When I thought of all this I started shaking. Have I become part of their organ market ‘inventory’? Am I being kept like an animal for harvest?

I started resisting straight away, doing everything I could to stop them from cuffing me again.

I also started screaming: ‘You want to kill me! You want to harvest organs from a living Falun Gong practitioner!’

During the commotion, one of the other doctors at the hospital approached her and quietly told her that she mustn’t go with anyone that night, but that he was on shift and would help. A nurse is going to come and give you some medicine. You must let him do the injection.

That night, a nurse indeed came to give her an injection … [which] somehow made it seem that her health had suddenly deteriorated, securing Ms. Tian’s release from the hospital.

The following day, another nurse came, began doing the check, and frowned: ‘Yesterday you were fine. Why are you suddenly like this?’ Another nurse had the same reaction. She was immediately sent back to the labor camp.

The guards there said ‘your organs are bad—we don’t want you!’ and injected her with what she said was a poison. Their intention was for her to be sent home and die, she said.”

**Dai Ying**

*Falun Gong practitioner from Shenzhen now living in Norway who was wrongfully imprisoned in China on two occasions during which she underwent medical exams indicative of forced organ harvesting preparations*

_Testimony published in a Health Europa article “Forced organ harvesting 'They kill innocent people for their organs,'” February 2020*

---

*Read Dai Ying’s testimony published in Health Europa*
“In April 2004 all the Falun Gong practitioners in the labour camp were given medical exams; they were given injections and had their blood taken.

On the day the medical exams took place a lot of policemen surrounded us, and doctors from outside came, and all the Falun Gong practitioners were dragged into a meeting room.

I asked one guard why only Falun Gong practitioners were given injections and he said this is a special [program] from the government. One female practitioner who had a strong mind and didn’t want to give up her belief was forced to get the injection, but after she was given the injection she fainted, so people panicked and ran out of the meeting room.

Several days later, the Falun Gong practitioners were dragged onto a luxury bus which had all the equipment to perform medical exams installed on it.

We were not told what this medical exam was for, we were just forced to go through different examinations. I had a huge vial of blood taken.

They took X-rays and then we went to the clinic in the prison, where they checked my kidneys and performed an electrocardiogram.

That doctor stopped for a while and asked me if I had any problem with my heart. I told them that I was severely persecuted for years and sometimes my heart would stop beating.

He asked me questions about my kidneys; I said before I began practicing Falun Gong, I had a disease of the kidneys.

When they checked my eyes, I told them that I couldn’t even see the biggest letter because I had been struck by the electric baton and lost my eyesight.”

**Xu Wenlong**

*Falun Gong practitioner, whose account was published on Minghui.org, October 2022*

“Mr. Xu was arrested ... and given six months of house arrest ... When the six-month house arrest was about to expire, the police took him back into custody ... [and] collected a blood sample and threatened to kill him.
According to Mr. Xu’s cousin who was arrested with him, although the police weren’t medical personnel, they were very proficient in drawing his blood. The cousin, who didn’t practice Falun Gong, also had her blood drawn.

The cousin said that while they were held at the Zhiyuan Police Station, she overheard two officers talking about a kidney selling for 400,000 yuan. She asked if they were talking about harvesting organs from Falun Gong practitioners. They didn’t reply.”

**Anecdotes vs. Evidence**

The aforementioned witness accounts are detailed, and the descriptions vary in format and content, with each unique individual testimony contributing to a larger picture of consistently similar experiences. They are credible, and yet critics might dismiss them as anecdotes because they are individual cases.

This is a frequent challenge when presenting witness testimonies: Should one give attention to individual testimony which may be dismissed as single case reports, or resort to generalized data that would provide statistical confidence but fail to provide critical information on the subject at hand? We need to realize that we risk dismissing the individual victims and the horror they went through when we downplay their accounts as mere anecdotes.
In order to address the concern of singular, anecdotal cases, DAFOH conducted a keyword search study in 2014 which reviewed reports collected on Minghui.org mentioning specific terms related to medical testing. The results show the number of articles posted on Minghui.org that mention the respective search term.

The numbers do not reflect the number of medical exams, rather, they only reflect the number of articles submitted that mention medical exams. In some cases one article might mention that ‘all inmates’ or ‘200 inmates’ underwent medical exams. In that case the actual number of medical exams is even higher than the number listed in the search results.

If there are two or three witness testimonies of forced organ harvesting, blood testing or medical exams, they might be considered anecdotes. But if there are hundreds and thousands of accounts of blood testing, medical exams and threats that organs would be harvested, the testimonies become strong pieces of evidence.

*If there are two or three witness testimonies of forced organ harvesting, blood testing or medical exams, they might be considered anecdotes. But if there are hundreds and thousands of accounts of blood testing, medical exams and threats that organs would be harvested, the testimonies become strong pieces of evidence.*
In March of 2020, the China Tribunal, an independent people’s tribunal led by Sir Geoffrey Nice, KC, rendered its final judgment regarding the Chinese government’s practice of forced organ harvesting of prisoners of conscience.

In its 556-page report, the seven-member panel concluded that “forced organ harvesting has been committed for years throughout China on a significant scale and that Falun Gong practitioners have been one—and probably the main—source of organ supply...very many people have died indescrivably hideous deaths” that “beyond
reasonable doubt... constitute crimes against humanity.”

The China Tribunal was formed by the International Coalition to End Transplant Abuse in China (ETAC) to examine the evidence of forced organ harvesting of prisoners of conscience in China and to investigate what criminal offenses may have been perpetrated by the Chinese government or government-supported institutions or individuals.

Panelists hailed from across the globe, with expertise in international law, medicine, business and international relations. Nice, from the UK, led the prosecution of Yugoslavia’s Slobodan Milosevic for war crimes. In his testimony via satellite at the Policy Forum on Organ Procurement and Extrajudicial Execution in China on Capitol Hill on March 10, 2020, Nice stated that “any person or organization that interacts in any substantial way with the People’s Republic of China” should recognize that “they are interacting with a criminal state.”

The Tribunal’s report follows months of investigations which began in 2018, including testimony from more than 50 experts,
first-hand accounts from former political prisoners and prisoners of conscience, evidence of phone call admissions from 2018, and numerous investigative reports with statistical data derived from years of research submitted as oral accounts or documentary evidence.

A total of 300 pages of witness testimonies and submissions were considered.

The Tribunal released previously undisclosed evidence to support the panelists’ conclusions, including:

- An undercover telephone call disclosing that former Chinese Communist head Jiang Zemin gave written orders to procure organs from Falun Gong practitioners;

- Admission by doctors at Chinese transplantation hospitals during undercover telephone calls that organs from Falun Gong detainees have been used and are still available for transplantation;

- The complete transcript of a telephone conversation with a Chinese government official who refers to himself as “the butcher,” and compares forced organ harvesting from living individuals to “slaughtering pigs . . . after scooping the organs out, I would sell them.”

The panelists noted in their report that CCP officials were invited to attend and address the allegations made against them but repeatedly refused to do so.

“Forced organ harvesting has been committed for years throughout China on a significant scale and that Falun Gong practitioners have been one—and probably the main—source of organ supply.”

In an interview with *The Daily Mail*, Nice said, “If you had clear evidence of crimes against humanity being committed closer to home in Europe, not only would the [UK] government act but the public would demand they act. It should not matter this is on the other side of the world.” Nice added that because there is such clear evidence of “systemic and widespread” organ harvesting in China, international organizations should investigate the question of whether or not these transplantation crimes constitute genocide.
6. Cold Genocide

The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 9, 1948 will celebrate its 75th anniversary in 2023. The Convention recognizes genocide to be a “crime under international law, contrary to the spirit and aims of the United Nations and condemned by the civilized world.” It further recognizes that during all periods of history “genocide has inflicted great losses on humanity.”

The Convention defines genocide as “any of the following acts,” such as “killing members of the group, causing serious bodily ... harm to members of the group, and deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part,” that are “committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group.”

“The profitable nature of forced organ harvesting is important in order to remotely ‘recruit’ doctors across the country and bribe their participation. It has thus became a self-propelling mechanism, where doctors and others involved in the transplantation process are paid for their compliance.”
The Convention further elaborates that not only is genocide punishable, but also the conspiracy or attempt to commit genocide and complicity in genocide are punishable offenses.

The Genocide Convention sets out a legal framework that is relevant in the context of forced organ harvesting of Falun Gong practitioners in China. In 1999, the former head of the CCP, Jiang Zemin, banned the practice of Falun Gong. He initiated the foundation of the 610 Office, a state agency with extrajudicial power that operated nationwide in China with the single task of eradicating Falun Gong. Jiang expressed intent to eradicate Falun Gong and its members in order to “destroy them physically.” He also ordered that if Falun Gong members died under torture, it would be falsely, but officially, recorded as suicide.

After 1999, the practice of harvesting organs from convicted and executed prisoners was extended and applied to prisoners of conscience. Instead of torturing them to death, the killing of Falun Gong practitioners for their organs was not only an efficient way to annihilate this group of peaceful citizens, but also offered significant financial gains for the government. The profitable nature of forced organ harvesting is important for remotely ‘recruiting’ doctors across the country and bribing their participation. It has thus become a self-propelling mechanism where doctors and others involved in the transplantation process are paid for their compliance. If it was for the financial incentives alone, any prisoner would have been turned into an organ source. Witness testimonies indicate that Falun Gong practitioners were uniquely singled out for specific medical exams and were heavily targeted for forced organ harvesting. Hence it is reasonable to establish that the main target of forced organ harvesting has been Falun Gong.

By applying the criteria of the Genocide Convention on the situation in China after 1999 laid out above, it is notable that:

- Killing members of the group of Falun Gong, in the form of torture or forced organ harvesting, is present;
- Bringing destruction to the group, in whole or in part, is present;
- The intent to destroy, in whole or in part, the religious group of Falun Gong is expressed by Jiang Zemin in words and orders, and by actions in the form of a highly active nationwide 610 Office;
- Genocide is being committed against Falun Gong, the destruction of Falun Gong and its members is expressed and attempted, and thus an international response according to the Genocide
Given the mechanism of forced organ harvesting, where transplant patients travel to China with the intent to receive a transplant organ, these so-called transplant tourists trigger the procurement of ‘organs-on-demand’ within days or weeks. The international community will need to decide if the issue of complicity to genocide is applicable, and then inform and prevent potential transplant tourists from going to China for transplantation purposes.

The Genocide Convention's definition of genocide does not include any reference to time. The destruction of a group can take place either in a short time frame or over a long period of time. In most cases, genocide occurs in high intensity in a short period of time, which is also described as a “hot genocide.”

In contrast, a cold genocide is carried out over an extended period of time in slow motion, which makes it less detectable and allows for a protracted destruction campaign.

A one-party system, such as the one in China, can ensure that a ban and eradication process stays in place over a long period of time, independent from elections and term limits. Therefore, the perpetrator is not under pressure to destroy the group quickly, but can pursue annihilation over decades. This makes a slow-moving destruction devastating in its outcome. The time frame of the destruction is irrelevant.

Understanding the distinction between a more recognizable hot genocide and a cold genocide is critical and allows us to clearly determine that a cold genocide, though not as easily discerned, is no less a genocide.

A slow-motion genocide can be carried out through long sentences in detention centers and labor camps, exposure to torture, including torture resulting in death and forced organ harvesting.

To illustrate the impact of a slow, but steady destruction, we present a model and assume for a moment that 18,250 Falun Gong prisoners of conscience are being killed for their organs per year. This would result in 50 members of the group losing their lives per day, which would be only a fraction of the 3,000 students who were killed during the Tiananmen Square massacre on June 4, 1989.

While the international media took notice of the June 4th massacre, a killing of 50 people per day does not seem to arouse much interest. However, extrapolated over
Before 2006, it was unimaginable to harvest organs from living prisoners of conscience without consent, and by now we should have learned our lesson that without independent, international inspections, we cannot rule out China’s next unimaginable act.

A cold genocide demands that we pay attention to the details and investigate the small acts that lead to crimes against humanity over time. Early detection of genocide has a higher chance of triggering an urgent response, while a protracted, slow moving destruction in small steps delays its detection and subsequently facilitates its continuation over a long period of time.

In either case, sudden or gradual, the destruction of the group can be potent and deadly.

After the 1989 student massacre on Tiananmen Square, the international community responded with determination. Sanctions affected China substantially. The Chinese government learned from this lesson.

With the ban of Falun Gong in 1999, a hot crackdown on the group did not appear to be an effective option, as it would attract too much attention. Instead, the Chinese regime chose a slow moving, less detectable eradication campaign in the style of a cold genocide.

An academic analysis, Cold Genocide: Falun Gong in China, published in Genocide Studies and Prevention: An International
Journal looked into the mechanisms of a cold genocide and published its findings as a case study on Falun Gong.

The authors discuss the slow-moving destruction and elaborated on factors that led to it. They demonstrated that this eradication campaign against Falun Gong is distinguishable as a cold genocide and can be described as a three-pronged, destructive strategy:

1. The Cold Genocide against Falun Gong is multi-dimensional, where Falun Gong practitioners are not only physically but also psychologically, socially and spiritually destroyed, which makes the destruction thorough and comprehensive.

2. It is subtle in terms of visibility, i.e., the destruction takes place in a concealed format, shielded from the public eye. While the Chinese regime conducted public executions of convicted prisoners, the torture and forced organ harvesting of Falun Gong practitioners is not publicly carried out.

3. It is normalized in China, i.e., governmental disinformation campaigns have ostracized and dehumanized Falun Gong practitioners and thereby solicited the consent of the Chinese people to carry out the persecution and eradication of Falun Gong.

The interplay of these invisible, physical and non-physical elements of eradication has caused a devastating and insidious destruction of Falun Gong adherents and the spiritual practice itself over the past 23 years. The three-pronged strategy reveals it as a cold genocide.

Observed in isolation, each of the three aspects—multi-dimensional, subtle, normalized—is a minor aspect that would at most be considered unjust or a violation of human rights. It is the extra step of recognizing the interplay of all three aspects that reveals the systematic and intentional destruction of Falun Gong.

By connecting the dots we can recognize the three-pronged strategy and confirm the presence of a cold genocide.

The former head of the Chinese government expressed the intent to destroy Falun Gong, and the actions of the government corroborate the agenda to commit a cold genocide against Falun Gong. Forced organ harvesting of Falun Gong practitioners plays a major role in this campaign.
We have limited this report to a small segment of the available data, evidence and witness reports on forced organ harvesting of Falun Gong practitioners. Our aim is to highlight critical data and information. Over the past 16 years, various independent investigators have gathered information and data that exceeds the content of our report by many times.

With this report we acknowledge the work and research that has been done by all investigators, journalists, legislators, human rights and medical organizations as well as the China Tribunal. We would also like to commend the brave individuals who have risked their lives to speak out about China’s transplantation crimes.

It is important to establish that there is an international and global interest to learn more about forced organ harvesting from Falun Gong practitioners in China and to end this transplant abuse completely as is shown by DAFOH’s global petition campaign which garnered over 3 million signatures from 50 countries and regions. Forced organ harvesting of Falun Gong practitioners and any other prisoners of conscience or civilians is a crime against humanity and in the case of Falun Gong, demonstrates the presence of a cold genocide.

The fact that the first allegations of forced organ harvesting in China were independently made by people who did not practice Falun Gong, and thus did not have a conflict of interest, is an important factor in terms of the credibility of the claims.
This should serve as motivation to take the allegations seriously and spend the necessary time evaluating the evidence.

The phone calls to Chinese hospitals conducted by the Kilgour/Matas team were probably the first specific pieces of evidence illustrating the existence and purposefulness of forced organ harvesting.

Another early sign of illicit transplant practices was the exponential increase of annual transplant numbers between 2000 and 2004, a crucial time period as no one in the global community suspected the existence of forced organ harvesting in China. Without public awareness, the Chinese government was emboldened to proceed without fear of reprisal, hence the 2.5-fold increase in transplants by 2004.

"Forced organ harvesting of Falun Gong practitioners and any other prisoners of conscience or civilians is a crime against humanity and in the case of Falun Gong, demonstrates the presence of a cold genocide."

At this point it is worth noting that though China officially reported performing around 13,000 transplants in 2004, a Chinese newspaper stated in 2005 that 20,000 transplants had been done the previous year, and later research released in 2016 suggests that the real transplant figures were upwards of 50,000-100,000 per year. But for this report, we will refer to the officially reported numbers in our analysis.

One would expect the increase in transplants seen between 2000 and 2004 to continue, however, the 2005 numbers show a decline. Usually, the transplant numbers for a given year are collected at the start of the subsequent year, thus transplant numbers for 2005 are released in early 2006.

In this case, early 2006 was the time when the first whistleblowers, Peter and Annie, spoke publicly of organs being forcibly harvested from Falun Gong practitioners. The Chinese government at that point would have been alerted to the international community taking notice of its transplant market. It is thus likely that the annual transplant numbers for 2005 and 2006 declined after its 2004 peak in order to defuse a sensitive situation. In other words, we cannot exclude the possibility that the annual transplant numbers after 2004 were manipulated to decrease the number of reported transplant cases, while the actual transplant industry in China continued to grow.

The concept of manufactured numbers was also later proven in the context of China’s organ donation program. It is reasonable to say that China has manipulated transplant numbers so frequently that they should not be taken at face value.
This is further revealed by comparing China’s transplant numbers with the numbers from countries that have altruistic organ donation programs. While other countries show an organic growth in transplants, with a continuous, steady increase, China’s figures have an unrealistic ‘mountain and valley’ trajectory:

- Between 2000 and 2004, the increase is too high.
- Between 2004 and 2006, China seems afraid to show its exorbitant increase in transplant numbers and attempts to correct it quickly with a steep decline not observed in any other country.
- Between 2006 and 2015, China appears to respond to the growing international interest and attention in its transplant market and reports a 10-year-long plateau of slightly under 10,000 transplants per year. While numbers in other countries steadily increase, China’s prior transplant boom seems to stagnate.

Reports showed that China’s transplant infrastructure expanded, with hospitals adding beds on transplant wards and reporting high occupancy and higher revenues, and with transplant teams working long hours. In other words, infrastructural and personnel indicators show a transplant boom, yet the official transplant numbers stagnated for 10 years. This is, to say the least, implausible. Subsequently, after the official launch of its public organ donation program, China seemed to have found new confidence and the transplant numbers increased again exponentially, larger than any other country. Are these numbers credible?

If the numbers are not credible, one must ask why China would go to the effort of manufacturing its transplant figures.

China’s transplant numbers seem to have the tendency to push upward, as the exponential increase before 2004 and after 2015 suggest. However, it appears that the nation’s organ supply does not keep up with the need for organs.

Before 2013, executed prisoners were the official, primary source of organs, but there was no exponential increase in crime or in death sentences to explain the exponential increase in organs and transplants before 2004, nor is a young public organ donation program a plausible explanation for an increase of organ donors that exceeds other donor programs by a factor of 200 in 2017.

If China’s transplant numbers were indeed
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accurate, it would raise other questions about the organ donation program. If China’s organ donor program indeed yielded 200 times more organ donors than other countries in 2017, how did China achieve these numbers? How could its organ donor program mobilize 200 times more organ donors than other countries? If the numbers were true, one would have to ask whether the registrations were voluntary or coerced in any way? Given the traditional reluctance to donate organs in China, and public suspicion of the government’s intention, the sudden increase of organ donor registrations does not make sense.

We are certain that the number of registered organ donors is inflated. So, where do the organs come from that are whitewashed through the organ donation program.

In the search for alternative explanations for the organ supply, the testimonies of potential victims gain importance. The testimonies of persecuted, vulnerable Falun Gong prisoners of conscience provide substantial insights.

When we consider alternative organ sources, we again observe implausible circumstances: Why do thousands of Falun Gong practitioners testify that they have received medical exams, or blood testing, while at the same time being tortured and never given treatment for any medical condition? Medical exams and blood tests are expensive procedures. Over 23 years, such expenses must have amounted to substantial costs. Why would one invest possibly millions of dollars on medical exams and blood tests of a population that was otherwise brutalized, tortured and killed.

While one cannot infer that these expenses were paid for the purpose of harvesting organs from Falun Gong practitioners, one can acknowledge that harvesting organs from Falun Gong or any other prisoners of conscience for the purpose of selling the organs for transplant surgeries would be a plausible explanation. It is fair to assume that the expense of medical exams and urine and blood tests would be covered by the government or prisons, which would demonstrate the CCP’s involvement and sponsoring of forced organ harvesting.

“While one cannot infer that these expenses were paid for the purpose of harvesting organs from Falun Gong practitioners, one can acknowledge that harvesting organs from Falun Gong or any other prisoners of conscience for the purpose of selling the organs for transplant surgeries would be a plausible explanation.”
8. Conclusion

By examining all of the various pieces of evidence, as tiny and insignificant as each might appear, the systematic and organized nature of China’s forced organ harvesting of Falun Gong practitioners becomes clear. What started as a concealed organ supply chain to foster China’s growing transplant infrastructure after 1999 has become a liability for the CCP.

Forced organ harvesting from living persons, i.e., the systematic killing of innocent people for their organs, is a crime against humanity, and in the case of Falun Gong, a cold genocide. Per definition and consensus, these crimes are not internal affairs of a country, regardless of the claims of sovereignty. Crimes against humanity and genocide do harm to our global community and impose a threat to humanity. It is in everyone’s interest to learn about forced organ harvesting and help stop it.
The CCP, in control of the Chinese government, has weaponized the discipline of transplant medicine by using medical doctors to carry out the killing of dehumanized adherents of Falun Gong. The execution of banned dissidents has shifted from public squares to secret operating rooms. While personnel are incentivized financially for their work in transplantation, the incentive for the Chinese government is different: They use profit from the transplant market to entice doctors to continue transplant abuse, but the real incentive for the CCP is to silence Falun Gong practitioners and propel their destruction.

By revealing the true motivation of the perpetrator, we can discern the most efficient way to end this crime against humanity. If silencing Falun Gong is the primary goal of the CCP, and killing them through forced organ harvesting is the final solution in this agenda, then the opposite should be true: lending Falun Gong our voice and helping them by informing the public about their spiritual practice of truthfulness, compassion and tolerance, would be the most powerful way to negate the CCP’s purpose behind forced organ harvesting.

If the death of each Falun Gong practitioner through forced organ harvesting is answered by 10 or more people learning about the persecution and the practice, then the CCP’s effort to silence and eradicate them is reversed and becomes absurd.

Previous efforts by good-hearted legislators to adopt motions and resolutions have helped to raise awareness but have not had the effect of stopping the Chinese government from carrying out forced organ harvesting.
Reversing the CCP's agenda of silencing Falun Gong, through a movement to talk openly about them, gives all of us a tool to stand up against this cold genocide and stop forced organ harvesting. This approach helps all prisoners of conscience who are subjected to forced organ harvesting.

Take action today. Save a life today.

Commit yourself to telling 10 friends or colleagues about Falun Gong and its practice of truthfulness, compassion and tolerance today.

This will make it inevitable that forced organ harvesting will end.

"By examining all of the various pieces of evidence, as tiny and insignificant as each might appear, the systematic and organized nature of China’s forced organ harvesting of Falun Gong practitioners becomes clear. What started as a concealed organ supply chain to foster China’s growing transplant infrastructure after 1999 has become a liability for the CCP."
Notable Public Statements

Since the news about forced organ harvesting from living Falun Gong practitioners first broke in 2006, the public has taken notice of this crime against humanity. Governments at all levels, from municipal bodies to national parliaments, have issued proclamations, resolutions and legislation.

Two of the most notable parliamentarian statements were adopted in 2016: House Resolution 343 of the U.S. Congress and the Written Declaration 48 of the European Parliament.

One year earlier, Taiwan passed an organ trafficking law. In June 2021, twelve UN human rights experts, including eight Special Rapporteurs, expressed their concerns about forced organ harvesting from prisoners of conscience in China in an open statement.

In 2022, the Parliament of Canada passed S-223, a critical piece of legislation with extraterritorial reach.

In 2023, the U.S. House of Representatives passed H.R.1154 with a nearly unanimous
vote. This bill, the Stop Forced Organ Harvesting Act of 2023, will “hold accountable persons implicated, including members of the Chinese Communist Party, in forced organ harvesting and trafficking in persons for purposes of the removal of organs.”

This is an incomplete list, as many other legislative steps have been taken. Associations within the medical profession have also been alarmed by the unethical organ harvesting practices in China and some have responded with an appropriate sense of responsibility.

The World Medical Association (WMA) adopted important statements that carry guiding principles, such as the WMA Statement on Organ and Tissue Donation and the WMA International Code of Medical Ethics.

In 2022, the International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation (ISHLT) published one of the strongest statements of a medical association so far, announcing that they would no longer publish data, or allow inclusion of data at conferences, from China regarding organ transplantation.

“The Stop Forced Organ Harvesting Act of 2023, will ‘hold accountable persons implicated, including members of the Chinese Communist Party, in forced organ harvesting and trafficking in persons for purposes of the removal of organs.’

Medical doctors and other professionals associated with the medical profession have also spoken out about forced organ harvesting in China. They have invested great time and effort in conducting research and publishing academic articles to increase awareness of China’s transplantation crimes and protect the integrity of the medical profession.

Indeed, raising awareness, saving lives and protecting those in and outside of China who have been unwitting bystanders or even accomplices to forced organ harvesting has been of utmost importance in helping to end this atrocity.


In September 2021, a group of five NGOs co-organized a World Summit on Combating and Preventing Forced Organ Harvesting and launched a Universal Declaration to address this crime.
Those who have exposed these mass murders have demonstrated tremendous courage and compassion. One needs to keep in mind that the authors of these public statements and professional articles, as well as those drafting legislation to address forced organ harvesting, are subject to the pressures and demands of a totalitarian power.
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