



DEPARTMENT OF ETHICS

Department of ethics

The Nuremberg Code: Hippocratic ethics and human rights

Evelyn Shuster

VIOLATES NUREMBERG CODE

The tension between Hippocratic ethics and human rights is perhaps best illustrated by the Nuremberg Code. The code was promulgated in August, 1947, in the wake of the Nuremberg trials. It was a response to the medical experiments in the concentration camps during the Holocaust. The code is a set of rules for the protection of human subjects in medical research.

Three physicians had central roles in the formulation of the Code—Leo Alexander, an American neuro-psychiatrist and the chief of the American neuro-psychiatry unit at the Nuremberg trials; Emanuel L. Lurie, an American physician who had been a witness to the medical experiments in the concentration camps; and James McHaney, an American physician who had been a witness to the medical experiments in the concentration camps.

Hippocratic ethics and the protection of human rights into a single code". Here, I explore why this merger was ignored by Alexander and Lurie themselves, and has been resisted by physician-researchers to this day. I also explain why the Nuremberg Code alone cannot resolve all the issues raised by contemporary research in developing countries.

The Judgment at the Doctors' Trial

The tension between Hippocratic ethics and human rights became obvious during Iy's cross-examination on July 13, 1947, at the Doctors' Trial. Iy was asked by defense counsel to reconcile his opinion that it is ethically permissible for physicians to conduct potentially dangerous experiments on volunteers with the Hippocratic moral maxim that forbids physicians to "administer a poison to anyone, even when asked for it". Iy had to admit that "his Hippocratic commandment refers to the function of the physician as a therapist, not as an experimentalist, and what refers to the Hippocratic Oath is that he must have respect for life and the human rights of his or her experimental patient". This admission did not escape the attention of the US prosecutor, James McHaney, who, in his closing argument on July 14, 1947, did not mention the Hippocratic Oath and ethics. In his 77-page summation, McHaney restated the three research rules that Iy had presented during his testimony, the first of which was that "consent of the human subject must be obtained" without "coercion in any form", and that "before volunteering, the subject must be informed of the hazards, if any".

Lancet 1998; 351: 974-77
 Veterans Affairs Medical Center, University and Woodland Avenue, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA (E. Shuster MD)
 (e-mail: Shuster.Evelyn@Forum.va.gov)

974

THE LANCET • Vol 351 • March 28, 1998

Vaccine Mandates Violated Medical Ethics, the Provision of Informed Consent, and the Nuremberg Code

"No one, under any circumstances, may receive any pressure, coercion, or threat of reprisal for either taking or not taking any medicine or injection."



Let's reflect on the fall of 2021, during the [peak of the onslaught](#) of vaccine mandates. Were these measures ethical? Were they legal? And are such measures for a new product ever justified? [Dr. Peter McCullough](#) joined [Maajid Nawaz](#) to discuss this fundamental matter of medical ethics.

Nawaz opens up, stating, "I believe we crossed that certain threshold of 'my body, my choice' when it comes to medical procedures. In your view, is this ever justified?"

Peter responds:

“Well, you mentioned we’re crossing the line of what’s called protection of human subjects. The United States, we have an office of the protection human subjects, OHRP, and they have six cornerstones of bioethics.”

Office for Human Research Protections

The Office for
Human
Research
Protections
(OHRP)



The first cornerstone: the Declaration of Helsinki. That is, providing fully-informed consent.

Declaration of Helsinki

Article Talk



This article is about the human medical experimentation ethics document. For other uses, see [Declaration of Helsinki](#)

“And we can’t provide full, informed consent because these are brand new! We don’t know what’s going to happen.”

So that’s the first problem with the COVID jab mandates. We can’t possibly have fully-informed consent without long-term safety studies.

The second problem with these mandates is “we violated the Nuremberg Code.”

Nuremberg Code

1. Voluntary informed consent
2. Fruitful result for the good of the society
3. Prior experimentation on animals and prior knowledge of the problems
4. Avoidance of unnecessary physical or mental injury
5. Banning of known lethal or disable procedures
6. Degree of risks should exceed benefits
7. Proper preparation and proper facilities to prevent injury or death
8. Performance of experiments only by scientifically qualified persons
9. Participants may freely end the experimentation.
10. The experiments must stop if it proves too dangerous

Image Credit: [slideserve.com](https://www.slideserve.com)

“Remember, the Nuremberg Code comes from the Nuremberg Trials of Nazi doctors and Nazi research done on the citizens of Germany. And we know there that the Nuremberg Code says that no one, under any circumstances, may receive any pressure, coercion, or threat of reprisal for either taking or not taking any medicine or injection.”

Dr. McCullough adds, “**So yes, we’ve crossed these lines. We’ve crossed these lines with these mandates.**”

Indeed, we did. But what do we say to someone that argues that this is an emergency? That the good of the population takes precedence over individual rights, personal autonomy, or shared decision-making with doctors?

"That, I would say this. In mid-2021, when our CDC director came out and said, 'You know what. They don't stop transmission of the virus; you transmit it the same.' That

when Boris Johnson in the UK came out and said, 'The vaccines don't stop anybody from getting COVID or transmitting it.' When public officials uttered these conclusions, which were correct. At that point in time, it didn't matter what one could say. There was absolutely no scientific support for ever having a large population be encouraged to take these products, let alone being mandated to do so."

Yes, if we remember carefully, we were fully aware that these jabs did not stop transmission, and they pushed forth with such vaccine mandates anyway. In Trudeau land, unvaccinated Canadians still can't leave the country.

Canada's Travel Rules Are Changing But Unvaxxed People Still Can't Cross The Canada-US Border

Unvaccinated Canadians may still face issues travelling to other countries. 🇺🇸 🇨🇦



Helena Hanson
Trending Editor

June 16, 2022, 08:57 AM - Modified June 17, 2022, 05:47 PM

Article: [Narcity.com](https://narcity.com)

From a historical, political, and civil liberties perspective, Nawaz argues that **what just happened with these mandates constitutes a War Crime**. He asks Peter, “Is there any substance to that charge?”



“Yes, there is substance to that charge, and I completely agree. If I was doing a research project, let’s say in diabetes, and I tell my patients, ‘You have to be in this research project. Otherwise, there’s consequences. You’re gonna lose your job; you’re gonna get kicked out of my clinic.’ I would actually almost certainly be reprimanded and have severe professional damages occurred to me for violating medical ethics.”

So what will happen to those who explicitly breached medical ethics these past two years? I haven’t heard an apology or observed any expressed feelings of guilt.

If we want to see action, to see something done about it, we’ll have to be loud and demand that it happens. Because if we brush it aside and give them a get-out-of-jail-free card, what’s to stop them from doing it again?

I am proud to announce that I have left my day job to become an independent reporter! If you want to help keep this operation afloat, consider becoming a paid subscriber.

Enjoyed this piece featuring Dr. Peter McCullough? Listen to what he has to say about ivermectin.



The Vigilant Fox

Horse Paste? Ivermectin Is the 'Most Dynamic' and 'Most Rapidly-Acting' Medication for COVID

Watch now (4 min) | Ivermectin has been an interesting topic, seeing a concerted effort to dismiss and smear the medication as a 'horse dewormer.' But what's behind this smear campaign? Could it be that ivermectin poses a serious threat to the vaccination campaign? In an interview with Maajid Nawaz...

Read more

a day ago · 53 likes · 11 comments · The Vigilant Fox

Articles and video clips by [The Vigilant Fox](#) are available for republishing and licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](#). All I ask is credit for the piece, a link to this [Substack](#), and a [video embed](#).

More video work is available at <https://rumble.com/c/VigilantFox>.

5 Comments



Write a comment...

Top First ▾



Smart Sucka Writes Smart Sucka's Never-Ending Stac... Jul 27 Liked by **The Vigilant Fox**

War crimes for sure!

5 Reply Gift a subscription Collapse



FreeFrench Jul 27

Peter McCullough is such a brave and principled man. He was one of the first people to wake me up to the truth about Covid and the vaccines.

2 Reply Collapse

Rob (of universe c137) Writes Robert's Occam's razor Jul 27



That's why we put Rand Paul into the mix, so he can point the finger at fauci and the nih and China,. Then people won't see that many more were involved in breaking laws and common rights of people.

It's ingenious.

2 Reply Gift a subscription Collapse



Just Me Jul 28

But doesn't the EUA give them the giant loop hole out? informed consent flies out the window under the emergency use. Seems like our Constitution flies out the window too! Disgusting!

1 Reply Gift a subscription Collapse



Jayne Doe Jul 27 · edited Jul 27

Here's one for you Vigilant Fox ! :) (Alex Jone's clip is on fire. It's good! Check it out :)

<https://theinfowar.tv/watch?id=62e1a71f2a02302e3f69a454>

1 Reply Gift a subscription Collapse