The Nuremberg Code and Vaccine Mandates

americaoutloud.com/the-nuremberg-code-and-vaccine-mandates/

Paul Engel

The Nuremberg Code is a set of medical ethical guidelines created in the wake of the human experimentation performed by the Nazis. While the Nuremberg Code is not law in the United States, it is designed to protect the rights of everyone when it comes to medical experimentation. Understanding the code and the rights protected by the Constitution will shine a bright light on what has been going on with the COVID-19 “vaccines”, the mandates, and freedom in America.

Be warned, what you learn may be shocking.

Many of you may be wondering what medical ethics has to do with the Constitution. Many who’ve been following what’s been going on with the COVID-19 “vaccine” and related mandates have asked me about the Nuremberg Code. While this set of medical ethics is not law in the United States, it does support the rights protected by the Constitution. Understanding this code, and how the Constitution protects your rights, is paramount if liberty and freedom are to survive the attack they are under by enemies both governmental and societal.

On December 9, 1946, criminal proceedings against 23 German physicians and administrators were heard by an American military tribunal. They were charged with willingly participating in crimes against humanity, specifically for medical experiments conducted on

human beings. In the tribunals' August 19th verdict, they produced ten points entitled *Permissible Medical Experiments*, which became known as *The Nuremberg Code*.

The Nuremberg Code

During the Nazi regime in Germany, people were the subjects of medical experiments. Some claimed that it was the only way to study certain things and that the good to society outweighed the pain, suffering, and loss suffered by the subjects. Others looked at both the forced subjection to experimentation and the horrendous treatment of some of the subjects and vehemently disagreed. The tribunal, after looking at the evidence presented to it, determined there must be a way to reap the benefits of human experimentation without the cruel and horrific treatment of the test subjects. Enter *The Nuremberg Code*.

The great weight of the evidence before us is to the effect that certain types of medical experiments on human beings, when kept within reasonably well-defined bounds, conform to the ethics of the medical profession generally. The protagonists of the practice of human experimentation justify their views on the basis that such experiments yield results for the good of society that are unprocurable by other methods or means of study. All agree, however, that certain basic principles must be observed in order to satisfy moral, ethical, and legal concepts:

Permissible Medical Experiments

How could the medical community gather the data it needs while still respecting the rights of their potential test subjects? The first, largest, and most important point of *The Nuremberg Code* is the idea of informed consent.

1. The voluntary consent of the human subject is absolutely essential.

This means that the person involved should have the legal capacity to give consent; should be so situated as to be able to exercise free power of choice, without the intervention of any element of force, fraud, deceit, duress, over-reaching, or other ulterior forms of constraint or coercion; and should have sufficient knowledge and comprehension of the elements of the subject matter involved as to enable him to make an understanding and enlightened decision.

It's absolutely essential that the subject not only consent to participate in the experiment, but that consent must be both voluntary and informed. One of the most horrific aspects of Nazi medical experiments was the forced participation of those considered Lebensunwerten Lebens (Life Unworthy of Life). To prevent that, *The Nuremberg Code* requires that the subject has both the legal capacity to give consent and the freedom of choice. Force, fraud, deceit, and duress are expressly forbidden. Furthermore, consent must be not only free, but informed. The subject must be made aware of, and able to comprehend, both the risks and rewards of participating in the experiment. This was expounded on as the first point went on.

This latter element requires that before the acceptance of an affirmative decision by the experimental subject there should be made known to him the nature, duration, and purpose of the experiment; the method and means by which it is to be conducted; all inconveniences and hazards reasonably to be expected; and the effects upon his health or person which may possibly come from his participation in the experiment.

Before becoming a test subject, a person must be made aware of the nature, duration, and purpose of the experiment. They must also be told all of the risks they can reasonably expect, not only upon their health, but upon their person as well.

The first point of *The Nuremberg Code* goes on to identify who is responsible for making sure the subject has provided informed consent.

The duty and responsibility for ascertaining the quality of the consent rest upon each individual who initiates, directs, or engages in the experiment. It is a personal duty and responsibility which may not be delegated to another with impunity.

It's not the responsibility of the subject to track down all of this data, but of those who initiate, direct, or engage in the experiment. This means that everyone from the person who initiates the experiment to the person administering the product is responsible for ensuring that the consent is both informed and voluntary. Notice that this is a personal responsibility, not something that can be pawned off onto someone else.

So what does The Nuremberg Code have to do with COVID-19 "vaccines"? The answer starts with how the "vaccines" were made available in the first place.

WATCH THE VIDEO AND SUBSCRIBE ON RUMBLE

Emergency Use Authorization

The first thing we need to remember is that all of the COVID-19 "vaccines" available in the United States fall under an Emergency Use Authorization (EUA).

(a) In general
(1) Emergency uses
Notwithstanding any provision of this chapter and section 351 of the Public Health Service Act [42 U.S.C. 262], and subject to the provisions of this section, the Secretary may authorize the introduction into interstate commerce, during the effective period of a declaration under subsection (b), of a drug, device, or biological product intended for use in an actual or potential emergency (referred to in this section as an "emergency use").

21 U.S.C. §360bbb-3

The idea is simple. In an emergency, the government will allow a drug, device, or biological product to enter the market before completing the regular approval process, which usually takes years. Certain conditions must exist before such an authorization can be legally issued. Let's take a look at them one by one in relation to COVID-19

(c) Criteria for issuance of authorization
The Secretary may issue an authorization under this section with respect to the emergency use of a product only if, after consultation with the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response, the Director of the National Institutes of Health, and the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (to the extent feasible and appropriate given the applicable circumstances described in subsection (b)(1)), the Secretary concludes-
(1) that an agent referred to in a declaration under subsection (b) can cause a serious or life-threatening disease or condition;

21 U.S.C. §360bbb-3

Is COVID-19 a serious or life-threatening disease? There is evidence that the initial variants of the disease could be serious enough to require hospitalization and even cause death. However, in August of 2020, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) issued a report stating that 94% of the COVID deaths they were reporting involved more than just COVID.

Using the data available by January 16, 2022, 94% of deaths certificates listed an average of four additional causes of death. This brings into question, how many of the over 800,000 deaths the CDC is reporting are people who died with COVID, not of it? As of the writing of this article, the CDC is reporting 862,494 total deaths. If less than 6% of those death certificates list only COVID as the cause of deaths, that means we are only sure that about 52,000 were caused by COVID, or about .015% of the U.S. population.

(2) that, based on the totality of scientific evidence available to the Secretary, including data from adequate and well-controlled clinical trials, if available, it is reasonable to believe that-
(A) the product may be effective in diagnosing, treating, or preventing-
(i) such disease or condition; or
(ii) a serious or life-threatening disease or condition caused by a product authorized under this section, approved or cleared under this chapter, or licensed under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act [42 U.S.C. 262], for diagnosing, treating, or preventing such a disease or condition caused by such an agent; and

(B) the known and potential benefits of the product, when used to diagnose, prevent, or treat such disease or condition, outweigh the known and potential risks of the product, taking into consideration the material threat posed by the agent or agents identified in a declaration under subsection (b)(1)(D), if applicable;

21 U.S.C. §360bbb-3

Based on the totality of scientific data, do the COVID “vaccines” diagnose, treat, or prevent the disease? While there was much hype about the effectiveness of these “vaccines” when they were first released, that bubble has well and truly burst. Well-controlled clinical trials, along with other studies, have shown that the effectiveness of these “vaccines” is short-lived at best, ranging between 2-6 months. Studies have shown that those who have received the “vaccine” can not only get COVID, but when they do they can spread it at least as easily as the “unvaccinated”. So not only do the “vaccines” not treat COVID, they neither prevent infection nor transmission. In other words, the “vaccines” are a private health concern, not a public one.

(3) that there is no adequate, approved, and available alternative to the product for diagnosing, preventing, or treating such disease or condition;

> The evidence that existing approved medications were capable of treating COVID-19 has been around for more than a year. However, the same government bureaucracy that has been promoting these “vaccines” has conveniently not only failed to approve these products for the treatment of COVID-19, but they have also lied about the evidence for their effectiveness.

(4) in the case of a determination described in subsection (b)(1)(B)(ii), that the request for emergency use is made by the Secretary of Defense; and

(5) that such other criteria as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe are satisfied.

21 U.S.C. §360bbb-3

These last two are not really an issue currently with COVID-19.

So what does this have to do with *The Nuremberg Code*? As I stated before, all of the “vaccines” currently available in the U.S. are NOT Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved; they are issued under an EUA. That means, according to the law, they are either unapproved or conditionally approved.

(2) Approval status of product
An authorization under paragraph (1) may authorize an emergency use of a product that-
(A) is not approved, licensed, or cleared for commercial distribution under section 355, 360(k), 360b, or 360e of this title or section 351 of the Public Health Service Act [42 U.S.C. 262] or conditionally approved under section 360ccc of this title (referred to in this section as an “unapproved product”); or
(B) is approved, conditionally approved under section 360ccc of this title, licensed, or cleared under such a provision, but which use is not under such provision an approved, conditionally approved under section 360ccc of this title, licensed, or cleared use of the product (referred to in this section as an “unapproved use of an approved product”).

21 U.S.C. §360bbb-3

It's not only the "vaccines" that are being distributed under an EUA, because the COVID-19 RT-PCR test is as well. I'm sure some of you are screaming that "The FDA approved the Pfizer vaccine!" Well, yes and no. You see the FDA gave approval for the Comirnaty brand of the Pfizer-BioNTech "vaccine", but Pfizer has refused to distribute that particular version in the United States. Furthermore, the FDA required, in their approval letter, that BioNTech conduct no less than six additional studies because they could not assess the risks of myocarditis and pericarditis from the data that had already been submitted.

> Not only are the COVID-19 "vaccines" only available in the U.S. under an EUA, but both the Pfizer and Moderna products are based on a new technology, mRNA, which has never been tested in humans before, and is not even legally a vaccine.

A preparation of a weakened or killed pathogen, such as a bacterium or virus, or of a portion of the pathogen's structure, that is administered to prevent or treat infection by the pathogen and that functions by stimulating the production of an immune response.

American Heritage Dictionary

Even a recent article from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) refers to these mRNA "vaccines" as experimental. So even if you haven't taken a COVID-19 "vaccine", you are participating in a medical experiment if you've had a PCR test.

We've looked at the law and *The Nuremberg Code*, but what does all of this have to do with the Constitution?

Liberty, Property, and Informed Consent

No person shall … be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; …

Amendment V

Your right to liberty and property go hand and hand with informed consent. I have been saying since the first mask mandates were issued, that these violated the Constitution because they denied you of the right to live at liberty without following due process (a process designed to protect the rights of the individual). Also, they violate your right to the property you have in your own body. These mask mandates though are nothing when compared to the infringement of these rights that "vaccine" mandates impose. Masks are not human medical experimentation. COVID-19 "vaccines" are.

The Nuremberg Code requires that, before you participate in a medical experiment, you must provide informed consent. Looked at another way, your right to liberty and the property you have in your body means you cannot be asked to participate in a medical experiment without informed consent. Have the American people been given the legal capacity to give informed consent when it comes to COVID-19 "vaccines"? Let's go back to *The Nuremberg Code* and break informed consent down step by step.

This means that the person involved should have legal capacity to give consent;

Permissible Medical Experiments

Throughout most of the states, the age at which a person can legally give consent is 18 years of age. Now we are seeing the medical community push for minors to be allowed to consent to receive these “vaccines”. The Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA) published an article in July, 2021 recommending “a policy allowing minors to receive the vaccine without parental consent would use a sliding scale of decision-making authority”. In short, they want a policy that allows children to participate in a medical experiment without the legal capacity to give consent.

It seems almost daily I hear of another group being pressured to participate in this medical experiment. From cities and states requiring proof of “vaccination” to participate in society to government regulations requiring employers to institute mandates for their employees, the push is on to get everyone to be part of this experiment. This, however, is not the free power of choice. These mandates are coercion, duress, and an over-reaching exercise of powers. Given the data from the CDC about the safety and efficacy of these “vaccines”, I would say this push to vaccinate amounts to fraud. Add to that the work of media, social media, and celebrities, to declare anyone questioning the efficacy or dangers of these “vaccines” as “anti-vaxers” or distributing “medical misinformation”, you have deceit on an international scale.

How can the American people have sufficient knowledge and comprehension of these vaccines when the FDA refuses to let their safety data be independently reviewed? How can the American people provide an informed consent when everyone from social media to the CDC, from networks to the FDA, and from celebrities to the White House, label anything contrary to the approved narrative as “medical misinformation”? There can be no true knowledge about the “vaccines” when those who are expected to share information instead hide what they disagree with.

All of this comes just from the first point of *The Nuremberg Code*. I do not have time to go into the other nine points. Perhaps I will in a future article. What I have shown is not only that those in government, entertainment, academia, business, and everyday citizens at all levels have been promoting a vast medical experiment, not only on Americans, but on people worldwide. People from bureaucrats to doctors, nurses, and volunteers have been violating the medical ethics contained in *The Nuremberg Code*, the laws of the United States, and, most likely, the laws of your state as well.

There are a group of people for whom the phrase “Never Again” has special meaning. We were supposed to have learned our lesson from the Nazis. Lessons about the dangers of rhetoric without evidence, of emotion over reason, of treating groups of people as sub-

human. We were supposed to have learned the dangers of unrestrained power and a lack of ethics. We were supposed to have learned of the horrible consequences of human medical experimentation.

I guess we have not learned from our history. This means Santayana was right: “Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.”