

THE NUREMBERG CODE (1947)

NO LONGER ABOUT THE NAZIS THEN – IT IS ABOUT US NOW

10 standards established by the Nuremberg war crimes tribunal oblige physicians conducting experiments on human subjects to ensure *voluntary informed consent* of the human subjects and to protect their right to control their own body. These standards are part of medical codes world wide, in ethics *and in law*.

Here the Nuremberg Code is formatted in the left column for easy comparison to the current experimental COVID-19 “vaccine” (ECV) trial, Phase III. Italics indicate violations of the Code. (Summary at bottom.)

THE NUREMBERG CODE 1947	COVID PRACTICE 2020-21
<p>10 PRINCIPLES OF PERMISSIBLE MEDICAL EXPERIMENTS</p> <p>“...The protagonists of the practice of human experimentation justify their views on the basis that such experiments yield results <i>for the good of society that are unprocurable by other methods*</i> or means of study. All agree, however, that certain basic principles must be observed in order to satisfy moral, ethical and legal concepts:”</p>	
<p>1. The voluntary consent of the human subject is absolutely essential. This means that the person involved <i>should have the legal capacity to give consent</i>; ...and be able to exercise free power of choice:</p>	<p>The vaccines are being forced on people and with diminished cognitive ability and others in nursing and care homes, often without informed family consent.²</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ... <i>without the intervention of any element of force, fraud, deceit, duress, overreaching, or other ulterior form of constraint or coercion.</i> 	<p>Every element listed here has been part of the COVID experience See Summary below.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>[The information necessary]... to make an understanding and enlightened decision.</i> 	<p>Doctors are often uninformed. Govt and media keep information from the public.³</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This latter element requires <i>that before the acceptance of an affirmative decision</i> by the experimental subject [the subject] should be told: 	<p>Subject isn't told the ECV is experimental and is not fully tested as a “vaccine”. There is no requirement or protocol to inform subjects of ECV risks.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>the nature, duration, and purpose of the experiment;</i> 	<p>In fact those administering the ECV are often equally ignorant of the nature of the experiment or its risks.⁴volunteers</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>the method and means by which it is to be conducted;</i> 	<p>Neither is it made clear that in lieu of proper protocols, the experiment is using its human subjects effectively as “test animals” to obtain information on the very risks they should be apprised of.⁵ Holtetz</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>all inconveniences and hazards reasonably to be expected;</i> 	<p>Doctors, nurses, paramedics, and lay volunteers are unaware they must ensure not only that the subject consents to the ECV but is also fully informed and understands the risks.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>the effects upon his [or her] health or person which may possibly come from his participation in the experiment.</i> 	<p>Other methods (HCQ, Ivermectin, Quercetin, Azithromycin, Zinc, Copper, Methadone, Vitamins D3, C K2, Corticosteroids, Ozone) all offer superior results than the ECV.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The duty and responsibility for ascertaining the quality of the consent rests upon each individual who initiates, directs, or engages in the experiment. <i>It is a personal duty and responsibility which may not be delegated to another with impunity</i> 	
<p>2. The experiment should be such as to yield fruitful results for the good of society, <i>unprocurable by other methods</i> or means of study, and not random <i>and unnecessary in nature</i>.</p>	

3. The experiment <i>should be so designed and based on the results of animal experimentation and a knowledge of the natural history of the disease</i> or other problem under study that the anticipated results justify the performance of the experiment.	Animal trials were inadequate and in some cases showed catastrophic risk. 6MINK The history of coronavirus indicates it is mild and short-lived. ⁷ SARS COLDS FLUS
4. The experiment should be so <i>conducted as to avoid all unnecessary physical and mental suffering and injury.</i>	Often there is no observation period no monitoring, and no follow up. Subjects die at home. ⁸ Drive through jab stations
5. <i>No experiment should be conducted where there is an a priori reason to believe that death or disabling injury will occur;</i> except, perhaps, in those experiments where the experimental physicians also serve as subjects.	Perhaps this is why there has been such a drive to have care givers and nurses receive the CRV first, sometimes with terrible results. ⁹ France
6. <i>The degree of risk to be taken should never exceed that determined by the humanitarian importance of the problem to be solved by the experiment.</i>	The great majority of the population at near zero risk from COVID are still being coerced unnecessarily to take the ECV ¹⁰
7. <i>Proper preparations should be made and adequate facilities provided to protect the experimental subject against even remote possibilities of injury, disability or death.</i>	The strident urgency of administering CRV to as many people as possible has replaced protection of subjects as a priority. ¹¹
8. <i>The experiment should be conducted only by scientifically qualified persons. The highest degree of skill and care should be required through all stages of the experiment of those who conduct or engage in the experiment.</i>	CRV stations are often run by people with limited training and no ability to assess, document or follow up on side effects. ¹² As a result post-ECV deaths and adverse events go unnoted, denied or discounted. ¹³
9. During the course of the experiment the human subject should be at liberty to bring the experiment to an end if he has reached the physical or mental state where continuation of the experiment seems to him to be impossible.	People refusing the ECV are facing a threat of being denied critical social and economic intercourse if they do not submit to participation in the ECV experiment. ¹⁴
10. During the course of the experiment the scientist in charge must be prepared to terminate the experiment at any stage, if he has probable cause to believe, in the exercise of the good faith, superior skill and careful judgment required of him, that a continuation of the experiment is likely to result in injury, disability, or death to the experimental subject.	Politicians, not scientists, are in charge of the COVID “vaccine” experiment which is pushed forward In spite of the growing evidence from science, statistical studies, and testimony from tens of thousands of medical experts around the world.

To see the unedited version of the Nuremberg Code go to <http://www.cirp.org/library/ethics/nuremberg/>

IN SUMMARY Aggressive Government campaigns to inoculate an unsuspecting and ill-informed populace with an untested “medical” agent of genetic modification—the product of a technology never before used in humans—which is deliberately mislabelled a “vaccine” even though it is still in the Phase III testing stage *constitute egregious and often multiple violations of every single paragraph of the Nuremberg Code.*

Government “ECV campaigns”, with *complicit media, have used fraudulent declarations of public emergency,¹⁵ censorship of critical information,¹⁶ unlawful mandates and overreaching controls,¹⁷ fraudulent data and protocols,¹⁸ and coercive social and economic force¹⁹ to induce the populace to submit to taking part in the experiment.*