U.S. WWII & COLD WAR EXPERIMENTS

**Introduction:** Unconscionable U.S. Government-Funded Medical Experiments exposed human subjects to serious risk of harm without any intended benefit to the individual. They were conducted without voluntary, informed consent decades after the Nuremberg Code set ethical standards for civilized medical experiments. The human subjects were either coerced or unwitting: they included military troops, prisoners, mentally disabled persons, institutionalized children, and hospitalized patients. Thousands suffered irreparable harm and an untold number died.
1920 – 1990: Unwitting Experimental Subjects – “Radium Women” Dial Painters

**Background:** In the early part of the twentieth century, radium was a symbol of science, medicine, and technology; power and wealth. Radium was a luminous vehicle for progress, publicly displayed for a week at the Public Health Exposition in Grand Central in New York (1921) to which medical students, physicians and nurses were invited as there was great medical interest in its potential uses. World War I created a huge demand for a variety of radium-treated devices. Radium was a highly valued investment for the dial painting industry which by 1920 had sold more than 1,000,000 illuminated watches and clocks. (RE Rowland. *(Radium in Humans. A Review of U.S. Studies*, 1994)

The first major American manufacturer was Radium Luminous Materials Corp. in New Jersey (renamed U.S. Radium Corp in 1919) which hired young women (mostly teenagers) to apply radium paint to the tiny figures and numbers on clocks, watches, speedometers, compasses, barometers, and dashboard instruments of airplanes, and submarines – so that these instruments would glow in the dark.

The girls put the paint brushes containing radium-226 between their lips in order to maintain a fine pointed brush tip. As a result, they wound up swallowing a minimum of 125 mg of radioactive fluid each day. The first report of disfiguring jaw necrosis suffered by a 20-year old “dial paint woman” was in December, 1922. After surgical removal of parts of her jaw bone, blood transfusions, and the onset of lung disease, she died in 1923.

One after another, the dial painters began to fall ill. Their teeth fell out, their mouths filled with sores, their jaw bones rotted; the frequency of horribly disfiguring cancers of the upper and lower jaw were particularly frightening to women
and the cosmetics industry which used radium in some of its products. By 1924, nine dial painters were dead. They were all young women in their 20s who had been healthy, happily painting tiny bright numbers on delicate instruments.

**Early example of collaboration by elite academic medical institutions with industry**

The U.S. Radium Corp hired academic physicians to provide “scientific evidence” to vindicate the company from liability. Hundreds of young dial painters suffered from a variety of acute disintegrating bones and died painfully. The company hired a doctor from the Industrial Hygiene section at Harvard Medical School (1924) who found no direct cause of harm; the cause was identified as “occupational poisoning.” However, an independent physician, Dr. Frederick Hoffman, named the new disease, “Radium Necrosis” in a paper he delivered at the American Medical Association in May 1925. A New Jersey county medical examiner then conducted an extensive examination of the women; he performed autopsies and described the symptoms, etiology, and pathology of the disease.

A series of law suits followed that were settled out of court for paltry sums. The radium dial industry denied culpability; U.S. Radium Corp hired yet another medical doctor, this time from the Industrial Section of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Columbia University, who “based on the scientific data acquired [by] Dr. Frederick Flinn [who] reached the conclusion that there was no industrial hazard in the industry.” (A.E. Rowland. *Radium in Humans: A Review of U.S. Studies* (1994, p. 14))

The tactics used by the radium industry in its legal defense presaged the tactics and strategies of the tobacco industry and the pharmaceutical industry in commissioning academic-affiliated physicians to provide “scientific evidence” denying the severe adverse medical effects of their products. While the radium dial painters were outwitted by industry’s legal and medical team, their plight aroused considerable public outcry and led to the establishment of standards for industrial exposure to ionizing radiation. Under pressure from the New Jersey Consumer's League, the U.S. Public Health Service finally recommended safe practice radium guidelines in 1933.
The radium dial painters became unwitting human experimental subjects

The death of a wealthy steel manufacturer in 1932 who ingested a popular radioactive tonic, called “Radithor,” prompted Robley Evans, a physicist at California Institute of Technology to investigate the safety of radium and to attain expertise in radium safety. Evans was commissioned by the U.S. Army to conduct the first of a series of epidemiological follow-up experiments on the long-term effects of radioactivity in human beings using the women dial painters as his subjects at the Radioactivity Center at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) (1934-1950).

The second phase experiments (1950-1970) were conducted on behalf of the Atomic Energy Committee (AEC) which studied the health risks of atomic tests. The research involved measuring the amount of radium in the women’s bodies; an arduous, repetitive process which Evans’ assistant described as “tough not only on the subject, but it’s tough on the researcher...you have to keep repeating the experiment all over again...” (Dept. of Energy Report, 1995 cited by Maria Rentetzi, 2004) The third phase of research that began after 1970, focused on research by the center for Human Radiobiology at the Argonne National Laboratory (ANL) and the University of Chicago. Eventually all of the radium case studies were centralized at Argone.

In standard medical literature, the radium experiments on the “radium women” are described as an occupational hazard, a “most valuable accident” which has subsequently contributed invaluable information, contributing to the establishment of safety radiation standards. For the researchers, the women were considered a “valuable” means to an end; which was the accumulation of scientific information. This is an immoral utilitarian view that is pervasive among researchers. R.E. Rowland, the author of several ANL human radium studies (1978) and the final review (1994) states in his article posted on the web, Radium Dial Painters – What Happened to Them?:

“By the time the final radium study was terminated in 1993, 3,161 radium dial painters had been identified and 1,575 of them had been seen and studied. A total of 6,675 people containing radium had been identified and 2,403 of them had been located and measured.”

Rowland states that the two studies confirmed that dial painters who were employed after 1926, following instructions NOT to tip brushes in on their lips, “was all that was necessary to reduce markedly the amount of radium acquired by these dial painters.” In his Radium in Humans: A Review of U.S. Studies (1994) Rowland cites a report by Schlundt et al,
published in 1933, describing an experiment conducted on 32 patients with dementia praecox (i.e., schizophrenia) at Elgin (Illinois) State Hospital who were subjected to radium administered intravenously. As our chronology of medical atrocities amply demonstrates, it was the norm and practice of American physicians to exploit such patients’ vulnerability and use them as human guinea pigs.

Categorized U.S. Radiation Experiments.
**1942: Manhattan Project Nuclear Scientists Conduct Total Body Irradiation Experiments**

The government began sponsoring total body irradiation (TBI) research in 1942 in connection with the Top Secret Manhattan Project — the nuclear scientists who developed the Atom Bomb. From its inception with the US nuclear program and supporting government policy placed scientific and military advancement far above the safety of the American people. At least eight of the 42 institutions performed their research with government contracts; an additional three were VA hospitals and one is the Los Alamos Hospital. More than 4,000 such experiments were funded by the Department of Defense, the National Institutes of Health, and other federal agencies. (Read more: ACHRE Report, 1995.)

Categorized U.S. Radiation Experiments.
1945–1947: Eighteen patients were injected with plutonium in AEC experiments

During WWII, hundreds of scientists and technicians working to develop the atomic bomb at Los Alamos were exposed to radioactive substances, including plutonium, whose hazards were not entirely known.

Pioneers of nuclear science, such as J. Robert Oppenheimer, Louis Hempelmann, and Stafford Warren, masterminded the experiments from the headquarters they carved out of the New Mexico desert, in Los Alamos. Doctors working with the Manhattan Project initially injected plutonium into 18 men, women, and children. They acted without obtaining the consent of these people, informed or otherwise, and without therapeutic intent. Their mission was to study dispassionately the “fiendishly toxic” effects of plutonium on selected groups so that physician-scientists would know how best to protect American researchers, soldiers, and citizens exposed to atomic weapons. (Washington, *NEJM*, 1999)

The first human subject administered plutonium injections at Oak Ridge Nuclear Facility was 53-year old a “colored man” Ebb Cade, a cement mixer at a construction company who had been hospitalized for broken bone injuries following an automobile accident. He told the doctors that he has always been in good health; so they secretly injected him with 4.7 micrograms of plutonium. At the time of the injection, scientists were perfectly aware of the serious negative effects associated with radiation — since they had conducted numerous radiation experiments on animals and recorded the severe adverse effects. The scientists knew exactly what they were doing; they were intent on documenting the effects of plutonium isotopes on living beings.

Over the next five days, scientists took excretions from Cade to see how much plutonium his body retained and refused to set his broken bones until April 15th, after they cut samples from the bone before doing so to examine the plutonium content in his bone tissue. Fifteen of his teeth were pulled for testing; they never informed Cade what or why they were doing. A nurse said that the tortured Cade escaped in the middle of the night; he died later in 1953 of heart failure. Ebb Cade was the first, but hardly the last American human being to be subjected to an inhumane radiation experiment without his knowledge or consent. (Anthony Gucciardi. . . . *Secretly Injected Citizens With Plutonium, Uranium*, 2012)

Eleven of the 18 plutonium subjects were patients at the University of Rochester, 6 or more were injected with uranium, and 5 were given polonium. Documents uncovered by ACHRE show that at least 9 patients at other universities and hospitals were also similarly injected with radioactive substances.

Physician-scientists, who participated in these grossly unethical experiments, denied responsibility for the decision; they have managed to distance themselves with the entire nefarious program. However, Dr. Wright Langham who wrote the experimental protocol and oversaw the plutonium experiments defended them, claiming the subjects were terminally ill patients who would have died anyway. Patricia Durbin, a scientist at the Lawrence Livermore Laboratory in California who participated in plutonium experiments — defended the experiments claiming:

They were always [conducted] on . . . somebody who had some kind of terminal disease who was going to undergo an amputation. These things were not done to plague people or make them sick and miserable. They were not done to kill people. They were done to gain potentially valuable information. The fact that they were injected and provided this valuable data should almost be a sort of memorial rather than something to be ashamed of. It doesn’t bother me to talk about the plutonium inductees because of the value of the information they provided. (Ensign and Acalay. *Covert Action Quarterly*, 1996; *Project Paperclip and the Nuremberg Trials Whitewash*)
Those claims are false: in April of 1946, Simeon Shaw, a four-year-old boy suffering from bone cancer was brought by his parents from Australia for treatment in the United States. They were told that the injection, and a subsequent removal of some bone tissue, was part of his cancer treatment. When he got sicker, his parents brought him back to Australia, where he died. It wasn’t until thirty years later that they found out what their son was actually injected with. (Inglis-Arkell. US government Secretly Injected People)

Categorized U.S. Radiation Experiments.
1945–1947: Vanderbilt “Nutrition Study” Exposed 820 pregnant women to radioactive iron

An exceptionally large-scale radiation exposure experiment at Vanderbilt University was funded by the U.S. Public Health Service and involved 820 poor pregnant Caucasian women who were given tracer doses of radioactive iron in a “cocktail” drink. The researchers worked with the Tennessee State Department of Health and they did not inform the women what was in the drink, nor were they informed that they were part of an experiment. The radiation portion of the experiment was designed study the absorption of iron during pregnancy under the direction of Dr. Paul Hahn. Vanderbilt researchers who re-examined the data in 1963–1964, claimed no significant difference in malignancy rates between exposed and non-exposed mothers. However,

| a higher number of malignancies among the exposed offspring (four cases in the exposed group: acute lymphatic leukemia, synovial sarcoma, lymphosarcoma, and primary liver carcinoma, which was discounted as a rare, familial form of cancer). No cases were found in a control group of similar size...This led the researchers to conclude that the data suggested a causal relationship between the prenatal exposure to Fe-59 and the cancer. The investigators also concluded that Dr. Hahn’s estimate of fetal exposure was an underestimation of the fetal-absorbed dose. (ACHRE Report Chapter 7) |

The Advisory Committee found that at least 27 experiments exposed pregnant or nursing mothers and their babies in nontherapeutic research between 1944–1974.

Categorized U.S. Radiation Experiments.
1944–1956: Radioactive nutrition experiments on retarded children by Harvard and MIT

In December of 1993, Scott Allen, a journalist at the *Boston Globe*, uncovered documents showing years of ethically dubious experiments conducted on Fernald Center youth. The day after Christmas, he published an article, “Radiation Used on Retarded,” noting that “Records at the Fernald State School list them as “morons,” but the researchers from MIT and Harvard University called the retarded teen-age boys who took part in their radiation experiments ‘the Fernald Science Club.’”

Children at Fernald State School fed Radioactive Cereal by scientist at MIT & Harvard University

Developmentally disabled children at the Fernald State School and a state School in Waltham, Massachusetts were subjected to radioactive nutrition experiments sponsored by the AEC conducted by Harvard University and MIT researchers. The children were fed Quaker Oats breakfast cereal containing radioactive tracers to test absorption of plant minerals and calcium. Parents were never informed that radioactive elements were involved in the tests.

“In the name of science, members of the club would eat cereal mixed with radioactive milk for breakfast or digest a series of iron supplements that gave them the radiation-equivalent of at least 50 chest X-rays. From 1946 to 1956, scores of retarded teen-agers consumed radioactive food to help the researchers better understand the human digestive process.”

“There is absolutely no ground for caution regarding the quantities of radioactive substances which we would use in our experiments,” Massachusetts Institute of Technology biochemist Robert S. Harris assured Fernald’s superintendent in a letter proposing the research in December 1945. At least some consent forms sent home to parents or guardians do not mention radiation.”
“Based on figures in an unpublished report on the project, the children’s spleens were exposed to between 544 and 1,024 millirems of radiation over the course of seven meals. By comparison, the typical American receives about 300 millirems of radiation from natural sources each year.”

“The experiments at the Fernald School, which almost certainly would not be permitted today, are one of the darker corners of Massachusetts’ atomic legacy. Along with pioneering the field of nuclear medicine, some of the state’s leading academic institutions and hospitals also subjected the terminally ill, the elderly and others to radiation doses that are considered unsafe today, often with no possible benefit to the test subjects.”

Though never secret — researchers published the results of the Fernald studies in scholarly journals — details of the research effort, funded partly by Quaker Oats Co. and the US Atomic Energy Commission, have sat in a jumble of boxes in the Fernald School library until now.

“It’s very important that the public begin to see that secrecy at bottom is what lets this happen,” said David Rush of Tufts University’s Human Nutrition Research Center, who has written a book on radiation exposure to defense workers. He called the Fernald experiments “something of which American medicine should be ashamed.”

But Constantine Maletskos, a former MIT researcher who studied how teenagers at Fernald metabolized radioactive calcium, defended the experiments, saying they yielded important information about nutrition. “I feel just as good about it today as the day I did it,” he said, “The attitude of the scientists was we’re going to do this in the best way possible. . . They would get the minimum radiation they could possibly get and have the experiment work.”

But Jacob Shapiro, director of radiation protection at Harvard University, declined to say whether the experiments were dangerous, but he stated: “I would ask a colleague of mine, would you let your child get that dose?”

Scott Allen’s article not only ignited a national debate about the ethics of medical research, but it inspired the federal government to launch an investigation into the matter.

In her article, “In Debate on Radiation Tests, Rush to Judgment Is Resisted” Gina Kolata of The New York Times, took a far different approach in reporting the egregious exploitation of helpless, vulnerable children in immoral experiments that indeed, no researcher would subject his own child to.

Her article is decidedly more sympathetic toward the researchers who conducted the radiation experiments as well as to the infamous Willowbrook experiments, which she credits with the development of the controversial Hepatitis B vaccine.

She quotes Dr. Victor Bond, a medical physicist and doctor at Brookhaven National Laboratory, who defended the Fernald experiments, arguing that:

“a question arose as to whether chemicals in breakfast cereals interfered with the uptake of iron or calcium in children. An answer was needed. One obvious way to do the study, he said, would be to use radioactively tagged trace amounts of iron and calcium and to follow the fates of these minerals in the body when children ate cereals.”


Scientists who defend radiation and other ethically dubious human experiments on persons who are incapable of refusing, do so from an elitist position of superiority. They continue to harbor the Eugenic ideology which regards human beings not of their class, as the means to an end.

“In reference to the entire series of cold war nuclear experiments, Bond offered that “Of course it’s useful information. It’s useful to know what dose of radiation sterilizes; it’s useful to know what different doses of radiation will do to
“They told me I shouldn’t have kids and I shouldn’t get married. They said I might have a defect, that I had something wrong with me. They said ‘You aren’t stabilized and you shouldn’t have kids because of what you have.’ I didn’t know what I had. Nobody ever told me. I thought I was like everyone else.

But I was only a kid. I had no interest in getting married, I was only fourteen years old. And to tell the truth, I just wanted out of there,” recalls Charles Dyer...

“Only in recent decades have we begun to shine a light into the dark closet of medical ignomony and illuminate the many stories of vulnerable subjects who were chosen for their perceived inadequacies and handicaps.”

Read more, Against Their Will: The Secret History of Medical Experimentation on Children in Cold War America by Allen Hornbloom, Judith Newman and Gregory Dober, 2013.

U.S. Air Force threw “Radiation bombs” expelled from USAF planes intentionally spread radiation to “unknown distances” endangering Americans young and old alike.

1949: “

Green Run

” intentional radioactive contamination experiment over Hanford, WA.

A massive intentional experiment was conducted by General Electric officials and officials from the Department of Defense (DOD) and AEC. Within seven-hours, 7,780 curies of radioactive iodine-131 and 20,000 curies of xenon-133 were released over Hanford. It was the largest single known radioactive incident. By comparison, Three Mile Island accident (1979) released between 15 and 24 curies of radioactive iodine. It remains unclear what the purpose was for exposing US citizens to this radiological warfare experiment.

Military “systematic radiation warfare program” spread radiation across wide areas around Oak Ridge, Tenn., Los Alamos, NM, and Dugway, Utah. The Pentagon’s aboveground nuclear bomb tests of 1945–1962, totaling more than 200, and the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, are not officially listed as radiation experiments. Yet between 250,000 and 500,000 US military personnel were contaminated during their compulsory participation in the bomb tests and the post-war occupation of Japan. (LaForge.

Radiation Experiments

... 2013)

1954: Castle Bravo, the largest U.S. Nuclear Test in the Marshall Islands; it resulted in greater radiation exposure than planned and the miscalculation resulted in the largest U.S. nuclear contamination accident. The purpose of the study was to evaluate the severity of radiation injury. An estimated 665 inhabitants were overexposed to radiation — years later, inhabitants of the island experienced numerous health problems, including birth defects. Traces of radiation were discovered in Australia, India, Japan, the U.S. and Europe spreading roughly 7,000 square miles. (Castle Bravo. Brookings Institute . 2014)

In 1959, the Air Force conducted at least eight deliberate experimental meltdown in Utah dispersing 14 times the radiation released by the partial meltdown of Three Mile Island in Pennsylvania in 1979, an Associated Press reported in 1994. And in the same year, a “radiation bomb” doused Utah with 60 times more radiation than escaped the Three Mile Island accident, according to Sen. John Glenn, D-Ohio, who released a report on the program 20 years ago.


Categorized U.S. Radiation Experiments.

Colonel E.E. Kirkpatrick of the U.S. AEC issues a secret document (07075001, January 8, 1947) stating that the AEC will begin administering intravenous doses of radioactive substances to human subjects. An April 17, 1947, AEC document states: “It is desired that no document be released which refers to experiments with humans that might have an adverse reaction on public opinion or result in legal suits,” revealing that the U.S. government was aware of the health risks its nuclear tests posed to military personnel conducting the tests or nearby civilians (Goliszek, 2003).

1947: An April 17, 1947 Col OG Haywood of the Army Corps of Engineers explained why the radiation experiments were classified: “It is desired that no document be released which refers to experiments with humans and might have adverse effect on public opinion or result in legal suits” (The Washington Post, Dec. 16, 1994).

Categorized U.S. Radiation Experiments.
1948–1970s: Nasal Radium Irradiation (NRI) of Children at Johns Hopkins

Between 1948–1954, 582 Baltimore school children were subjected to radiation in a federally-funded experiment whose stated intent was to gauge long-term hearing loss. The treatment was incorporated as “standard care,” and an average of 150 patients a month, mostly children, were given the treatment at the Johns Hopkins clinic over a period of several years. Many children received the treatment more than once as recurrent lymphoid tissue was considered an indication for treatment. (ACHRE Report, Ch.7) The overall estimate by the US Centers for Disease Control is between 500,000 to two million U.S. citizens, mostly children, were treated with NRI. (CDC) The treatment involved inserting metal rods tipped with Radium into the children’s nostrils to shrink their adenoids. The children were exposed to high doses of radiation; and their exposure to radium lasted 12 minutes for “three bilateral-through both nostrils-irradiations;” during which the children’s thyroid gland and pituitary gland were exposed to high doses of radiation.

“The President’s Advisory Committee on Human Radiation Experiments, extrapolating from the known effects of radiation doses, calculated that children who received nasal radiation faced a lifetime risk of brain cancer of 4.35 cases per thousand population, 62 percent higher than normal. The rate of all cancers of the head and neck caused by the treatment could be twice that high, according to the committee.” (Keough. The Boston Globe Magazine, 1999)

The mortality risk of cancer to the head and neck for these children is estimated at 10 times higher than the risk for military veterans treated with NRI who were typically exposed for six to eight minutes. In 1997, the Pentagon announced that 20,000 radium-treated veterans deserved notification and medical follow-up. The Baltimore Chronicle reported: “This was the sole human experiment, from among 2,300 known human experiments performed by the Department of Defense that was deemed worthy of follow-up.” Yet, despite the significantly higher risk for cancer the children incurred, the Interagency Working Group on Human Radiation Experiments failed to even mention the children treated with nasal radium.” (Baltimore Chronicle, 1997)

Categorized U.S. Radiation Experiments.
1950: Biologist Warns AEC Official, Radiation Experiments Comparable to Nazi Experiments

In 1950, Dr. Joseph G. Hamilton, a top radiation biologist at the AEC, sent a memo to Dr. Shields Warren, a senior AEC official who directed human radiation experiments; he warned him that the radiation experiments might have “a little of the Buchenwald touch,” and that commission officials “would be subject to considerable criticism” for conducting experiments in which human subjects were exposed to potentially harmful doses of radiation. “For both politic and scientific reasons,” he wrote, “I think it would be advantageous to secure what data can be obtained by using large monkeys such as chimpanzees” (NYT, 1993).

*The NY Times* quotes Dr. David Egilman*: “The memorandum, made available to The Times by Dr. David S. Egilman, a physician from Rhode Island who teaches at Brown University and has investigated instances of human experimentation by the military and the AEC. Dr. Egilman said the memorandum was a clear indication that the Government’s own nuclear scientists knew they were working at the very edges of medical ethics.”

“Based on their own documents and the history of medical ethics, they knew clearly at the time that the studies were unethical,” Dr. Egilman said. “They called this work, in effect, Nazi-like. The argument we hear is that these experiments were ethical at the time they were done. It’s simply not true.”

Dr. Egilman is a member of the Board of Directors of the Alliance for Human Research Protection

Categorized U.S. Radiation Experiments.
1953: Dr. Lester Middlesworth injected 7 newborn babies with radioactive iodine

Dr. Lester Middlesworth of the University of Tennessee injected 7 newborn babies with radioactive iodine in an experiment sponsored by the Atomic Energy Commission at a hospital treating low income people. Six of the babies were African American. Dr. Middlesworth lost track of the infants — no follow-up records were kept. Exposure to low-level radiation increases the risk of cancer. Similar experiments were conducted in Detroit; Omaha; Little Rock; and Iowa City. The published reports in medical journals such as *Pediatrics*, *the American Journal of Diseases of Children* and the *Journal of Nuclear Medicine*, document that scores of premature and normal, term infants — some only minutes or hours old — were injected or ingested radioactive iodine. *(Chicago Tribune, 1993)*

Categorized U.S. Radiation Experiments.
1953: CIA Project MK-ULTRA

1953: CIA’s Project MK-ULTRA included at least four sub-projects specifically using children; 102, 103, 112, and 117 to radiation. Indeed the Advisory Commission on Human Radiation Experiments (ACHRE) heard testimony from persons who had been used in mind control experiments when they were children. ACHRE identified 81 pediatric radiation exposure projects, and found that the CIA funded radiation experiments on children. Under MKULTRA, subproject 86, radioactive isotopes were either implanted or injected in children. (ACHRE Staff Memo, 1995). CIA Mind Control*

Categorized U.S. Radiation Experiments.
1953–1957: Uranium, boron neutron experimental injections at MGH

1953–1957: Oak Ridge-sponsored experiment injected uranium into eleven patients at Massachusetts General Hospital (MGH) in Boston. (ACHRE staff report)

Dr. William Sweet, chief of Neurosurgery at Harvard’s MGH conducted numerous unethical experiments on terminally ill patients. Some of the experiments were conducted under a government shield of secrecy: for example, Sweet experimented on eleven patients whom he injected with uranium to test its viability as chemotherapy against brain tumors; (Moreno 2001) he also conducted both brain electrode implant experiments. In his 1995 testimony to the ACHRE Advisory Committee, Dr. Sweet claimed that all the subjects gave informed consent. However, one of the subjects was injected with uranium when he arrived at the hospital unconscious and he died without ever regaining consciousness or being identified.

1961-62: The “Boston Project” involved an experiment on 14 patients testing boron-neutron-capture therapy (BNCT). The experiment was run jointly by MGH and the Health Physics Division of Oak Ridge National Laboratory. The idea was to destroy tumors by injecting them with boron and exposing the chemical to a beam of neutrons, but the treatment was found to also kill healthy brain tissue and blood vessels. Autopsies on 14 patients who were treated with BNCT at those institutions showed that 10 of them, including George Heinrich and Eileen Sienkewicz, died of complications from the experimental treatment.

A medical malpractice lawsuit was filed in New York (1995) for the deaths of George Heinrich and Eileen Sienkewicz, two of the MGH patients who died. The suit claimed that Dr. William Sweet misled Heinrich and Sienkewicz to believe there was a good chance the treatment, which was painful, would succeed, according to Heinrich’s wife, Evelyn Heinrich, and Sienkewicz’ son, Henry M. Sienkewicz.

The lawsuit cites Dr. Victor Bond, head of the medical department at Brookhaven, who stated in a 1982 interview: “The early experiences was very unfortunate...Then they went beyond that. It wasn’t until long after it became evident it wasn’t working.”

The suit estimated that 75 patients underwent the boron neutron treatment in Massachusetts or New York, and 66 others received injections to their tumors, but were not exposed to neutron beams. The suit maintains that none of the patients was told enough about the procedures to give consent. “It is a monstrous crime that Dr. William Sweet did, and I’m glad that he is still living so that he can be exposed, not as great scientist, but as the monster that he is,” Evelyn Heinrich told The Boston Globe. She said her husband wanted to die before Sweet persuaded him to undergo the treatment.

Anthony Roisman, a Washington attorney for Heinrich and Sienkewicz, said Sweet and others treated terminally ill people as if they had no rights. “Their attitude was, these bodies – not these people – are essentially dead. Let’s do some stuff with them that we would never think of doing on a living person,” Roisman said.

The case was transferred to Mass in 1997 and re-tried in 1999. Read one of the most convoluted legal wrongful death and negligence rulings (308 F.3d 48 – Heinrich v. Sweet HH Md) at OpenJurist

Categorized U.S. Radiation Experiments.
1960–1972: Whole-body radiation experiments

1960–1972: University of Cincinnati Medical School researchers led by Dr. Eugene Saenger conducted whole-body radiation experiments on 88 patients its charity hospital — 62% of who were African American. These experiments may have caused the most deaths and they spanned the most years.

All but one of the 88 patients has since died. “Following exposure to 100 rads of whole body radiation (about 7,500 chest X-rays), Amelia Jackson bled and vomited for days and became permanently disabled.”

Martha Stephens, a junior faculty member at U Cincinnati wrote a report that brought the experiment to a halt in 1972. The experiment was funded by the DoD and had absolutely no potential therapeutic value for the patients. Dr. Saenger had reason to know that the experiment was likely to cause harm; he was among the first to report — in 1960 — that children exposed to irradiation for benign conditions developed tumors. Within a month of radiation, 21 of 88 people in the experiment died. A class action suit was filed against 13 researchers and their institutions in 1994. Federal Judge Sandra Beckworth “compared the deeds of the doctors to the medical crimes of the Nazis during World War II and refused to dismiss the researchers from the suit.” Indeed, the experiment was designed to answer how much radiation could a soldier withstand in the event of a nuclear explosion, before becoming disabled?

Under the Court agreement, in addition to compensation for the families of those who had been victimized, the University of Cincinnati was required to place a plaque which reads, in part: “The Cincinnati citizens listed below were the innocent victims of human radiation experiments in this hospital from 1960 to 1972. Their names are placed here so that all may remember their injuries and afflictions, and their unwitting sacrifice in a project sponsored by the U.S. Department of Defense and carried out by professors in the University of Cincinnati College of Medicine.” In her book, The Treatment: Those Who Died in the Cincinnati Radiation Tests (2002) Prof. Stephens writes, “It seemed to me then, and it seems to me now, that we had become a secret slaughterhouse, a secret death camp”.

Dr. David Egilman, a clinical associate professor of community health at Brown University, has argued that it was known that total body radiation was not effective for the types of solid tumors the patients had. “What happened here is one of the worst things this government has ever done to its citizens in secret.” *Dr. Egilman is a member of the AHRP board of directors.

Categorized U.S. Radiation Experiments.

In 1963, prior to flights into space, scientists were concerned about the effect of space radiation on astronauts’ testicles. They also were concerned about radiated gonads of workers at America’s atomic energy plants. So, they conducted experiments designed to test the effects of massive radiation on prisoners’ testicles without any regard for the consequences for the test human subjects.

In an ugly exercise of rudimentary science that is only now coming to a close, a captive group of human guinea pigs — inmates of Washington and Oregon prisons — were lured into a literal balls-out effort to answer those questions. Enticed with cash and suggestions that participating could help win them parole, and lulled by official assurances that the tests were safe, dozens of prisoners between 1963 and 1973 lined up, stripped down and offered their genitalia to what science called “reproductive radiation tests. . . Dozens of prisoners had their testicles bombarded with radiation in the name of science back in the ’60s and ’70s. (Anderson. Balls of Fire, Mother Jones, 2000)

Until 1973, Dr. C. Alvin Paulsen (University of Washington) who was under a private contract with the AEC, conducted “Reproductive Radiation Tests” on 63 prison inmates at the Washington State Penitentiary in Walla Walla. He used X-rays on the testicles of 64 prisoners — later reports indicated the number of prisoners was 131 — to find the dose that would make them sterile (KD Steele. Radiation Experiments Raise Ethical Questions, 1994).

His former mentor, Dr. Carl Heller, simultaneously conducted similar experiments on 67 inmates at the Oregon State Penitentiary sponsored by the Pacific Northwest Research Foundation of Seattle. These experiments were also funded by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

The inmates agreed to participate in the experiments having been lured with cash and the suggestion of parole — $5 a month and $100 when they receive a vasectomy at the end of the trial. Most of the subjects were exposed to over 400 rads of radiation (the equivalent of 2,400 chest x-rays) in 10 minute intervals. The risks of radiation had not been disclosed to the incarcerated subjects. Mother Jones (2000) reported that declassified government documents show that NASA officials and some unnamed astronauts sat in on Heller’s meetings.

Categorized U.S. Radiation Experiments.
1985: Large-scale experiments that spewed radiation across Idaho and beyond

1985: The Energy Department conducted large-scale experiments as late as 1985 that deliberately produced reactor meltdowns that spewed radiation across Idaho and beyond. The Washington Post reported the meltdown July 10, 1985, quoting an Energy Department spokesman as saying, “It appears that the test was a complete success.” (http://www.citywatchla.com/4box-right/5005-humans-used-for-radiation-experiments-a-shameful-chapter-in-us-history)

Categorized U.S. Radiation Experiments.
1994: Heliobacter pylori

1994: Ali Zaidi, a student at the University of Rochester, was not informed about the risks of radiation when he was asked to sign a consent form for a clinical trial testing Heliobacter pylori. The study was eventually terminated and researchers placed on probation.

Categorized U.S. Radiation Experiments.

1995: The Advisory Commission on Human Radiation Experiments cataloged 81 pediatric radiation exposure projects — 27 of these experiments were judged to be non-therapeutic.

Categorized U.S. Radiation Experiments.
1995: Roadmap of Human Radiation Experiments


Experiments on individuals involving intentional exposure to ionizing radiation, and

Experiments involving intentional environmental releases of radiation that (A) were designed to test human health effects of ionizing radiation; or (B) were designed to test the extent of human exposure to ionizing radiation.

Categorized U.S. Radiation Experiments.
2000: Participants in the Walla Walla experiments settled

In 2000, the former participants in the Walla Walla experiments settled a $2.4 million class-action settlement from the University. Dr. Paulsen defended the tests stating, “If our work was unethical, then you’d have to say that all the [federal and UW advisory boards] that approved it in those days were completely unethical. . .” Paulsen stated that he chose Washington State Penitentiary for his radiation research because “Prisoners were considered ideal subjects because it would be easy to do follow-up studies. They were a population that wasn’t going anywhere.”

Categorized U.S. Radiation Experiments.
1932–1972: Tuskegee Syphilis experiment

1932–1972: Tuskegee Syphilis experiment, “the longest nontherapeutic experiment on human beings in the history of medicine,” continued unabated 25 years after Nuremberg. Tuskegee Syphilis experiment, “the longest nontherapeutic experiment on human beings in the history of medicine” sponsored by the U.S. Public Health Service continued unabated until 1972 — 25 years after Nuremberg. More than 400 black sharecroppers were observed without treatment so that the government researchers could document the natural course of untreated syphilis in Negro men.

The men were subjected to painful spinal taps and suffer the debilitating disease. When a cure — penicillin — became available in 1947, the doctors failed to provide it. Even the Surgeon General of the U.S. enticed the men to remain in the experiment. By the end of the experiment 28 men had died of syphilis, 100 died of related complications, at least 40 of their wives had been infected, and 19 of their children were born with congenital syphilis. Fifteen scientific reports about this experiment were published in medical journals — but no one in the medical community complained.
Tuskegee came to public attention when Jean Heller, of the Associated Press broke the story, after Peter Buxton, a former venereal disease interviewer with the Public Health Service blew the whistle.
News journalist (ABC and CBS) Harry Reasoner described the “study” as an experiment that “used human beings as laboratory animals in a long and inefficient study of how long it takes syphilis to kill someone.”

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1939: “The Monster Experiment”

The “Monster Experiment” was conceived by and conducted under the supervision of Dr. Wendell Johnson, one of the nation’s most prominent speech pathologists. The experiment induced stuttering in twenty-two children living at the Iowa Soldiers’ Orphans’ Home in Davenport. It was designed to test Dr. Johnson’s theory about the cause of stuttering, using psychological pressure to induce children who spoke normally to stutter. The experiment was uncovered by Jim Dyer who had been a graduate student at the University of Iowa in 2001.

* http://ahrp.org/article-24/

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1942: The American Psychiatric Association debated legalizing murder (euthanasia)

In 1942, psychiatrists debated legalizing murder (“euthanasia”) at the American Psychiatric Association. Foster Kennedy, MD, advocated killing “feebleminded” “defective” children whom he called “Nature's mistakes” “hopeless ones who should never have been born.” (Jay Joseph. The Missing Gene... 2006) He opposed euthanasia for normal, but severely ill adults. Dr. Leo Kanner argued against the validity of the concept “feebleminded.”

An unsigned editorial in the American Journal of Psychiatry (1942) endorsed killing “defectives” and endorsed the expansion of compulsory eugenic sterilization. No one argued that it was unethical to kill disabled persons. (Joseph. Euthanasia Debate, 2005) [This debate took place precisely as the Nazi children's “euthanasia” — i.e., medicalized murder was in full swing in Nazi Germany. * Medicalized Murder]

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1940s: Fiendish “Refrigeration” experiments on mental patients at Harvard, U. of Cincinnati

A series of fiendish Hypothermia experiments subjected mental patients for prolonged periods to freezing temperatures. They were conducted by prominent psychiatrists at Harvard University’s McLean Hospital and the University of Cincinnati.

DB Dill, MD, and WH Forbes, MD, described the procedure for freezing human beings in their published journal report:

the naked and slightly anesthetized patient is placed between rubberized blankets. These contain rubber coils through which a refrigerated fluid circulates . . . peripheral vasoconstriction and shivering occasionally delay the fall in rectal temperature for some hours . . . Within 1 to 4 hours the administered anesthetic has been dissipated . .

(Am. J of Physiology, 1941)

John Talbott, MD a prominent Harvard psychiatrist used prolonged total body hypothermia as a means of administering shock therapy to psychotic patients at Massachusetts General Hospital. He reported two deaths from cardiac arrest (Talbott, Physiologic Effect of Hypothermia, 1941). Talbott became editor-in-chief of the Journal of the American Medical Association (1959–1972); and editor of Psychiatric Services (1981–2004); and was elected president of the American Psychiatric Association (1984).

In 1943, Douglas Goldman, MD, and Maynard Murray, MD, Psychiatrists at the University of Cincinnati published a report describing a series of “Studies on the use of Refrigeration Therapy in Mental Disease.” Their stated purpose was “to study the effect of frigid temperature on mental disorders.” They describe their despicable experiment which was conducted on sixteen mentally disabled patients who were put into refrigerated cabinets at 30 degree Fahrenheit, and forced to remain for 120 hours. The experiment resulted in the death of two patients from pneumonia, and several of the survivors suffered from mental retardation and physical decay bordering on cachexia (Goldman & Murray, Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 1943).

The experiments bear a striking similarity to those conducted by Nazi doctors at Dachau * pt. 2* and Japan’s Unit 731 * Pt. 3*

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.

1942: Edward Cohn, MD, a Harvard biochemist injected prisoners with beef blood

Edward Cohn, MD, a Harvard biochemist injected 64 Massachusetts prisoners with beef blood in an experiment sponsored by the U.S. Navy. The antigenic irritants in bovine serum albumin could not be purified away biochemically, dooming the medical utility of the bovine protein for the casualties of war. The rejection of the blood was catastrophic. (Pepper & Cina)

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1941–1958: Infectious disease experiments: institutionalized children “canaries in the mines”

1941–1945: U.S. Committee on Medical Research (CMR) was dedicated to wartime medicine; it funded and coordinated 137 institutions in the US that conducted research — including chemical warfare agents and prevention of infectious diseases tested on prisoners and children.

CMR-funded infectious disease experiments: institutionalized children were used as “canaries in the mines” to test the safety of experimental vaccines for malaria, influenza, dysentery, and sexually transmitted diseases. For example, children at the Ohio Soldiers and Sailors Home, at the Dixon Institution for the Retarded in Illinois, and the New Jersey State Colony for the Feeble-Minded, were used to test experimental vaccines against dysentery that caused severe reactions adverse in the children — thereby precluding the use of the vaccine in the military.

In some of the CMR-funded experiments, vaccination was accompanied by deliberate challenge with the infectious agent. After vaccination against influenza, children developed painful nodules. Three to six months after being vaccinated, the children were exposed to a preparation of the virus for four minutes. Some of the subjects developed influenza. (Lederer. Military Medical Ethics, 2003, p.514)

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1942–1969: Dr. Lauretta Bender, child psychiatrist from Hell

Child psychiatrist, Dr. Lauretta Bender, began her experimental electroshock “treatments” in children in 1942 at Bellevue Hospital. She experimented extensively on helpless children whom she “diagnosed” with “autistic schizophrenia.” Some of the children were as young as 3 years of age. She used multiple electroshock (ECT) “treatments” at Bellevue Hospital (NYC) and then added LSD and other hallucinogenic drugs experimenting on children at Creedmoor Hospital with CIA funds.

Lauretta Bender* link CIA Mind Control*

WWII Through Cold War

Categorized Psych Drugs, U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1944: The largest malaria experiment involved 800 prisoners

US Army and State Department funded a crash program to develop new drugs against malaria. The largest single CMR malaria experiment involved 800 prisoners at federal penitentiary in Atlanta, New Jersey State Reformatory and Illinois State Penitentiary. A series of experiments were conducted at Stateville Penitentiary by medical researchers from the University of Chicago led by Dr. Alf Alving. Four-hundred prisoners were exposed to infected mosquitoes carrying the most virulent strain of malaria, then given drugs to test the drugs' efficacy. The inmates were all on one floor, they were given general information about helping the war effort: but they were not informed about the nature of the experiment. Nazi doctors at Nuremberg cited the Chicago studies to defend their own research. Dr. Alving also infected 60 psychiatric patients at Illinois State Hospital with malaria to test the effect of experimental treatments. (Comfort. The Prisoner as Model Organism... 2009; Ethics Protocols, 2010)

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1945: Sterilization tally in the USA; in Nazi Germany

1945: “Sterilization of the Insane in the USA” a report in The Lancet based on information published in the Journal of the American Medical Association reported that in the U.S. 77,878 people were sterilized:

20,063 (1907 to 1934);
15,815 (1935–1940);
More than 42,000 (1941–1943)

California led the pack with over 10,000 forced sterilizations.

1945: The Central Association of Sterilized Persons estimates that in Nazi Germany sterilized at least two million people were sterilized between 1933–1945. (Samaan. From a Race of Masters to a Master Race, 2014)

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
August 20, 1947: Judgment at Nuremberg

August 20, 1947: Judgment at Nuremberg: 16 out of 23 doctors were found guilty of crimes against humanity. The Nuremberg verdict also set forth the parameters of “Permissible Medical Experiments” known as the Nuremberg Code.

The Nuremberg Code laid the foundation for biomedical ethics mandating that medical experiments conducted on human beings must conform to well-defined humane, ethical standards; foremost is immutable standard:

The voluntary consent of the human subject is absolutely essential;
The information sought is “unprocurable by other methods or means of study;
The anticipated results will justify the performance of the experiment;
The experiment is designed “to avoid all unnecessary physical and mental suffering or injury;”
Risks to subjects be minimized to protect against “even remote possibilities of injury, disability or death.

The Nuremberg Code makes clear that ethical standards protecting individual human rights supersede arguments invoking the “greater good of society.”

Categorized Medical Research Ethics, Nuremberg Code, U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1947: U.S. Government-Sponsored Human Experiments Disregard Nuremberg Standards

American public health officials and the medical community pretended that the Nuremberg Code did not apply to American medical researchers. The assumption was that the physicians who had conducted heinous experiments had been Nazi doctors in Germany; and they rationalized that most of the rogue doctors had been held accountable by the tribunals. (Lederer. *Military Medical Ethics*, Vol. 2, 2003)

Tuskegee Syphilis experiment was “the longest nontherapeutic experiment on human beings in the history of medicine.” This most well-known U.S. unethical medical experiment was sponsored by the U.S. Public Health Service and continued unabated until 1972 — 25 years after Nuremberg.

In the aftermath of WWII, the federal government accelerated and expanded its medical experiments both within the military and civilian population in complete violation of medical ethics as laid down by the Nuremberg Code, whose foremost mandatory requirement is: “The voluntary, informed consent of the human subject is essential.”

Categorized Medical Research Ethics, Nuremberg Code, U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1946–1948: Syphilis Experiments in Guatemala

Syphilis experiments in Guatemala were funded by the US Public Health Service (PHS) and the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to the Pan American Sanitary Bureau (later renamed Pan Am Health Org.) The US team of researchers in Guatemala was led by John Charles Cutler, MD of the PHS who had conducted a similar earlier research project at Terre Haute, Indiana prison in 1944, in which the researchers injected inmates with gonorrhea. Cutler and Guatemala records online; includes graphic medical images of the effects of untreated sexually transmitted diseases.

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1946: National Security Act

1946: Congress passed the National Security Act; one of its provisions created the CIA. Most of CIA officials were formerly with the wartime Office of Strategic Services (OSS). The CIA funded massive mind battering experiments aimed at incapacitating human free will modeled on the fiendish experiments at Dachau death camp. CIA Mind Control and *Paperclip

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1947–1953: Project CHATTER

1947–1953: U.S. Navy Project CHATTER focused on identifying and testing drugs for interrogations and recruitment of intelligence agents. *CIA Mind Control*

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1948: The CIA begins its secret study of LSD

The CIA begins its secret study of LSD (lysergic acid diethylamide) purchased from Sandoz Pharmaceuticals, as a potential weapon for use by American intelligence. The CIA in consultation with Sandoz explored LSD’s possible defensive and offensive uses. Both civilian and military human subjects were used, most without their knowledge. Read CIA Mind Control*

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1947: Prisoners Were Fed Hepatic Liver and Hepatic Feces In Hepatitis Experiment

John Neefe and Joseph Stokes, Jr. conducted a hepatitis experiment in which prisoners in New Jersey State Prison were fed hepatic liver and hepatic feces. “The authors describe the blending of hepatic liver and hepatic feces in a Warring Blender to create “liver suspension in sterile beef heart infusion broth” and “feces pool.” The study “volunteers” were male prisoners with no history of jaundice or hepatitis. The researchers described the inoculation procedure: “On each of 4 successive days, 5 ml. of feces pool . . . was administered in chocolate milk to each of the five volunteers. . .” Despicable experiments such as these, in which otherwise healthy people were infected with contagious diseases may well have helped spread hepatitis and other diseases among the prisoner population.

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1950: Two-hundred female prisoners infected with viral hepatitis

1950: Dr. Joseph Stokes of the University of Pennsylvania deliberately infected 200 women prisoners with viral hepatitis. *(Acres of Skin, 1998)*

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1950: US Army sprays bacteria over San Francisco

1950: U.S. Army secretly used a Navy ship outside the Golden Gate to spray supposedly harmless bacteria over San Francisco and its outskirts. Eleven people were sickened by the germs, and one of them died.

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1951: Pont-Saint-Esprit, France, sprayed with aerosolized LSD

1951: In August, a joint Army-CIA project (an offshoot of CIAs secret ARTICHOKE Project) secretly tested the aerosol use of LSD as a potential weapon. They sprayed LSD on the French village of Pont-Saint-Esprit causing an outbreak of delirium and insanity among its 500 inhabitants. CIA Pont-St. Esprit.

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1950s: CIA retains consultant to help perfect interrogation

1950s: Dr. Henry K Beecher, chief anesthetist at Harvard’s Massachusetts General Hospital, an outspoken advocate of the Nuremberg Code; who authored a seminal article in the *NEJM* (1966), was a secret paid CIA consultant who participated in secret, CIA- and US Navy-sponsored experiments aimed at perfecting interrogation (i.e. torture) techniques and producing amnesia. (McCoy, 2007; Jacobsen, 2014) *CIA Beecher — Mind Control*

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1954: The Doolittle Report, heightened fear and prospect of annihilation by Soviet Union

The Doolittle Report was alarmist and heightened fear of the prospect of annihilation by the Soviet Union; it justified the suspension of longstanding American concepts of “fair play” and lent legitimacy to the Covert Activities of the CIA:

We are facing an implacable enemy whose avowed object is world domination by whatever means and at whatever cost. There are no rules in such a game. Hitherto acceptable longstanding American concepts of “fair play” must be reconsidered. We must . . . learn to subvert, sabotage, and destroy our enemies by more clever, sophisticated, and more effective methods than those used against us.

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1958: Institutionalized children used as “canaries in the mines”

Institutionalized children continued to be used as “canaries in the mines” to test the safety of experimental vaccines for infectious diseases including, malaria, influenza, dysentery, and sexually transmitted diseases for twelve years Nuremberg. The experiments were conducted at academic institutions that received funding from the CMR was dedicated to wartime medicine.

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.


Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1962–1974: Project SHAD sprayed biological and chemical warfare agents on U.S. ships

Project 112/ Shipboard Hazard and Defense (SHAD) Dept. of Defense tested biological and chemical warfare agents, by spraying several U.S. ships while 6,000 thousand of U.S. military personnel were aboard the ships. Veterans say they were not notified of the tests, and were not given any protective clothing. Chemicals tested included the nerve gases VX and Sarin, toxic chemicals such as zinc cadmium sulfide and sulfur dioxide, and a variety of biological agents. (Medical Countermeasures: Fact Sheets)

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1960s: Zinc cadmium sulfide was sprayed on a housing complex in St. Louis

Zinc cadmium sulfide was sprayed on a housing complex in St. Louis that was home to 10,000 low-income people, 70% of who were children under age 12. Lisa Martino-Taylor is a sociologist whose life’s work has been to uncover details of the Army’s ultra-secret military experiments carried out in St. Louis and other cities during the 1950s and 60s found evidence in the documents released in the 90s that showed the Army placed sprayers on a former Knights of Columbus building on Lindell and in Forest Park. The Army always insisted the chemical compound was safe, but documents prove otherwise.

“There is a lot of evidence that shows people in St. Louis and the city, in particular minority communities, were subjected to military testing that was connected to a larger radiological weapons testing project. . . It was pretty shocking, the level of duplicity and secrecy. Clearly they went to great lengths to deceive people.” (Army’s Secret Cold War Experiments... 2012)

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1966: Bacillus Globigii released into New York subway tunnels


Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1948–1980s — Civilian Medical Experiments

1948: The American Medical Association endorsed research on prisoners
The American Medical Association endorsed research on prisoners — provided consent is not coerced with knowledge of potential risks; prior animal studies and knowledge of natural history of the disease; must be expected to yield results not otherwise obtainable; must be conducted by scientifically qualified personal; avoid unnecessary physical or emotional suffering; there must be no reason to believe that death or disabling injury would occur. Following AMA’s endorsement much of NIH’s budget was earmarked for research on prisoners — until 1976 when such research was banned. (J of Amer. Psych and Law, 2013)

By the late 1940s and 1950s, prisoners were the experimental subjects of choice, both for the expanding U.S. pharmaceutical and health care industries and government. Indeed, most of the federal funding was earmarked for research on prisoners. (McDermott, J of Amer. Psych and Law, 2013)

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1950–1952: DES a synthetic estrogen tested on pregnant women without their consent

DES (diethylstilbestrol) is a man-made form of estrogen which has proven to be very harmful to developing female fetuses in the womb. At the University of Chicago, every pregnant woman at the University’s Lying-In Hospital (1,646) was a test subject for a DES experiment without their knowledge or consent. Half the women were exposed to DES, the other half to placebo. The experiment demonstrated that twice as many women treated with DES had miscarriages and premature births, thereby confirming the finding of a Tulane study that contradicted the original uncontrolled Harvard study which extolled high doses of DES effectiveness against pregnancy complications. Despite the confirmatory findings of harm, physicians continued prescribing DES for 20 years resulting in numerous birth complications and exposing the unborn daughters of their patients to serious risk of cancer. NIH News, 2011

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1953–1954: Multi-Site NIH Cooperative Study of Premature Babies’ Survival

NIH Multi-Site Cooperative Study of Retrolental Fibroplasia (RLF, later called, ROP), a form of blindness in premature babies was conducted at 18 hospitals nationwide. The first recorded case of RLF in a premature baby was in 1942 in Boston, decades after premature babies had been routinely provided unrestricted oxygen during their first weeks of life. The NIH Cooperative Study was touted as a state of the art “scientific” double-blind randomized experiment which its authoritative promoters claimed; they had proven that by restricting oxygen to 40%, they prevented blindness in premature infants.

The experimental design required that all 1,420 premature babies at 18 participating hospitals would be deprived of life-sustaining oxygen for 48 hours after birth — as a result, 634 of these fragile babies (45%) died. That high death rate is alarming when compared to the 32% death rate documented at a Cooperative Study participating hospital in New York one year before the Cooperative Study began. (Silverman and colleagues, among them, Dr. Algernon Reese, Archives of Ophthalmology, 1952) The NIH Cooperative Study sacrificed the lives of 161 babies.

The surviving 786 infants in the NIH Cooperative Study were randomized; half received restricted oxygen and half received standard care — i.e., unrestricted oxygen for three months; thereafter they too received restricted oxygen, regardless of their clinical need. The conflating of the two groups fundamentally undermined the scientific integrity of the study which was no longer a “controlled, double-blind” study. The conflating eroded the basis for the published claimed findings rendering that report fraudulent. Furthermore, the researchers failed to report the deaths of 634 babies who had been denied oxygen for 48 hours. In their published report, they disclosed the results of only 786 infants who survived the first 48 hours; and claimed success at preventing ROP without an effect on the infants’ survival rate.

The misleading claims about the results of this defective study were highly influential in establishing rigidly restricted oxygen practice standards at intensive care units for premature babies for many decades resulting in an estimated 150,000 deaths in the first two decades. The experiment was grossly unethical; it was designed in the knowledge that withholding oxygen from very fragile premature infants during the first 48 hours after birth would increase the number of deaths. The researchers’ callous disregard for the life of these infants is further demonstrated by their failure to report the deaths of 634 babies in their published report. The prominent NIH researchers who designed and conducted the experiment misrepresented entirely the true results of the experiment; they committed fraud. Dr. William Silverman, a prominent neonatologist, who had advocated for a controlled study, in hindsight, acknowledged that “the weak design led to problems that plague the field to the present day:

“Why were they enrolled in 48 hours, I questioned for 40 years or more. This has been driving us crazy. Was it that mortality in those days was very high, and most of the burden of mortality was in the first 2 days? It was decided that they should be enrolled at age 48 hours. Well, this came back to plague us, as you can imagine.” (Oral History Interview, William Silverman, MD. American Academy of Pediatrics, 1997)

And Dr. Silverman acknowledged that the theory blaming oxygen as the single cause for premature infant blindness is “largely in doubt,” calling it “dogmatic slumber” (“Oxygen Dogma Challenged” in the Archives of Disease in Childhood, 1982).

Peter Aleff, who has studied the ROP literature in depth, and whose website contains the most comprehensive documentation about this issue, argues that the NIH Cooperative Study design betrays the eugenics mind-set among neonatologists who were convinced that ROP was due to a prenatal genetic “defect” and that babies were “better-dead-than-blind.” In his article, Deceptive ROP Research Peter Aleff writes,
“...blindness had been a favorite target of eugenicists[1] whose pseudo-science dominated medical thinking to the point that most U.S. states passed medically inspired sterilization laws to keep the “undesirables” from contaminating the gene pool. And some of the most influential American ophthalmologists at the time believed that ROP was caused by “defective germ plasm”. One of them, Dr. Algernon B. Reese, wrote a series of learned-looking papers to assert the allegedly prenatal origin of the eye damage. He presented the latest of these at the June 23, 1948, meeting of the American Medical Association’s Section on Ophthalmology where he and his like-minded colleagues recommended that the best way to deal with the epidemic was to “not be so zealous in preserving defective persons, of which the world has a sufficient quantity already”. [Emphasis Added] (Abstract of Discussion Following presentation by Algernon Reese: Persistence and Hyperplasia of Primary Vitreous; Retrolental Fibroplasia in Archives of Ophthalmology, May 1949, pp. 527–550)

One year after the Doctors Trial at Nuremberg, when the world learned about the unspeakable but real medical atrocities committed by leading German doctors, leading American physicians were promoting infanticide! Read about the incredible suffering and brain damage that insufficient oxygen causes:

Under the continued oxygen starving regime, those preemies who do not die of asphyxiation can breathe only in agony, and many of them suffer permanent harm from it. That harm takes multiple forms, often in the same patient. The resistance of oxygen-deprived babies is diminished and their recovery delayed, their mental development is frequently stunted, and they are more likely to have physical handicaps. For instance, a British study of more than 1000 ex-preemies found in 1962 that denying them supplementary oxygen during their first few days had quadrupled the incidence among them of spastic diplegia, a form of cerebral palsy, from 5% for those with 10 or more days in oxygen to 20% for those with fewer or none. (Silverman, 1980)

Furthermore, other severe brain damage must be expected in people whose brains suffered even briefly from lack of sufficient oxygenation. This damage usually develops later than the short timeframes of the typical hit-and-run clinical studies, so this additional toll in physical and mental damage from the “better-dead-than-blind” therapy remains largely the hidden part of the iceberg.” [http://retinopathyofprematurity.org/20oxygen Eugenics.htm]

Despite overwhelming evidence that restricting oxygen from extremely fragile premature babies kills them, the NIH sponsored a multi-site SUPPORT oxygen study, another medical atrocity in which extremely premature infants were restricted in the amount of oxygen they were given. The foreseeable result was documented in “extra” deaths. Read more *

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.

1950s: Drs. Jonas Salk & Thomas Francis tested their influenza vaccine in institutionalized mental patients

Dr. Jonas Salk and Dr. Thomas Francis tested their influenza vaccine in institutionalized mental patients and prisoners in Michigan; Dr. Albert Sabin tested his live virus polio vaccine in 133 prisoners at the Federal Reformatory in Ohio; Sloan-Kettering collaborated with Ohio State University, and conducted cancer experiments in which live cancer cells were injected into supposed “volunteers”. (*J Am Acad Psych Law*, 2013)

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1951–1974: Dr. Albert Kligman’s “supermarket” variety of experiments at Holmesburg Prison

From the 1950s through the 70s Holmesburg Prison became the “supermarket” or “kmart” for human medical experiments conducted by Dr. Albert Kligman, a University of Pennsylvania dermatologist. Under his direction hundreds of painful experiments were conducted involving nearly 1,000 inmates. He recalled his first visit to the prison: “All I saw before me, were acres of skin . . . It was like a farmer seeing a fertile field for the first time.” (Hornblum. Acres of Skin, 1998)

Kligman proceeded to exploit those “acres of skin” testing a garden variety of benogn and toxic chemicals including, psychopharmacological experiments such as, LSD, BZ; radioactive experiments, infectious diseases agents, and skin product experiments on behalf of 33 pharmaceutical companies and secret service government agencies. In 1964, Medical News reported that 9 out of 10 Holmesburg prisoners were subjects of his medical experiments. Even benign tests involving toothpaste, detergents, hair dye, and deodorant involved painful biopsies.

One Army-funded experiment, focused on “the effects of poisonous vapors on the skin.” The study included machines “that create radioactive isotopes” and drop “small amounts” of highly toxic substances “on a limited area of [the inmate’s] skin.” Kligman proclaimed, “This is a program for national defense . . . once such vapors get through the skin they can destroy the nerve system and the central function of the brain.” Similar experiments were conducted at Edgewood Arsenal on U.S. soldiers. "<link> Soldiers Guinea Pigs"

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1952–1964: Chester M. Southam, MD, injected live cancer cells into 14 patients and healthy convicts

Chester M. Southam, MD, a noted immunologist at Sloan-Kettering Institute sought to study the human immunity response to cancer. He obtained funding from the government and injected live cancer cells into 14 patients with advanced cancer and into healthy convicts at Ohio State Prison. The study in prisoners was designed to examine “the natural killing off process of the human body”; inmates were misinformed, when told they faced “no grave danger. Any cancer that took would spread slowly . . . and could be removed surgically.” Two of the patients died before their projected prognosis; four patients developed tumors that were surgically removed; in some patients the tumors grew back, and one patient metastasized. Half of the test subjects in this NIH-sponsored study were black. [Hornblum, BMJ, 1997] In 1962, Dr. Southam and his team conducted a similar experiment in demented elderly patients at the Brooklyn Jewish Chronic Disease Hospital. (Read below)

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1965–1966: Dioxin Experiments

1965–1966: Dr. Kligman conducted dioxin experiments on 70 prisoners at Holmesburg on behalf of Dow Chemicals. Dioxin has proved fatal in laboratory animals given small doses. These experiments were uncovered in 1980 at EPA hearings. (NY Times, 1983) In testing dioxin, a component of Agent Orange, Kligman went beyond Dow Chemical’s instructions. The Times reported that Kligman subjected 10 inmates to 7,500 micrograms of the toxic chemical — 468 times as much as Dow had requested. He reported that “Eight of the 10 subjects showed acne lesions. . . In three instances, the lesions progressed to inflammatory pustules and pules. These lesions lasted for four to seven months, since no effort was made to speed healing by active treatment.” EPA sought the identity of the 70 men, but Kligman refused to cooperate, claiming no records of the prisoners’ identities were kept.

In 2006, in response to a New York Times reporter’s inquiry about prisoner research, Kligman stated: “My view is that shutting the prison experiments down was a big mistake. . . I’m on the medical ethics committee at Penn, and I still don’t see there having been anything wrong with what we were doing.” “Nothing wrong” from his perspective inasmuch his experiments generated enormous profits from his patent of Retin-A, an anti-acne cream; and from the hundreds of experiments he performed on prisoners for Johnson & Johnson, Dow Chemical, the U.S. Army and his own corporation, Ivy Research. (Prison Legal News, 2008)

The University of Pennsylvania website praises Dr. Kligman as: “an innovative, captivating teacher... inspired generations of researchers and clinicians... a giant in the field...”

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1954: Polio Vaccine

1954: Polio vaccine was tested on one million children aged six to nine. In April 1955 the vaccine was deemed “safe and effective” by NIH; the vaccine was hailed as a medical triumph of the 20th century.

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1955–1963: Dark Side of Salk Polio Vaccine

Scientific evidence existed showing the vaccine was contaminated with a cancer causing monkey virus — simian virus 40 (SV40) — but public health officials refused to take precautionary action.

An estimated 98 million Americans received the Salk Polio vaccine. “Few back then grasped that these vaccines might also be a huge, inadvertent, uncontrolled experiment in interspecies viral transmission.” (Tom Curtis, The Lancet, 2004)

But those scientists who did recognize the catastrophic risk were silenced and punished. Federal health officials have for decades denied the evidence and tried to suppress it. In 1954, Bernice Eddy, PhD., a vaccine safety researcher at NIH tested the vaccine manufactured by Cutter in 18 monkeys who immediately showed symptoms of paralysis. She sent a report of her findings and attached pictures of the paralyzed monkeys to her superiors at NIH. Her effort to avert the spread of the polio virus to healthy children failed; NIH officials ignored her findings. As a result, 40,000 children were sickened with “abortive polio,” 56 children developed paralytic polio, and five died in what is known as “the Cutter Incident.”

Dr. Eddy also discovered that the monkeys in which the polio vaccine had been cultured were carriers of a cancer causing monkey virus — later identified by Dr. Maurice Hilleman, Merck’s chief of vaccines, as simian virus 40 (SV40). The hamsters she had injected with the monkey serum developed tumors. NIH officials regarded her discovery as a threat to a pivotal public health policy; namely, mass vaccination. They tried to muzzle her, but in 1960 she presented her findings to the NY Cancer Society; whereupon NIH blocked her from publishing her findings, stripped her of her regulatory duties and laboratory. In 1961, Dr. Eddy finally published her findings: the polio vaccine contained SV40, a cancer causing virus.

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1955–1970: Saul Krugman, MD, conducted despicable medical experiments at Willowbrook

Dr. Krugman deliberately infected mentally disabled children who were confined at Willowbrook School (NY) with hepatitis B. The school housed 6,000 children in abominable conditions. In one experiment, children were fed excrement containing live hepatitis B virus. In another experiment children were injected with live hepatitis virus in an effort to deliberately infect the children with hepatitis in order to learn about different viruses that caused hepatitis and to find a preventive vaccine. Participation in the study was a condition for admission to institution. This infamous experiment was funded by the US Army and approved by the NYS Department of Mental Hygiene. Dr. Krugman won several awards from his medical peers who called his work, “groundbreaking” without any thought about the abuse and suffering of the children he infected. An expose by Geraldo Rivera in 1972, led to a NYS consent decree that forbids the incarceration of mentally retarded children in large institutions. That same year, Dr. Krugman was elected president of the American Pediatric Society. A documentary about the experiments, Willowbrook won best short film category at the Boston Film Festival, 2012.

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1961: Public Health Officials’ Criminal Culpability in Contaminated Polio Vaccine Disaster

In July, 1961, Merck and Parke-Davis recalled their Salk vaccines — without mentioning the cancer risk. NIH officials concealed the SV40 cancer risk and never recalled the rest of the polio vaccine supply. Even after they knew that the vaccine was infected, they continued to expose millions of Americans to the serious risks of cancer for an additional two years. In total, 98 million Americans received contaminated vaccine shots from 1955–1963. [Debbie Bookchin and Jim Schumacher. The Virus and the Vaccine: ...Contaminated Polio Vaccine, and the Millions of Americans Exposed, 2004]

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1964: SV40 Virus implanted into patients with cancer

A report by Dr. Fred Jensen, in the *Journal of the National Cancer Institute* describes an experiment performed in patients terminally ill with cancer. The researchers took tissue from the patients, exposed the tissue to SV40, then they implanted the infected tissue back into the patients. Result: these implants grew into tumors in their human hosts, suggesting the possibility that SV40 could cause cancers in man. The experiment is cited in a 2003 Institute of Medicine report — without ever questioning the ethics of such an experiment: “The committee concludes that the biological evidence is strong that SV40 is a transforming virus.” Read more: SV40 Foundation

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.

1960–1972: University of Cincinnati Medical School conducted whole body radiation experiments on 90 seriously ill cancer patients at its charity hospital — 60% were poor African Americans. Read more Radiation experiments

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1961: Stanley Milgram “Obedience to Authority” experiments at Yale

Stanley Milgram, a Yale psychologist, conducted the first of a series of “Obedience to Authority” experiments shortly after the trial of Adolph Eichman, the Nazi criminal tried in Jerusalem for crimes against humanity. Eichman’s defense was, not guilty, claiming that he had merely followed orders. Milgram sought to learn the conditions that led ordinary Germans to be transformed into perpetrators of torture and heinous crimes against inmates of Nazi concentration camps.

Milgram hired actors to be “learners” and recruited 40 men through newspaper ads who were told that they would serve as “teachers.” They were instructed by white coated experimenters who encouraged them to apply increasingly higher electric shocks whenever a “learner” answered a question incorrectly. A fake electric “shock generator” was used displaying 30 clearly marked switches indicating “Low” (15 to 100 volts), “Moderate” (75 to 120 volts), “Strong” (135 to 180 volts), “Danger: Severe Shock” (375 to 420 volts) and the highest levels marked “XXX” (435 to 450). The experimenters used a series of four prods: please continue or “please go on; the experiment requires that you continue; it is absolutely essential that you continue; you have no other choice you must go on” (Gordon. Mainstream Torture, 2014).

The experiment sought to answer the question: “For how long will someone continue to give increasingly stronger — more painful and risky — electric shocks to another person merely because they were told to do so by an authority figure, even if they thought they could be seriously hurt?” Milgrim sought to prove that German people who were conditioned to obey authority became accomplices to the Holocaust. His results have been replicated in several other obedience experiments showing that 65% of ordinary people continued to give increasingly higher volts of electric shocks even as the “students” cried out in pain. The experiment is a classic in psychology demonstrating the perils of obedience to authority: when people are conditioned to obey authority, they will do so even when instructed to act against their own conscience, such as becoming perpetrators of torture. Professor Alfred McCoy suggests that it is likely that Milgram’s Experiment was one of the 185 research programs funded by the CIA under MK-ULTRA projects which explored various facets of psychological torture. ( )

He notes that like others linked to mind-control projects, “Milgram showed an apparent disregard for his subjects,” recruiting them without serious screening by innocuous advertisements in the local newspaper. He then manipulated them, through deceptive instructions, to participate in torture. McCoy cites Milgram’s biographer who described the feelings expressed by one of Milgram’s subjects, a military veteran named William Menold who recalled feeling “an emotional wreck” a “basket case,” when he realized “that somebody could get me to do that stuff.” (McCoy, Science in Dachau’s Shadow, 2007)

Privately, Milgram himself viewed the experiment as “ethically questionable” because “it is not nice to lure people into the laboratory and snare them into a situation that is stressful and unpleasant to them” (Milgram, 1974, pp. 1–43n cited by McCoy)

In 1962 Milgram conducted a variation of his Obedience to Authority experiment, “Relationship Condition” in which two friends are subjects; one becomes the learner the other the teacher. Only 15% of teachers completed the RC experiment — it was a powerful demonstration of disobedience — yet, Milgram never published the findings, nor did he even mention the experiment in his all encompassing book, Obedience to Authority: An Experimental View (1974). (Nestar Russell. Stanley Milgram’s Obedience to Authority “Relationship” Condition... Social Sciences, 2014)

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.

1962: Dr. Chester Southam injected live cancer cells into 22 elderly patients

Dr. Chester Southam injected live cancer cells into 22 elderly patients at Jewish Chronic Disease Hospital in Brooklyn. After being rebuffed by his institution, Sloan-Kettering, he convinced Dr. Emanuel Mandel at Jewish Chronic Disease. He sought to learn whether people who were debilitated by cancer could reject cancer cells. None of the patients were informed about the risks — and were never informed that the experiment involved injecting live cancer cells. Several doctors told Southam they did not want their patients experiment on — but he used them anyway.

Three whistleblowers — Drs. Avir Kagan, David Leichter and Perry Fersko — refused to participate in the experiment. They complained to the NYS Board of Regents and to a hospital board member, William Hyman, who was a lawyer. Hyman accused Drs. Southam and Mandel of acting like Nazi doctors: “I don’t want Nazi practices of using human beings as experimental guinea pigs.” The whistleblowers resigned their position, and went public — which proved to be most effective. State attorney General Louis Lefkowitz who read about Southam’s research via the media, accused him of fraud and unprofessional conduct and demanded that the Board of Regents suspend his medical license. Lefkowitz wrote:

Every human being has an inalienable right to determine what shall be done with his own body. These patients then had a right to know the contents of the syringe: and if this knowledge was to cause fear and anxiety or make them frightened, they had a right to be fearful and frightened and thus say NO to the experiment. (Oxford Textbook of Clinical Research Ethics, 2008)

The NYS Board of Regents found Dr. Southam guilty of fraud, deceit, and unprofessional conduct, and revoked his license for one year. However, two years later, the American Cancer Society elected him President; once again, demonstrating that the medical establishment does not consider violations of medical ethics an impediment to career advancement.
(Hornblum, New York Post, 2013)

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1963–1973: Reproductive Radiation Experiments

1963–1973: “Reproductive radiation experiments” were conducted on 64 prison inmates by Dr. C. Alvin Paulsen (University of Washington) under a private contract with the Atomic Energy Commission (now the Energy Department). Read more * Radiation experiments.

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1966: Policies for the Protection of Human Subjects

1966: NIH Office for Protection of Research Subjects (OPRR) created Policies for the Protection of Human Subjects calling for the establishment of independent review bodies later known as Institutional Review Boards.

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1966: “Ethics and Clinical Research”

1966: Animal Welfare Act establishes ethical use of laboratory animals in research. There is no law protecting human research subjects from unethical experimentation.

1966: Henry Beecher’s article “Ethics and Clinical Research” in New England Journal of Medicine identified 50 unethical clinical studies. But it would be eight years before a federal law would set ethical standards for human experimentation. Beecher’s article had been rejected by the Journal of the American Medical Association. Read about Beecher’s unethical collaboration with the CIA. *

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1967: Human Guinea Pigs: Experimentation on Man

1967: British physician Maurice Pappworth published Human Guinea Pigs: Experimentation on Man; he was far less circumspect than Beecher. He identified researchers by name and provided their institutional affiliations, stating bluntly: “No doctor, however great his capacity or original his ideas, has the right to choose martyrs for science or for the general good.” Dr. Pappworth is on the AHRP Honor Roll *

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.

1967–1968: California prisoners were paralyzed with a neuromuscular agent

Sixty-four California prisoners were paralyzed with succinylcholine, a neuromuscular agent that restricts breathing. Succinylcholine has since been used in lethal injection protocols. When five prisoners in the California experiment refused to participate as subjects in the experiment, researchers were given “permission” to inject the recalcitrant prisoners against their will. (Harriet Washington, *Baltimore Sun*, 1995) By 1969, 85% of new drug research in the US was conducted on prisoners. (*Acres of Skin*)

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1969: San Antonio Contraceptive Study conducted on 70 poor Mexican-American women

San Antonio Contraceptive Study conducted on 70 poor Mexican-American women. Half received oral contraceptives the other placebo. In the middle of the study the two groups were switched — none were informed that they may not receive active contraceptives. [NCBI-NIH]

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.

Although its true birth is rooted the revelations at the Doctors Trial at Nuremberg, the birth of American Bioethics is credited to The Hastings Center and Kennedy Institute for Bioethics, Georgetown. “Bioethics was born in scandal” — the unholy trinity of American research travesties: Jewish Chronic Disease Hospital cancer cell injections in elderly patients (1964–65); Willowbrook deliberately infected retarded children with hepatitis (1963–66); and Tuskegee failure to treat (1932–72). Tuskegee has had the longest life in bioethics and American public memory. It has become a metaphor and has had the greatest impact on public policy and the growth of bioethics. (Susan Reverby, Examining Tuskegee, 2009)

Two of its intellectual founders — the philosopher Hans Jonas and the psychoanalyst and legal scholar, Jay Katz — both of who were Jews who had fled Nazi Germany — had a humanitarian perspective. They recognized that by protecting the right of the individual, society protects itself against atrocities such as the Nazi experiments on Concentration Camp prisoners. Their views, however, have been largely eclipsed by the dominant faction in bioethics which is driven by utilitarian values that apply a moral calculus grounded in business ethics.

Utilitarian Bioethicists embraced “scientific progress” as the overarching value, rationalizing government policies that override individual rights. They calculate a risk / benefit ratio in medicine and healthcare from a societal viewpoint for the supposed “greater good.” Implicit in utilitarian ethics is the eugenic rejection of the guiding principle in Hippocratic medicine that values each individual. Public health policies are formulated to facilitate “scientific progress” as defined by the biomedical industrial complex, and enforced by government. That mind set of bioethics and government policymakers is rooted in the American Eugenics movement — though Bioethicists self-consciously avoid using the term “eugenics” because of its inexorable link to Nazi ideology and the “Final Solution.” Read more...*

*Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.*

Stanford Prison Experiment (SPE) conducted by Philip Zimbardo, Ph.D, a psychologist simulated a prison constructed in a basement at Stanford University. The 24 male subjects were screened normal Stanford undergraduates who were paid $15 a day for an experiment that was to last two weeks. They were randomly assigned to be either “guards” or “prisoners.” The prisoners were picked up unexpectedly at their homes by real Palo Alto police officers. They were roughly hustled to the “prison” where they were stripped, deloused, and put into rough muslin smocks with no underwear and one ankle chained.

Zimbardo claimed that the students assigned to be guards soon began spontaneously abusing the prisoners both psychologically and physically. “Within a day or two, they were marching prisoners to and from the bathroom in paper bag hoods, keeping them naked, stepping on their backs while they did push-ups, and sexually humiliated them.” The experiment ended when Zimbardo’s girlfriend, Christina Maslach, came to look and expressed her horror at the abuse. Although Zimbardo has acknowledged that the experiment was unethical, he has built his career on this sensationalized experiment which he first reported publicly in The New York Times Magazine in 1973. Zimbardo’s thesis – which the experiment was designed to prove – is that good, ordinary college students became sadistic tormentors, simply because they were given permission, the means, and the opportunity of doing so. The Stanford Prison Experiment (SPE), and its well-publicized result, became a fixture in the popular conception of psychology despite a body of serious criticism. Zimbaro was elected President of the American Psychological Association in 2002.

Over the years a chorus of serious criticism has grown raising questions about conceptual flaws; subject selection bias; flawed methodology that tainted the participants’ behavior; preconceived manipulated results; any results were rendered meaningless by insufficient small sample size inadequate for statistically useful results. And Zimbardo’s active participation in the experiment as the prison superintendent put himself in the position of ultimate active authority over the guards’ behavior calls this into question. Many designers of such experiments would summarily throw out such a study. (Brian Dunning, 2008)

The noted psychologist, Erich Fromm, was an early critic of the experiment. In The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness (1973) he challenged Zimbaro’s thesis, validity of such experiments, and the study’s conclusion that the prison situation itself determines an individual’s behavior. Fromm cited historical studies that examined the behavior of inmates in Nazi concentration camps.

“the data from concentration camps tend to disprove [...] Zimbardo’s main thesis, which postulates that individual values, ethics, convictions do not make any difference as far as the compelling influence of the environment is concerned. On the contrary, differences in the attitude, respectively, of apolitical, middle-class prisoners (mostly Jews) and prisoners with a genuine political conviction or religious conviction or both demonstrate that the values and convictions of prisoners do make a critical difference in the reaction to conditions of the concentration camp that are common to all of them.”

“The failure of the authors to check their conclusions with a realistic situation is particularly regrettable since there is ample material at hand dealing with a prison situation far more brutal than that of the worst American prisons—Hitler’s Concentration camps.”

Fromm challenged the validity of the screening test used to ascertain an individual’s underlying sadism, noting that:

http://ahrp.org/1971-stanford-prison-experiment-conducted-by-philip-zimbardo-was-an-exercise-that-unleashed-unprovoked-violence-and-a-predilection-for-abuse-bo...
“If in psychological experiments the "subjects" were clearly aware that the whole situation is only a game, everything would be simple. But in many experiments, as in that of Milgram, they are misinformed and lied to; as for the prison experiment it was set up in such a way that the awareness that everything was only an experiment would be minimized or lost. The very fact that many of these experiments, is order to be undertaken at all, must operate with fakery demonstrates this peculiar unreality; the participants’ sense of reality is confused and their critical judgment greatly reduced.”

“the difference between the mock prisoners and real prisoners is so great that it is virtually impossible to draw analogies from observation of the former. For a prisoner who has been sent to prison for a certain action, the situation is very real; he knows the reasons. In “real life” the person knows that his behavior will have consequences. In addition, the role of the experimenter must be considered in laboratory experiments of this type. He presides over a fictitious reality constructed and controlled by him. In a certain sense he represents reality for the subject and for this reason his influence is a hypnotic one akin to that of a hypnotist toward his subject. The experimenter relieves the subject, to some extent, of his responsibility and of his own will, and hence makes him much more prone to obey the rules than the subject would be in a nonhypnotic situation.” (Fromm. excerpt from The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness, 1973)

Fromm pointed out that the uniforms worn by the “prisoners” were inconsistent for American prisons. The ill-fitting uniforms made the prisoners feel awkward in their movements; since, these dresses were worn without undergarments, the uniform forced them to assume unfamiliar postures, more like those of a woman than a man—another part of the emasculating process of becoming a prisoner. In 2004, when the Abu Ghraib torture photographs were shown, the similarity in details to the Stanford prisoner uniforms — as well as bags being put over the heads of prisoners — was strikingly apparent.

The experiment has been criticized for subject selection bias; flawed methodology that tainted the participants’ behavior; preconceived manipulated results; rendering such results meaningless by insufficient small sample size inadequate for statistically useful results. And Zimbardo’s active participation in the experiment as the prison superintendent put him in the position of ultimate active authority over the guards’ behavior calls this into question. Many designers of such experiments would summarily throw out such a study. (Brian Dunning, 2008)

Peter Gray, Ph.D., the author of Psychology a textbook has focused on methodological problems; he criticized Zimbaro’s experiment as poorly conceived and improperly interpreted. Much research has shown that participants in psychological experiments are highly motivated to do what they believe the researchers expect them to do – “demand characteristics”. In any valid experiment it is essential to eliminate or at least minimize demand characteristics. In this experiment, Zimbardo’s expectations (demands) were everywhere in evidence. Zimbardo provided a blueprint detailing what the guards are expected to do. (Peter Gray. Why Zimbardo’s Prison Experiment Isn’t in My Textbook, Psychology Today, Oct. 19, 2013)

Zimbardo and his colleagues had consulted with Carlo Prescott, an African American who had served 17 years in San Quentin for attempted murder and who had spoken before Congress on issues of prison reform. Zimbardo acknowledged the contributions of Mr. Prescott in writing as “our prison consultant.” In his book, The Lucifer Effect, he referred to Prescott as “my co-instructor...an invaluable consultant and dynamic head of our “Adult Authority Parole Board.”

However, after reading about the various ways the experiment was being used by Zimbardo and others to explain real prison atrocities, Prescott wrote a devastating Op Ed article for the Stanford Daily entitled “The Lie of the Stanford Prison Experiment” (reprinted here). Prescott expressed great regret for his involvement in the experiment and stated that it was he, not the guards in the mock prison, who came up with the ways of psychologically humiliating and harassing the prisoners.

“...ideas such as bags being placed over the heads of prisoners, inmates being bound together with chains and
buckets being used in place of toilets in their cells were all experiences of mine at the old “Spanish Jail” section of San Quentin and which I dutifully shared with the Stanford Prison Experiment braintrust months before the experiment started. To allege that all these carefully tested, psychologically solid, upper-middle-class Caucasian “guards” dreamed this up on their own is absurd.”

“How can Zimbardo ... express horror at the behavior of the “guards” when they were merely doing what Zimbardo and others, myself included, encouraged them to do at the outset or frankly established as ground rules? At the time, I had hoped that I would help create a valid, intellectually honest indictment of the prison system. In hindsight, I blew it. I became an unwitting accomplice to a theatrical exercise that conveniently absolves all comers of personal responsibility for their abominable moral choices.”

If so, then the experiment was not about situation dynamics under prison conditions, nor spontaneous acts of abuse of prisoners, but rather about the mental reaction of students playing prisoner under extreme psychological abuse bordering on torture.

Portions of the Stanford Prison Experiment Video taped:
http://www.personalgrowthcourses.net/video/stanford_prison_experiment

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1972: “Syphilis Victims in U.S. Study Went Untreated for 40 Years.”


Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1973: Final Report of Tuskegee Syphilis Study

1973: The Final Report of Tuskegee Syphilis Study concluded: “Society can no longer afford to leave the balancing of individual rights against scientific progress to the scientific community.”

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1974: National Research Act


Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1973: Jessica Mitford’s Powerful Expose Brought Experiments on Prisoners to a Halt.

Jessica Mitford’s article “Experiments Behind Bars,” in the Atlantic Monthly, 1973, followed by her book Kind and Usual Punishment: The Prison Business, 1973, exposed massive exploitation of U.S. prisoners who served as incarcerated “lab rats” in pharmaceutical drug research and government mind control experiments. Until Mitford’s powerful indictment, from 1962–1975, prisoners were the preferred experimental subjects for medical research funded by both government and industry. Phase I drug safety tests on behalf of pharmaceutical companies were conducted almost exclusively on prisoners who were viewed as “test material.”

Dr. Albert Sabin, who had tested his live virus polio vaccine on prisoners, argued that prisoners were ideal subjects for research: they were “a stable, long-time permanent study group.” Tropical disease tests, respiratory infections, skin infections, hepatitis, and “pain tolerance studies” were all conducted on prisoners. By 1974, 70% of drugs approved by the FDA were tested on prisoners. Mitford had the greatest influence on bringing this lucrative venue to a halt. Read more...* Cheaper Than Chimpanzees; (Hornblum. They Were Cheap and Available, BMJ, 1997; Amy Landa. When Medicine and Ethics Meet in the Public Sphere: The Role of Journalism in the History of Bioethics, 2009

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1974–1994: Norwegian sterilization experiments on mentally retarded used radiation

The experiments were conducted with the cooperation and funding from the US government. [US and Norway Used Insane for Nazi-style Tests, London Times, 1998 cited by International Campaign to End Human Rights Violations Involving Classified New Weapons of Mass Destruction: Electromagnetic and Neurological Technologies by Cheryl Welsh, 1999–2000]

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1976: “We don’t want to kill science but we don’t want science to kill, mangle and abuse us.”

1976: National Urban League held a conference on Human Experimentation, announcing: “We don’t want to kill science but we don’t want science to kill, mangle and abuse us.”

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1978–1981: Is HIV-AIDS linked to CDC’s Hepatitis B Vaccine Experiment?

In 1978–1981, the CDC conducted a hepatitis B vaccine experiment on homosexual men living in New York City, San Francisco and Los Angeles. HIV/AIDS was first detected among the participants in the CDC hepatitis B vaccine trial and quickly spread throughout the gay community in those cities. A body of evidence, including a detailed statistical analysis of the documented time line of when HIV infection was detected in the men’s blood and reported to the CDC. Dissidents who have studied the available published data are convinced that this ill-conceived experiment precipitated the devastating AIDS epidemic in America’s homosexual community. The gay men in the experiment were injected with a vaccine that had been made using human hepatitis B infected blood which was injected into chimpanzees known to be infected with the cancer causing simian virus 40 (SV40); the virus that had contaminated the polio vaccine.

Before these CDC experiments there were no reported cases of HIV or AIDS in America. The AIDS epidemic was officially declared by CDC in 1981, at the conclusion of the experiment. Yet, in the NEJM published report (1980) researchers proclaimed the vaccine “safe and incidence of side effects low,” and claimed a 96% success rate. They failed to mention the emergence of a new disease affecting some of the subjects.

The men in the Manhattan experiment had the highest rate of HIV ever recorded for that time period: 20% were discovered to be HIV-positive in 1980, and over 40% in 1984. In addition, a re-examination of the stored blood samples from an AIDS trial in NYC by epidemiologists at the National Cancer Institute in 1999, found that one out of five gay men (20%) tested positive for the new KS herpes-8 virus (Kaposi’s Sarcoma virus in 1982.

Before 1978 no stored blood anywhere in the US tested positive for either HIV or the Kaposi’s Sarcoma virus (which was not identified until 1994).

An extraordinary PBS taped interview (1987) with medical historian Edward Shorter and Dr. Maurice Hilleman, Merck’s foremost vaccine developer acknowledged that the polio vaccine (manufactured by Merck) had been contaminated with SV40. He also indicated the likelihood that SV40 is the source of AIDS: “I didn’t know we were importing AIDS.”

He nevertheless defended the contaminated vaccine stating: “it was good science at the time because that was what you did. You didn’t worry about these wild viruses…”

The taped interview was never aired for fear of liability; but it was submitted to the Library of Congress and in 2011 was posted on YouTube.

How did these two viruses of primate origin get into the gay male population to cause AIDS and a contagious form of cancer? Can the AIDS epidemic in the US be traced directly to CDC’s experiments? Given the lethal nature of these two combined viruses, it is likely that many, if not most, of the men in the CDC experiment eventually died of AIDS. The actual number of AIDS deaths among the men in the experiment has never been revealed, nor have their medical records been studied. Efforts to obtain this information have been rebuffed invoking the “confidential” nature of the experiment to deny access. Read more... (Alan Cantwell, MD., Gay Vaccine Experiments and the American (Not African) Origin of Aids, 2011; The Virus Cancer Program, 2005

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
1979: The Belmont Report

On July 12, 1974, President Nixon signed the National Research Act which created a commission whose task was to identify basic underlying ethical principles to be used in conducting biomedical research; and the law required codified regulations to protect human subjects during medical research in the United States. Regulations for the Protection of Human Subjects in Biomedical and Behavioral Research—45 C.F.R. 46 — which established standards for matters such as informed consent, selection of research subjects and Institutional Review Boards (IRBs).

In 1978, 45 CFR 46 Subpart C specifically protects prisoners in biomedical and behavioral research. In 1979 the commission’s recommendations were published in the Belmont Report, which established ethical guidelines for informed consent, beneficence, and justice; and risk assessment and selection of human test subjects. Notably, the Belmont Report, which addressed human research subjects, was published thirteen years after the Animal Welfare Act (1966) was enacted to protect animals. 1979: National Commission issued The Belmont Report setting forth three basic ethical principles: respect for persons, beneficence, and justice.

In 1980, the FDA issued 21 CFR 50.44 prohibiting the use of prisoners as subjects in clinical trials shifting phase I testing by pharmaceutical companies to non-prison population.

In 1991, 45 C.F.R. 46, Subpart A, became known as the “Common Rule.” Seventeen federal agencies agreed to adopt the principles of the regulations and consistently apply them to subjects in all federally funded research.

Categorized U.S. WWII & Cold War Experiments.
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Liability waivers for swine flu vaccine-induced narcolepsy costs Euro governments over $1 Billion

Posted by Meryl Nass, MD

Swine flu vaccine-induced narcolepsy is costing European governments over $1 Billion due to liability waivers for manufacturers; and the same waivers were just issued for Ebola vaccines.

The UK is paying out about $1.7 million dollars per victim. Although the media rarely reported on the severity of narcolepsy cases, vaccine-induced narcolepsy patients are much sicker than most people with narcolepsy. It isn’t only a matter of falling asleep; there is additional brain damage, including personality changes.

Now scientists in Finland, where the first evidence for the GSK Pandemrix 2009-10 vaccine-narcolepsy connection was made, suggest it may be both a specific protein in Pandemrix vaccine, and an excessive amount of protein that caused narcolepsy, writing in PLOS.

Until now, the best guess re causality was that the novel ASO3 adjuvant in the vaccine was the problem. However, millions of Canadians received a similar GSK vaccine which used the same adjuvant, but Canada did not see an excess of cases from GlaxoSmithKline (GSK)’s Arepanrix swine flu vaccine. Only GSK’s Pandemrix, used primarily in Europe, seemed to cause this serious complication. The Finnish researchers note that the two vaccines, despite using identical antigens and adjuvants, employed different manufacturing methods. If so, this will be great news for GSK. It would mean their multibillion dollar ASO3 adjuvant might be used again.

In fact, the narcolepsy fiasco barely hurt GSK, since the company suffered no financial liability for the narcolepsy cases. In order for a country to receive pandemic vaccines, it had to agree to assume the liability for potential injuries. WHO assisted in the issuing of liability waivers, as part of a pre-existing agreement with manufacturers. Only Poland refused to accept this deal.
A Polish Health Ministry spokesperson was quoted by the BBC:

“It’s not about satisfaction. We don’t want to be seen as a country which opposes vaccines, we want to protect our citizens but not under the conditions set by the pharmaceutical companies,” health ministry spokesman Piotr Olechno told the BBC.
Mr Olechno said the government had decided not to buy the vaccines because it could not guarantee there were no side effects and it did not want to take responsibility for those.

The US government, on the other hand, is happy to take on liability risks for its largest banks and pharmaceutical companies. (It may be much harder to get a payout from the government, however. DHHS is the both the adjudicator, so it gets to decide whether a vaccine caused a specific side effect, and the payor. DHHS has capped Public Readiness and Emergency Preparedness Act (PREPA) awards for death or total disability from vaccines at about $350,000.)

Sylvia Burwell, current Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services, recently issued a liability waiver to several companies (Merck, Johnson and Johnson, GSK) making Ebola vaccine candidates, identical to the swine flu vaccine waivers. If you receive one of these Ebola vaccines, you will be prohibited from suing the manufacturer for damages, if the vaccine causes an injury. Your only recourse is to ask DHHS to find in your favor and then pay you a relatively small award.

The Reuters story on this subject is generally correct, but errrs in comparing this liability waiver to that for childhood vaccine injuries. The 2006 Public Readiness and Emergency Preparedness Act (PREPA) waiver, issued only for vaccines like anthrax, smallpox, swine flu, adjuvants and Ebola, gives a much more extensive waiver of liability to manufacturers, and gives smaller cash awards. It also fails to pay legal fees, unlike childhood vaccine injury cases.

The implications of PREPA are actually huge: vaccine manufacturers are being incentivized to perform only limited safety testing of their products, because if they don’t know about a problem, they cannot be held liable for it. I have written on this issue at length here, here and here.

In 2009 the federal government did not inform citizens that the swine flu vaccine they were receiving had been issued a liability waiver. I suggest you inform yourself before accepting an Ebola or any emergency vaccines.

Note that due to widespread concerns expressed in 2009 by me and many others, about potential side effects from adjuvants like ASO3, the US government (after purchasing large quantities of novel adjuvants to fight swine flu) did not use them.

The US averted the narcolepsy epidemic seen in much of Europe.
1942–1975: U.S. Soldiers Experimental Guinea Pigs

Alfred Richards, a pharmacologist, headed the Committee on Medical Research coordinating wartime medical research initiated by Department of Defense (DOD), Atomic Energy Commission (AEC, later EPA), and the CIA. In 1942, Richards requested permission from the Secretaries of the Army and Navy to use soldiers as subjects to “study vesicant gases”. He explained that human experiments with poison gas were necessary and could be done safely. “In the hands of competent experimenters much can be learned concerning the prevention and treatment of gas burns in men without subjecting them to more than relatively trivial annoyance.” (Raffi Khatchourian. Operation Delirium, New Yorker, 2012)

In reality, U.S. soldiers and sailors were subjected to unconscionable experiments testing chemical and biological agents for use as weapons. Admittedly, “the weapons development program, [ ] was controversial at the start and remains so to date. Biological weapons are still as silent, deadly, and inhumane, whether they kill, maim, or incapacitate.” (Cutting Edge: The History of Ft. Detrick, 1997)

The Army built a gas chamber “to advance clinical research.”

“The chamber—an upgrade of an earlier model—occupied a corner of Building 326, which also housed the Officers’ Club. The structure’s walls, made of tile and brick, gave it a vaultlike appearance. Its door was airtight and forged out of thick metal; it had been salvaged from a First World War Navy ship, as was a porthole that served as its sole window. The chamber was a perfect cube, nine feet in all dimensions. Inside, the only source of light was a hundred-watt bulb mounted behind an explosion-proof shield. No more than seven men would be in the room at any given time.” (Operation Delirium, 2012)

A classified report, “Gassing Chamber for Human Tests: Construction and Operation,” explains that the chamber’s equipment was designed to run “completely automatically,” with an attendant necessary only to manipulate the dials and to observe the glass bubblers and the pressurized containers and the ducts used to control the flow of gas.

The experiments were conducted by both military and academic physicians. The uninformed human subjects included military servicemen, prisoners, mentally incapacitated persons, disabled veterans, and hospitalized patients; most of whom were not volunteers.

Categorized US Soldiers - Guinea Pigs.