



The Solari Report

March 12, 2020

The Nuremberg Principles with Amy Benjamin



Catherine Austin Fitts



Amy Benjamin

Summary: After several decades of globalization, with trillions disappearing from the U.S. federal government and explosive global corruption, it has become increasingly fashionable for those in power to ignore domestic and international law. The message is "crime pays."

Part of our challenge is the explosion in invisible weaponry and digital technology that has made it possible for those who have excelled at these technologies—remote control of planes, hacking of bank accounts, weather warfare, surveillance capitalism, online entrapment, entrainment and mind control—to get away with murder. It's hard to defend yourself against invisible technology if you don't appreciate that it exists—and your ignorance wildly emboldens those who do.

The question for many of us is "What do I do?" One foundational step is to revisit the values, principles, and laws that are the cornerstone of our civilization. We gather power by grounding ourselves in the cultural and moral covenants that we share. We can live by and express these principles in our daily life and finances—and shun those who violate them.

This week, Amy Benjamin joins us for a briefing on the Nuremberg Principles—the principles of international law that emerged from the Nuremberg Trials at the end of World War II.

Bio: Amy Benjamin teaches the Nuremberg Principles in her international law classes at the School of Law at Auckland University of Technology. We also discuss the Nuremberg Code—one of the most important sets of international standards for medical ethics.

Amy is a legal scholar and lecturer in Public International Law. Her research centers on the evolution of the concept of state sovereignty from the Thirty Years' War to the present and on the asymmetric aspects of the laws of war. She has published about government secrecy, international treaties, and 9/11.

Amy's work to bring transparency to efforts to sabotage democratic process through international treaties dovetails powerfully with her writings on how secrecy is engineered.

Amy's landmark analysis "The Many Faces of Secrecy" was published in the *William & Mary Policy Review* in October 2017. It addresses the "systemic secrecy crisis" in the United States. Amy is a former attorney at the US Department of Justice.

C. Austin Fitts: Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to *The Solari Report*. It is my privilege to welcome back a woman who needs no introduction on *The Solari Report*, and that is Amy Benjamin who hails from Auckland and is a professor teaching law at the University in Auckland. She has joined us on several occasions.

There are many people who say that her interview with us on secrecy was the best *Solari Report* we ever did. If you haven't listened to the previous Amy Benjamin interviews, I strongly recommend them.

This is a woman with incredible knowledge of the law. She has experience in practicing law, including at the Department of Justice, so she knows the US system well. But she also knows a great deal about international law.

I realized that I wanted to discuss the **Nuremberg Principles**. They kept coming up recently – in particular with some of the solutions being proposed for Coronavirus. So I called Amy and said, “Could you get on *The Solari Report* right away?” I am very grateful that she said yes.

Amy, welcome to *The Solari Report*.

Amy Benjamin: Hi, Catherine. It is lovely to speak with you as always.

Fitts: **Nuremberg Principles.** This is something that you know a great deal about. As you pointed out earlier, this is something that you teach people about.

Benjamin: I do teach them about it because, for international law, the Nuremberg Principles, in a sense, can't be overstated about their importance to the Magna Carta and the Constitution. They were announced, and they came from the Nuremberg war crime trials of the senior Nazi leadership right after World War II, and were codified by a UN commission right after the trials ended. They are very short, but what they set out is incredibly important for international law. They do form the heart of the international law paper that I teach to undergraduates.

Fitts: Walk us through the **Principles**: What do the Principles say?

Benjamin: They do two things. One is they define in some detail the international crimes which were prosecuted at the Nuremberg war crime's trials; the main one being the crime of aggressive war. At the trials, it was called 'a crime against peace'. —

I think that the French were the ones who gave it that appellation. It was very poetic – a crime against the peace of the person. Then there are war crimes – the crimes that soldiers commit during war, for example, violating the principle of discrimination or distinction. You can't target civilians or shoot prisoners when they try to surrender.

Then there was a new one, which was extremely novel at the time, and that was crimes against humanity. That was crimes committed against any civilian population, including a domestic population. They introduced this completely novel crime, and turned a lot of heads because they wanted to be able to prosecute things that happened in Germany – crimes committed by the Nazi regime against their own citizenry, not against the citizenry of occupied territories in war, which would come under 'war crimes'.

That was easy. But what about the things that the Nazis did to groups in their own country – homosexuals and Jews and gypsies and communists – both before the war and during the war? These were crimes that had never been crimes before. It had never been suggested that they were crimes or that international law, which is between nations, could reach intra-national (within the nation) events. So this was huge.

The Principles set forth the crimes that were prosecuted in Nuremberg. The second major thing they did was say that individual statesmen and officials could be held accountable for these crimes. The nation-state wouldn't be accountable as Germany had been held accountable after World War I en masse with the reparations.

After World War II, the international community forsook that route and said, "No, we are not going to do collective guilt and hold a whole nation accountable. We are going to go after the individuals responsible and the senior leadership and the senior politicians and the senior governing officials." That had never been done before.

So the Principles basically said, "If you are responsible for getting your nation to commit a crime under international law, then you – the official – will be held accountable regardless of what the national law says and regardless if the national law allowed you to create the international crime or even directed you to commit the international crime."

"National law can no longer serve as a field for violating international law. It can't immunize you if you violate international laws. So you will be held accountable, and your nation's law – if it is violent or directed you to commit a crime – cannot be used as a defense."

So, that was the second major thing that the Principles did. It established the supremacy of international law over national law in a very small area related to crimes of aggression, war crimes, and interestingly, crimes against humanity.

Fitts: Crimes against humanity includes slave trafficking, right?

Benjamin: Yes, it includes murder, extermination, and enslavement. I think that it specifies enslavement in the Principles. Other inhuman acts are also included.

If you fast forward to the end of the 20th century, you have the establishment of the **International Criminal Court**, and crimes against humanity were more developed by that time because it was almost 60 years later. It was the **Rome Statute** which established the International Criminal Court. The elements of crimes are going to be much more numerous and would and do encompass trafficking and the like.

Fitts: When these were developed-when they came out of the trials-what was the process by which they were adopted by the United Nations?

Benjamin: I think the **International Law Commission**, which is, to some extent, the committee that looks at developments of international law and then seeks to restate them in a codified form, did that with respect to the verdicts and the judgements that were delivered. Of course, the main trial of the Nuremberg Trials had many judgments respecting the defendants. So, the International Law Commission took those judgement, and from those, distilled down the Principles, and then proposed that to the general assembly, and it was adopted by the general assembly.

Fitts: How does that convert into something that can be used to enforce?

Benjamin: It can't actually. The short answer is that it can certainly be used to shame. In terms of enforcement, you have to look to the International Criminal Court and the Rome Statute because, although the Rome Statute is called the 'Rome Statute', it is really a treaty that is the founding document for the international criminal court.

It took the crimes enunciated in the Principles – crime of aggression and war crimes and crimes against humanity – and added genocide. Those were the crimes that can be prosecuted before the ICC (**International Criminal Court**).

So if you are looking for enforcement, you would have to look at the jurisdictional provisions of the ICC. But the ICC's jurisdiction is very hard to bring to bear against a non-state party. The United States, for example, is not a state party; it's a non-state party. So, the prohibitions against crimes against humanity, for example considering the Rome Statute, how could you hold US officials accountable for a crime against humanity?

Probably the only jurisdictional avenue under the ICC would be if the **Security Council** were to sign off on a referral to the ICC prosecutor for that. But, of course, the United States would veto that in the Security Council. So for all intents and purposes, the non-party to the Treaty – China, Russia, and the United States – are immune before the ICC for anything that they do to their own citizens because they would veto Security Council referrals.

Britain and France are parties, so they might be a bit more vulnerable. But as a matter of power, they could certainly stymie the ICC from going anywhere. So only as a matter of practicality, the United States is immune.

Fitts: They certainly act like they are.

Benjamin: That doesn't mean they're not relevant as a political figure. As a political matter, they are very relevant for the substance of the Principles. But as to the extent of the **Nuremberg Code**, which is specific to crimes committed in a war of a medical nature, the Nuremberg Code as a political matter is deeply relevant to many of the issues. And we can get into that further.

Fitts: Let's talk about the Nuremberg Code. How did that develop?

Benjamin: Some of the inhuman acts, be they crimes against humanity (against their own civilian population) or war crimes (against people in the occupied territories), what the Nazis did was of a medical nature and medical experimentation, which they did on concentration camp prisoners are well-known, just like Dr. Mengele.

There was a consensus that the German medical profession had gone 'off the deep end' and had basically, – in the name of science – committed atrocities against human beings in the name of making medical progress. These would either be crimes against humanity if committed against Germans or war crimes.

There were medical advisors advising the prosecution, and they saw to it that a number of principles found in clinical research ethics, – what you can do when you are trying to do clinical research and using human subjects – came out of the trial.

I don't know if those principles were literally included in the judgements or not. Some sources say yes, but I haven't looked at it. Nonetheless, in the wake of the trials, these principles and this code of clinical research ethics or medical ethics concerning the do's and don'ts of human experiment subjects did emerge.

There really was not much controversy about them. We can talk about the **two main pillars of that ethical code**, which is informed consent, and that humans cannot be a means to a larger end. Those are the two pillars. There wasn't a lot of controversy, and some Western doctors said, "This is a code for Barbarians; this doesn't apply to Western non-German doctors. We don't do this sort of thing."

Fitts: It's very peculiar to see the arrogance at the time towards them.

Benjamin: Yes. Those two pillars – the one of informed consent and the prohibition against utilitarian treatment of humans in the name of scientific progress – you can't argue with.

Fitts: If you look at the relationship between the Nuremberg Code and the **Hippocratic Oath or the Helsinki Accord**, there is a huge amount of serious effort to establish the clear line that a doctor or a healthcare professional should never cross. What is interesting about both the Principles and the Code is what I remember when I was in high school. I went to a Quaker day school. We had these 'beaten' into us. It was unthinkable that a civilized country would ever cross any of these lines, and yet particularly in recent history, we are 'blowing by' these lines as though they don't exist and acting like it is perfectly fine.

If you had these things beaten into you in high school, I just find it absolutely amazing.

Benjamin: I tend to think of it as this, and I'm sure that many would agree: Over the last 70 years there has been an overall Nazification of the American culture medical ethics relating to human experimentation, which is just one aspect of it. Look at the surveillance state; look at national security and the national security state; look at the corporate control of government; look at the police state; look at the spying; it's everywhere. Look at the American empire; we were never supposed to be an empire.

Karl Rove famously said to reporters, “We are an empire now.” When did that happen? It’s the progressive Nazification represented most historically and specifically by **Operation Paperclip** when we imported all the Nazi scientists, and we co-opted the Nazi spy apparatus or the Gehlen spy apparatus (US intelligence agency), and, basically, the CIA in the early post-war period with a number of ex-Nazi spymasters.

Fitts: If you look at the experimentation that continued, it’s almost as if the **research continued uninterrupted.**

Benjamin: It did. You had MK Ultra (CIA mind control program), and then you had so much that came out in the 1970’s, and they uncovered a lesser scandal that took place in the 1950’s where we were injecting Guatemalan peasants with syphilis and other things to see what would happen.

It’s hideous, and I can’t help but think that some of that was instigated by these ex-Nazi scientists who obviously saw nothing wrong with using human guinea pigs in the name of ‘scientific medical progress’ to see what would happen.

That is the second major pillar, apart from informed consent. The Nuremberg Code basically says that one human being cannot be deemed the means to the end of scientific knowledge.

There was a very specific event or crime that happened during the war that was in many people’s minds at the end of it, and in the minds of those who wrote the Code, and that was during the war, the German air force Luftwaffe had a number of pilots who were being shot down over the North Sea. Of course, if they survived the crash, they would be in very cold water. The Luftwaffe wanted to know how long the pilots could survive in the temperatures in the frigid North Sea’s water before drowning so they would know if it was worth sending out a rescue crew to try to save them. If they were going to die within five minutes, there was no point to it.

So, one experiment of the Nazi doctors was they would take a concentration camp prisoner and plunge them into freezing water and see how long it was before they died. Was that done for scientific purposes? I guess if it was very narrowly construed, it was done for that purpose. You were advancing medical knowledge, but you were taking a human being and using them as the means in a very utilitarian sense for the greater good.

You are taking an *untermenschen* – a member of a subgroup of humanity – and saying, “You will die so that we will have medical knowledge that may be able to save more important lives.” That is a big ‘no-no’ now. And yet it is being done in China right now where they are taking Muslim critical prisoners and organ harvesting off of them to make sure that senior members of the Communist Party have the organs they need to live long lives.

It is arguably happening in the whole **vaccination scenario**. I know that the general line of the pro-vaccination establishment is that they don’t cause the many problems that seem evident from them, such as the epidemic in autism. The line is, “No, you are mistaken. There is no causal link between vaccines and the MMR and autism.” That is the establishment first line of defense.

But what I think may be going on – and I don’t have proof of this –is that many in the medical establishment don’t buy that argument. They know that there is a causal link. One reason I suspect that is because they have exempted pharmaceutical companies from lawsuits for product liability. If there is no causal link, then why say that they can’t be sued? Let them be sued, and then the suits will fail.

So, I suspect that is what is happening in the vaccine scenario. Many medical professionals know that there is a causal link, but they basically salve their consciences by saying, “It’s for the greater good. We do know that vaccines will do harm in 5% of cases, but the herd will benefit.”

That, in a very real sense, is a violation of that Principle that one human being shall not be sacrificed for the herd or for the greater good – or for the life of anyone else.

Fitts: My guess is that it’s not true either. It’s a great cop-out, but I doubt it is true.

I just finished watching *Vaxxed II*, and I don’t know if you have had a chance to see it. It is absolutely stunning. Several people make the case: The vaccine goes on the road with the first *Vaxxed*, and all these parents start showing up. They are overwhelmed by the flow of parents and healthcare practitioners.

They did *Vaxxed I* on the MMR, but this is all of the vaccines. The flow is just unbelievable, and the stories are even more unbelievable.

Finally, travel becomes overwhelming, and Polly Tommey says, “Let’s buy a bus.” So they buy a bus, and start filming all the people who come in to talk to them, which are thousands and thousands. It becomes absolutely so depressing – this overwhelming flow of disabled and injured and dead children – that Polly says, “Look, I can’t take this anymore. Let’s start talking to and filming non-vaccinated children.”

In fact, many of the non-vaccinated children turned out to be in families where they had vaccinated the first child. That child had been injured, so they didn’t vaccinate any others.

You see the comparison in the same family with the same DNA, and the same food in the same household, and it is astonishing. Then several practitioners say, “Look, they have to mandate vaccines because when you look at how much healthier the unvaccinated are, at some point no one is going to be vaccinated because no one wants to destroy their children’s chance for a healthy life.”

Benjamin: I think there are different justifications given for mandatory vaccines. I think there are three different ones that we need to keep separate. The one that the establishment has gauged via public is that there is no causal link. “Don’t be silly; you are a conspiracy theorist. Sit down, shut up, and take your vaccine.” That is where much of the battle is engaged – whether there is a causal link.

I suspect that for many well-meaning doctors out there, they know that there is a causal link, but they salve their consciences with this idea – which is impermissible under the Nuremberg Code – that some have to be damaged. It is inevitable, and some will be damaged, but the herd will benefit over all. I think that may be what their unacknowledged rationale is: It is impermissible, but I think that might be what it is.

Then there is a third rationale that is even deeper, which is not even a utilitarian one; it’s just, “We will harm these people. We have an agenda to degrade the population and to control them.” That is the ‘off-the-charts’ evil one that, of course, runs afoul of the Nuremberg Code.

\ The last two – the sacrificing the individual for the herd and the ‘we want to harm them and degrade them in order to control them – definitely violates Nuremberg. The first one, which is, “No, it’s good for you and it’s good for the herd. You are just a conspiracy theorist to think that it is harmful,” does not violate the Nuremberg Code, and that is where much of the battle is joined.

In that first rationale, they are saying, “It’s good for you.”

Fitts: But if you disagree and say, “I disagree, and I have religious and personal objections, and I don’t want it,” then the questions are: Who controls my body? Is it the state or me? On what grounds do they have the right to force me?

Benjamin: That is an excellent point. When can the state control our bodies – either regarding what we can put into our own bodies, such as smoking or similar, or whether the state wants to force itself into our own bodies against our will?

When there is a great amount of **consensus** about the medical issue, like in the case of smoking, the population is willing to permit the government to be extremely coercive. Just think about the last 20 years how smokers have been completely marginalized in society. They have to go ‘five miles away’ from the building where they are working in order to light up.

You don’t hear a ‘peep’ out of the population. You hear plenty of grumbling by the smokers, of course, but the general population is okay with that because there is widespread consensus that smoking does cause cancer and second-hand smoke is dangerous and so forth. So there is a consensus.

In the case of **no consensus** and in the case of **acute controversy**, then what will we allow the state to do?

Let’s consider the **abortion context**. We can hang the pro-vaccine people who tend to be leftist on their own petard. In the abortion context the issue is: Can the state intervene and prevent a woman from ‘doing what she wants to do with her own body’, i.e. end a pregnancy?

What Roe (Wade vs. Roe) basically stands for is there is great controversy about when life begins. The controversy is that it is greatest in the first trimester; some say that it is conception. Others say that it doesn’t begin until viability, or at least not until the second trimester, etc. So what Roe basically says is, “It is unconstitutional for a state to seek to interfere with a woman in the first trimester.”

So, the state cannot force a woman to carry a baby from the moment of conception, but it can force a woman to carry a baby after the second trimester. During the second trimester, things are a bit murky, but definitely at the onset of the third trimester, it is not unconstitutional for a state to say to a woman, “You must carry this baby to term.”

What I am saying is: Where there is controversy about whether a fetus is a human being in that first trimester, the Constitutional rule is in favor of **human autonomy**. We should apply that to the vaccines. There is controversy, so it should be resolved in favor of human autonomy.

In the abortion context, the woman in the first trimester – because there is controversy about when life begins – is able to exercise her human autonomy to the point of putting an end to this incipient life. So, I would think that there is a very good argument to be made that in the vaccine context, if there is reasonable room for disagreement about the safety of vaccines, the default should be in favor of personal autonomy, and someone should be able to exempt themselves from a legal requirement to vaccinate even if this won't result in immediate death to others (as is the case in the abortion context). It could at most, result in the greater likelihood of others contracting a disease.

Fitts: Let me be the **economics** person. When I look at these issues, what it says to me is that when the pharmaceutical companies want fetal tissue, it is fine for a woman to have an abortion, but when the pharmaceutical companies want to give people vaccines, then autonomy can be overruled.

In other words, one of the drivers here is that much of the evolution of abortion in this country is driven by the demand on the part of pharmaceutical companies for more and more fetal tissue.

Benjamin: Absolutely, but my point is they are not going to acknowledge that, so let's take advantage of that. As a matter of principle, if autonomy rules for women in the first trimester for the reasons that I have mentioned, why doesn't autonomy rule for people who don't want to take vaccinations?

In the abortion context, that is resulting in immediate death of the fetus, whereas in the vaccination context, the refusal to vaccinate is only resulting in a higher probability of a contraction of a disease that may be 'overcomeable'. So, let's use the Principles against them.

Fitts: Absolutely. So, let's return to the **Nuremberg Code**. Has there been any discussion that you are aware of, of people saying in the last 20 years, "These are serious violations of both the Nuremberg Principles and the Nuremberg Code? What is going on?"

Have the parties who are promoting the violation of these principles and codes been pointed out to them? Is there any pushback?

Benjamin: In academic circles?

Fitts: Anywhere that you know of.

Benjamin: I have not seen these Principles, or more particularly, the Code, formally invoked by anybody. I haven't canvassed the literature, but I do get the sense that these Principles – and in particular the Code – are being violated, and that is what is implicitly motivating plenty of resistance to what the establishment is doing.

For example, take the notion of '**informed consent**'. Informed consent means, not only should a person have knowledge that they are a subject of treatment or of experimentation, that something is being done to them, but they should know the risks and the benefits of that procedure.

Why are we so aggravated over this notion about what they may or may not be spraying in the atmosphere for whatever potentially beneficial reason – such as combatting climate change or whatever? Why are we so up in arms about that? Because that violates the right to informed consent. We don't cite the Nuremberg Code, but it is that principle that comes out of the Nuremberg Code. We don't even know that we are being sprayed.

That secrecy is a 'dagger right to the heart' of informed consent. We might be the subject of a huge scientific experiment, and we don't even know it.

When you ask, "Are these Principles, and is the Nuremberg Code in particular, being invoked? Formally, I'm not sure, but implicitly, very much so. Those two pillars of the code, informed consent and the prohibition against using human beings in a utilitarian-like fashion, animate the modern consciousness.

Fitts: We will have both the **Principles and the Code**, as well as some of the related **Hippocratic Oaths** and some of the others that relate to the Nuremberg Code, linked in the commentary. I really think that it serves every citizen of whatever country to read them and understand them, and to understand the behavior that contradicts these is not acceptable with the tradition of our culture. It is not acceptable for a doctor to violate the Nuremberg Code or the Hippocratic Oath.

I have had several experiences with this. My father trained us well to be suspicious of doctors. A few times I have been in a doctor's office and had them 'sail right across the line'. Unfortunately for them and fortunately for me, I am well-trained. When you call them out and you cite chapter and verse of what the rules are that apply, they really turn bright red and back down.

There is real power in knowing these and applying them to your day-to-day circumstances. They are important, and they can really count in a pinch. So, I think that it is worth learning them.

Benjamin: The legal remedies under them are practically nonexistent, but as a political manner and as a shaming mechanism – especially the idea that our doctors and our American medical personnel are running afoul of rules written to curb Nazi abuses-this is a hugely potent **shaming mechanism** and a political tool.

Just because we don't have a legal remedy directly under the Principles or the Code via the ICC, that is regrettable, I suppose, but that doesn't mean that they are not effective. They should be cited. It could be as simple as, "You're doing the same things that the Nazi doctors did. It's only dressed up a little."

"What? I am? What do you mean?" The CDC or FDA should be invoked because they unmask the Nazification of American medicine.

Fitts: It was extraordinary. I don't know if you saw any of the excerpts from the **Vaccine Summit** in Switzerland.

Benjamin: No, and that overwhelms me with emotion.

Fitts: Here is what was interesting: I followed quite closely the different pushback in multiple countries. You could see that the pushback has become so educated and knowledgeable from both parents and healthcare practitioners country by country by country. They had a presentation by a doctor from London whose job as an anthropologist was to determine why vaccines are getting so much pushback. What she came back with was that we don't have scientific proof of safety.

Then the head of the Nigeria program said, "Not only do we not have proof of safety for individual vaccines, but there is no scientific evidence to say that when you put all these different vaccines with all these different adjuvants into one little body that all of that cocktail together is safe."

Benjamin: This is the **ultimate crime against humanity**. This is criminal negligence, although I believe that it goes beyond that. I think that it goes to intentional genocide.

Fitts: Here is what was so interesting about it: Everyone, including the woman running the global program, looked stalled and scared and ashamed. I don't remember seeing one person who wasn't ashamed.

You could tell that we have now killed and injured enough people that even the people running the global program are stalled because they are ashamed. I think that some of the things that happened since then can be explained by the fact that the powers that be watching the videos would say, "Uh-oh. We really have a problem."

Now the people running the program are affected. It's not only the parents and the healthcare practitioners and the program staff country by country, but it is the global staff that is stalled and being forced to face the fact on public videotape that they have no safety studies. It is quite extraordinary.

Benjamin: These are scientists who love to lecture non-scientists about scientific methods, and fact over myth and correlation and causation. You get an earful every time you talk to one of these many who are not repentant and haven't seen the real evidence. All they do is lecture you, and it's just sickening.

Actually, the facts are against them, and the signs are against them, and what they have prescribed for decades is genuinely scientifically flawed. It's heartbreaking, and I think of these babies. I have a 20-year-old and an 18-year-old, and they survived their vaccinations, but of course, I am thinking ahead to my grandchildren and the lengths that I am going to go through to make sure they are protected.

Fitts: Make sure that you watch *Vaxxed II* and get your children to watch it. It is very, very impactful.

Benjamin: We have to **find a solution** here. To some extent, there is the opt-out solution with homeschooling and the like, but that is an imperfect solution because so many people can't afford to opt out. It's the same with trying to opt out of public fluoride treatments. Some people can afford to buy their own water or expensive water filters, but many can't. You have to go higher up the political food chain, if you will, and solve it there.

The opt-out is nice. I do think that opt-out in the case of vaccinations is going to become increasingly more difficult.

Fitts: Here is the thing. When I first saw the vaccine summit excerpts, I said, “How many scientists can you buy for \$21 trillion?” Apparently, a lot.

So, I would say that the principle that is now way out of balance is the principle between control, responsibility, and authority. So I am a parent, and I am responsible as a legal fiduciary and guardian for a child, but the state can order me to do all sorts of things that makes the child sick or makes the child behave in ways that are out of control, and I can’t discipline. The state makes me pay for school, and if I am in California, it is teaching my child how to be a ‘sex slave’.

Benjamin: It’s hideous!

Fitts: We are getting further and further into the state mandates that I pay, and then what I get is something that destroys my economics. So the state mandates a vaccine, and now I need \$5 million for a heavily autistic child so that I can take care of that child for the rest of their life, and I am financially responsible.

There is a real imbalance between who pays and who is legally responsible, and who has the authority and control to be able to perform under those obligations. This is a very serious economic issue.

I always tell this story, so I am sure that the *Solari Report* subscribers have heard it before. I had a wonderful grandparent who I spent a lot of time trying to provide information on vaccines for him to use with his child. He kept saying, “Look, it’s none of my business.”

I said, “Yes, it is. If your child becomes heavily injured from vaccines, it is going to cost you \$5 million because your child doesn’t have \$5 million, but you do, so it is your business. You are the banker, and you are going to pay; you have to assert banker’s rights here.”

The financial aspects of this, I can’t tell you how many families I have seen destroyed by ‘violations of healthcare freedoms’. That is the way I will describe it because it is far bigger than only vaccines.

I want also to ask you this: You have done a great deal of work on the **weaponization of human rights**. It is something that I have talked with you about. We don't have time to get into it deeply, but part of the challenge that I see is, if you look at the Nuremberg Principles or the Nuremberg Code, what I call 'the shriek-o-meter' is quite clever in using those to weaponize them to engineer regime change or affect political power in a situation.

The United States has been very clever at abusing some of these 'standards', haven't they?

Benjamin: Regime change operations in the name of freedom and democracy have ruined Libya, Syria, Ukraine, and they tried to undermine Russia. It is highly detrimental to the human condition – these human rights campaigns. Then human rights for the 'first world countries' are used to set up divide and conquer mentality. The human rights of women are not just to bring women up to a level playing field; it is to undermine maleness, to undermine the confidence and the capacity to serve, and the reputation of an entire biological sex (male) through notions of masculinity and the like.

With homosexuals, it's not enough for marriage equality. Now you have to take that into the whole transsexual idea; getting away from binary notions of sex, and genderless bathrooms and the complete thing. It is carried to such an extreme, and it is meant to break down more conservative values of more conservative cultures. I would call them sane values of sane cultures; it's not only conservative values of conservative cultures.

It's a two-pronged agenda. For the weaker countries, it is to overthrow regimes. For the stronger countries, it is to divide and conquer the populations of men against women and straight against gay and black against white and legal residents against non-legal residents with the whole immigration and open borders issue.

It is just a 'beast', and it has different prongs to it.

Fitts: One of the things that we have seen is the US getting quite clever over the last 20 years at applying and using economic sanctions. One of the principles that they have applied is the right to go through the sovereign government and apply sanctions to an individual regardless of whether they were acting under orders or in accordance with the domestic law. It is very much like what you were describing of the Nuremberg Principles.

Was there any connection with that principle flowing from the Nuremberg Principles into the **economic sanctions** practiced that you know of?

Benjamin: It is an interesting question on the face of it to sanction the individual and say that any permissive state legislation can't shield them if they were acting consistently with their nation's laws. That seemed to be very much in line with the Nuremberg supremacy of international law over national law.

On the other hand, the reason I think that the United States practicing this slapping sanctions is not okay because economic sanctions under the UN Charter has a very good argument to be made, and I make it to my students. They were meant to go through the Security Council. Under Chapter VII: The economic sanctions are a weapon to be decided upon by the Security Council, not unilaterally.

Economic force is not military force, but it is force, and there is a general prohibition in the UN Charter about the unilateral application of force. If you go to Chapter VII in the UN Charter, it is clear that economic sanctions are one tool that the founders of the Charter, the founders of the UN, and the writers of the Charter determined to be a tool for the Security Council, not for any individual state.

So, I have made an argument to my students that unilateral economic sanctions in the name of international law are a violation of the UN Charter. The United States can say, "We are just trying to vindicate an international law against contravening national law, and Nuremberg says that we can go after individuals to do that."

That is true except they are not taking into account the fact that the unilateral aspect of their decision-making arguably runs afoul of the UN Charter, and these decisions to go after individuals in the name of international law have to go through the Security Council.

So is Nuremberg relevant? Yes, but it's not dispositive.

Fitts: So, when you **teach** your **students** about the Principles and anything related to the Nuremberg trial, what is their response? What is their reaction? What do they find important?

Benjamin: I wish I could say that they stood up and said, "Wow!" Not only do they not have a great deal of **historical knowledge**, but they have very little interest in historical knowledge.

These are undergraduates because in New Zealand, it is studied as an undergraduate subject. So, they usually look at me as though, “Why do we have to go back and look at what was happening in the 1940’s and the 1950’s?” These are millennials, and that is their usual response.

Fitts: Really?

Benjamin: We don’t get into the Nuremberg Code. We go to the Nuremberg Principles for the reasons that I mentioned at the outset – how it was **revolutionary** in making individuals participants in the international legal community, and this was putting individuals in a negative sense as defendants before an international tribunal. Then I spell out the elements of the crimes, especially crimes against humanity.

We usually go through that, and they say, “Let’s get to more modern ‘stuff,’” because they are quite apathetical to historical commentary.

I think that if I were to pitch to the Nuremberg Code and say, “Listen, this was meant to tell the world the do’s and don’ts of how not to be a Nazi doctor, and that despite this, we see contemporary medical professionals violating these principles. Are they not acting in a Nazi sort of way?” I think they would probably sit up and pay a bit more attention. Certainly, older people will because we know what it means to be a Nazi, and we don’t want our medical personnel acting like Nazis.

The younger generation, and I think I have mentioned on a prior interview, don’t have much use for history; they just don’t.

I always give a warning. On the very first class I tell them in every course that I teach, “I take a very historical approach to the subjects that we are going to cover, meaning that in some cases we are going to go back to the 30 Years’ War, and we will start from there. Other times we will go back to the Roman Empire, and we will start from there.”

They all roll their eyes. I wish they were interested, but they’re not.

Fitts: It is quite remarkable. At one point, I went back. I had never known my family history, and when I was in the middle of the litigation, I drove around the country and downloaded the family history from all the wise elders just before they died. They died off over the next ten years.

One of the things that I discovered is that the ‘tapeworm’ has been harvesting my family for generations, but every generation had a ‘memory wipe’ so they didn’t know how to protect themselves against the next harvest.

They kept thinking that this was all a coincidence and bad luck, and you realized that if they had taken the time – and you will see that certain groups are very good at this – to pass the knowledge down so they don’t get harvested, they would be better off. Many families don’t know to conspire together to outwit the game.

One of the things that I learned is that you absolutely want to know your history. You **need to know your history** if you are going to play the game to win today; I learned that.

Benjamin: That is an excellent statement. You certainly need to know it at the macro-level. You need to know the history of nations and the history of empires and the history of economic crises and the history of wars.

You know the old saying, “If you don’t know your history, you are condemned to repeat it.”

You need to know it on the family level for the reasons that you just stated, and you need to know it on your individual personal level. If you don’t know where you’ve been, if you don’t take an accounting of what you’ve done for a host of metaphysical and psychological reasons, you might not be where you want to be.

Looking back and knowing what has transpired is invaluable on at least three different levels, and probably more.

Fitts: If you want to be able to be a player and create history; we are creating history; the future is unwritten. We get to participate and play in creating it. But you **can’t create history forward** if you don’t understand the threads that brought you to where you are.

If you want to get in the game and be a player, you have to know; you have to have that mastery.

The question really is: Do you want history to just be something that happens to you, or do you want to be part of creating it?

Benjamin: In my view, there can be no wisdom which comes from a deep perspective without a knowledge of what has transpired at any of the levels that I mentioned. There can be no wisdom.

Fitts: I agree.

Benjamin: There can be strong preferences, and there can be a certain practical wisdom, like, “I have an immediate goal. How do I achieve it?” But without the perspective that comes from historical knowledge, there is no wisdom. And what is a society without wisdom? What do we have then? I don’t think that we have much.

Fitts: It’s really simple: You have a mess, and that is what we have; we have a mess.

I once had a pastor who would scream every Sunday, “God does not bless a mess.”

Benjamin: No, but he certainly allows them to happen.

Fitts: Absolutely.

Benjamin: He allows free will, and he is going to let us learn the hard way.

In a prior interview, you asked what could be done about the **deep state and the secrecy**, and I said that I thought it would be the older generation coming to the rescue of the young. Usually, it’s the young that lead the revolution, but I think that the revolution against globalization and modern-day fascism is going to be led by the oldsters with the historical memory.

The young ones, although we might be able to enlist them as foot soldiers, don’t have a clue. It’s not their fault, ‘God bless them’. We haven’t given them the tools, and they don’t have a clue.

Fitts: Right, but I also think that it is our **responsibility**. In other words, we are supposed to leave a better world for the next generation than the world that we found. That hasn’t happened, and I think that we have a responsibility.

Benjamin: We have ‘dropped the ball’ so hard that it isn’t even ‘funny’. We have really ‘screwed’ it up. I scratch my head about how it happened. On a personal note, my parents were in their early 30’s when Kennedy was assassinated. They were in their mid-30’s when Vietnam happened, and then Watergate.

I come from a family of medical doctors, so I grew up trusting doctors – unlike you. They are very, very smart people. My dad went to Yale Medical School, which is a big state medical school. These are very, very smart people, and yet they couldn't see it. They couldn't see what I think is relatively clear concerning all the deep state machinations of the 1960's and 1970's and 1980's. They haven't been able to see it, and they are still alive. They are nearly 90, and they still don't see it.

They were very smart people. So, it has left me scratching my head. We have dropped the ball, but 'boy', have we had a number done on us.

If you could fool my parents, you could fool anybody. Both my parents have deep historical knowledge.

We have had a real number done on us, and it's called **Nazism**; it's Nazi propaganda techniques.

I know Joseph Farrell has done a lot of work on the Nazi International, and he could speak to this – the Nazification of the United States over the last 70 years.

Fitts: I don't know if you have had a chance to watch the *Movie of the Year* last year, which was Truthstream Video's *The Minds of Men*. I cannot recommend it highly enough because it goes back and looks at the technology that came to the US at the end of the war – which meant infinite financing of the black budget and the intelligence agencies. You had an incredible investment in research to develop the **mind control**.

Secret societies have had mind control for centuries, but if you combine the experimentation that the Germans did, and then you add to that the infinite financing and research capacity that the United States and the intelligence agencies had after the war, we have taken mind control to an unbelievable level. One of the great things about *The Minds of Men* is that the Truthstream personnel dug in, got the patents, traced the government money pouring in, and nailed the story.

They had a psychiatrist named Peter Breggin, who did great research and fought it for decades. I am hoping they will do an update because they ended it in the 1970's, and they have to bring it up again.

If you look at the impact of mind control on the society, it is quite extraordinary and unbelievable.

Amy Benjamin, I think that you are just a treasure. We have had you talk about secrecy, and we have had you on international treaties, which was absolutely fascinating. I thought it was terrible that Congress abrogated the appropriations in the budget and war powers. Then when you contacted me and explained, “No, they have abrogated international treaties,” I was thinking, “Oh, God! It can’t be that bad!”

That was absolutely fascinating. So, tell us what you are going to be doing next year.

Benjamin: I have another journal article ready and waiting, but I’m not going to tell you what it’s about. It’s secret, but I will tantalize you with this: I will not be submitting it for publication until after (if and when) certain arrests are made, and then I will take it out of storage and submit it. It is going to be a ‘doozy’, and is essentially written. I wanted to have it ready if and when a certain group of arrests happen. Then I will submit it, but it is already written.

Then next year, I have an extended sabbatical to do research, and I am probably going to turn my attention to this whole open border’s phenomenon. I want to write something that will wipe the smug, virtuous, and complacent smile off the faces of those who advocate for open borders. I vehemently oppose open borders, and I feel it is time I write something that really goes after that agenda. I will probably use my research study leave, which is in the first part of 2021, to write that ‘smile-wiping’ piece.

Fitts: Anything that we can do to help I would love to, so please keep us posted. We want to publish these as soon as they are available and help you in any way we can.

I would encourage everyone to look at the links to educate yourself about the **Principles and the Code.**

Benjamin: And use them politically; use them as an argument and as a definite shaming mechanism. They are very useful politically.

Fitts: Absolutely, and Amy, it is always a pleasure. Thank you again for making the time on such short notice to join us on *The Solari Report*.

We had many requests for this, and I know it is going to be deeply appreciated.

Benjamin: Thank you for letting me have another conversation with you, Catherine.

Fitts: Have a wonderful day! Goodbye.

MODIFICATION

Transcripts are not always verbatim. Modifications are sometimes made to improve clarity, usefulness and readability, while staying true to the original intent.

DISCLAIMER

Nothing on The Solari Report should be taken as individual investment advice. Anyone seeking investment advice for his or her personal financial situation is advised to seek out a qualified advisor or advisors and provide as much information as possible to the advisor in order that such advisor can take into account all relevant circumstances, objectives, and risks before rendering an opinion as to the appropriate investment strategy.