An Open Letter to Doctors, Nurses, and Medical Leaders

On Professional Responsibility, Voluntary Informed Consent, and Moral Failure During the COVID-19 Vaccination Rollout

During the COVID-19 vaccination campaign, millions of people were subjected to intense pressure to comply with a medical intervention. They were threatened with loss of employment, exclusion from public life, social isolation, financial harm, and stigma. For many, refusal was not a viable option.

Vaccinators – doctors, nurses, pharmacists – nevertheless collaborated:

They picked up the needle.
They pierced the skin.
They administered injections to people who were under duress to comply.

Whatever the surrounding policies, messaging, or mandates, this was a personal act performed by an individual practitioner upon another person's body.

Had doctors, nurses and other vaccinators refused to participate in coercion, the vaccination mandates would have collapsed. Mandates could not have been sustained without their cooperation.

This raises an unavoidable question for the profession: **what has gone wrong in medical culture that so many practitioners were willing to perform an invasive medical act on people under duress, rather than refuse to collaborate?**

There is no denial that the medical profession was subjected to extraordinary pressure. Professional regulators enforced conformity, employers threatened livelihoods, leadership figures promoted obedience, and dissent was discouraged, marginalised, or punished.

Pressure explains behaviour. It does not erase responsibility – pressure does not convert an unethical act into an ethical one.

Medicine has always recognised that consent obtained under duress is not consent. This is not a novel principle. It is foundational. A practitioner's ethical obligation does not disappear because a government issues a directive, an employer issues an instruction, or a regulator signals alignment with policy. If it did, ethics would be meaningless.

Informed consent was not merely weakened – it was destroyed.

Voluntary informed consent requires freedom from pressure, coercion, or manipulation; the ability to decline without penalty; and an individualised, patient-specific discussion of risks and benefits. **Wherever mandates, penalties, or coercive pressures were applied during the COVID-19 vaccination rollout, these conditions could not exist.**

Instead, the profession participated – actively or passively – in an environment where refusal was punished, questioning was stigmatised, uncertainty suppressed, and compliance rewarded. In many cases, practitioners were not even attempting to obtain genuine consent. They were administering injections in a hostile climate where consent was structurally impossible.

Proceeding under those conditions was a moral failure, not an administrative oversight.

Leadership failed – catastrophically.

This failure did not originate at the coalface alone. Senior figures within the profession – including those in leadership, advisory, academic, and regulatory roles – did not act to protect ethical standards.

Many did the opposite. They publicly promoted coercive messaging, threatened exclusion and punishment, discouraged discussion of uncertainty, and framed compliance as professional virtue.

Rather than warning practitioners to uphold voluntary informed consent, they modelled obedience and intimidation. This leadership failure conditioned the profession beneath them. But conditioning does not absolve those who complied.

Subsequent regulatory actions have demonstrated a disturbing inversion of ethical risk within the medical system.

Doctors who questioned, departed from, or publicly challenged official COVID-19 vaccination policy have faced investigation, sanction, or professional restriction. By contrast, those who aggressively promoted, enforced, or amplified coercive vaccination narratives – even where such conduct undermined voluntary informed consent – have not faced comparable scrutiny.

This regulatory asymmetry sends a clear and chilling message to the profession: ethical dissent is dangerous; policy enforcement is protected.

Such a system does not safeguard patients. It conditions compliance. It places the public at serious risk by discouraging independent clinical judgement and suppressing the ethical obligations meant to protect people from harm. At the same time, it leaves frontline practitioners exposed – positioned to absorb blame if accountability ever arrives – while policy-level actors, institutional leaders, and regulators retain distance and deniability.

This is not a failure of a few individuals. It is a structural failure of regulation, leadership, and ethical governance.

Ultimately, this comes down to a simple truth: no guideline, mandate, employer, regulator, or professional body can insert a needle into another person's body. Only an individual practitioner can do that.

And the practitioner has a personal ethical obligation to ensure consent is voluntary.

Many did not meet that responsibility. Some refused. Some spoke out. Most complied.

History is not kind to professions that confuse obedience – 'following orders' – with ethics.

The medical profession must acknowledge that voluntary informed consent was systematically destroyed; accept that many practitioners acted unethically under pressure; confront the failure of leadership and regulation; resist efforts to shift all responsibility onto frontline vaccinators while absolving policy architects; and reassert that ethics do not disappear in emergencies.

Without confronting this failure, the profession stands exposed as having substituted ethical judgement for policy obedience.

Each practitioner must now ask themselves: **when the pressure was greatest, did I protect my patient – or my position?**

History will judge what was done. But responsibility for the act itself cannot be shifted to regulators, employers, or institutions.

It belongs to the person who held the syringe.

Elizabeth Hart
Independent researcher on medical ethics and vaccination policy
Vaccinationispolitical.net
20 December 2025