1. In the early decades after World War II, debates over the governance of human experimentation were an important placeholder for a longstanding epistemic conflict over the legitimacy of modern medical science.

2. Scholars who puzzle over the absence of ethical concern over human subjects research in these decades are looking in the wrong place.

3. Dutch research ethics committees were originally designed to enforce a specific epistemic perspective upon Dutch clinical research and practice.

4. The Dutch practice of ethics by committee has been made to function as a mechanism of exclusion for more radical perspectives on the value and validity of human subjects research.

5. That a patients’ rights discourse came to dominate conversations over medical ethics after the 1960s is not as self-evident as it is often made out to be.

6. In the late twentieth century, the Dutch government strategically used the newly established ethics discipline to depoliticize discussions over the ethical permissibility of human subjects research.

7. A gap in historical literature is not a problem in and of itself.

8. Careful historical research serves as an important check on public policy to ensure that historical events are not misunderstood or misused by political actors to push through their desired policy measures.

9. It is an exciting development that historians of science are starting to pay more attention to the ways in which institutions such as scientific journals, funding bodies, and ethics committees have impacted scientific development in the nineteenth and twentieth century.

10. Careful historical scrutiny of such institutions is needed to understand how they have become crucial apparatus for deciding what and who counts as authoritative in the sciences today.

11. The *El País* interview in which Zygmunt Bauman explains why “social media are a trap” should be mandatory literature in Dutch secondary schools.