

■ Log in

THE DAILY SCEPTIC

QUESTION EVERTIMING. STAT SAILE. EIVE TREE

Q

ARTICLES

ABOUT

ARCHIVE ~

PODCASTS

NEWSLETTER

PREMIUM

DONATE

LOG IN

Covid Vaccine Science Catching Up With 'Conspiracy Theorists'

BY DR RAPHAEL LATASTER 7 OCTOBER 2024 3:31 PM













Two new peer-reviewed medical journal articles indicate that the science is starting to catch up with the 'conspiracy theorists' and 'anti-vaxxers' such as myself, also known as people who rationally asked questions of novel products that were rushed out the door to help stem a pandemic virus that was far less deadly than all other causes, including cardiovascular disease, cancer and even tobacco use (and note that COVID-19 deaths tend to be inflated).

Publishing in the *Polish Annals of Medicine*, Michael Thoene conducts a limited literature review on the reporting of COVID-19 vaccine severe adverse events in scientific journals, finding:

From 2020 to 2024, the literature has gone from claiming there are absolutely no SAEs [serious adverse events] from mRNA based vaccines (2020-2021) to an acknowledgment of a significant number of various SAEs (2023-2024); including but not limited to neurological complications, myocarditis, pericarditis and thrombosis. ... The early scientific literature was biased so as not to report SAEs due to social and political concerns and overwhelming corporate greed. Only in the last year have scientists been able to publish articles that acknowledge a high number of SAEs linked to mRNA based vaccines. This should act as a warning that science should be completely objective when evaluating health risks, but can often be influenced by social and economic considerations.

Proving once again that Eastern Europeans are based (the Hungarians stand up to the EU on immigration, and the Bulgarians published my little study on the correlation between COVID-19 vaccination and European excess mortality), the Polish journal kindly accepted my brief response, entitled 'Scientific views around mRNA based covid vaccines are changing, but to what end?' In it, I praise the journal and author for this important paper, and note that this is only the tip of the iceberg. There is so much more in the published science that most people are unaware of, such as:

- Thacker, on "issues such as data falsification and patient unblinding concerning Pfizer's vaccine trial".
- Fraiman et al., on the "excess risk of serious adverse events of special interest with the mRNA vaccines".
- Benn et al., on there being "no statistically significant decrease in COVID-19 deaths in the mRNA vaccine clinical trials, while there was an increase (also not statistically significant) in total deaths".
- The JECP4 articles by Peter Doshi's team and myself on "counting window issues (such as counting window delays, counting window biases, and counting window misclassifications), likely leading to exaggerated effectiveness and safety estimates" in the clinical trials and major observational studies, with one of the major problems being "when COVID-19 infections are being overlooked in the 'partially vaccinated,' and in some cases were even ascribed to unvaccinated groups". Note that Mead et al. discussed some similar issues and yet was astonishingly retracted.
- Faksova *et al.*, which Thoene barely mentioned, and which demonstrated that the vaccines are associated with several concerning adverse effects, despite employing a counting window endpoint of only 42 days following vaccination.
- Raethke et al., "which noted a rate of serious adverse drug reactions of approximately one per 400 people", which I note compares "very unfavourably with U.K. Government estimates on the numbers needed to vaccinate in young and healthy people to prevent a severe COVID-19 hospitalisation being in the hundreds of thousands".
- Mostert et al., on the "mysterious problem of excess mortality post-pandemic, which they hint could be related to the COVID-19 vaccines", and my aforementioned Bulgarian Medicine article demonstrating that there are indeed correlations between COVID-19 vaccination and European excess deaths.

- Of course, my 'favourite' topic, COVID-19 vaccine negative effectiveness, where "the vaccines increase the chance of COVID-19 infection, and even COVID-19 death, a 'benefit' which is of course a poor trade-off for the risk of (other) adverse effects". This "led to some discussion in major medical journals such as the *BMJ* [and also *AJGP*], with the most common excuse for this phenomenon being that there must be some confounding variable at play", an "excuse that somehow does not apply before vaccine effectiveness crosses the x-axis [goes negative], indicating a clear double standard (one of many) in how the vaccines are evaluated".
- Fürst *et al.* (those Eastern Europeans again!), on evidence "that a healthy vaccinee bias is at play", which "would further imply that the effectiveness of the COVID-19 vaccines is being exaggerated, beyond the effects of counting window issues and other data manipulations, even when declining to zero and beyond".
- The "substantive critiques appearing in influential medical journals of major observational studies purporting the benefits of the vaccines (with more on the way)". These include my BMJ rapid response on the WHO's jab study and the little academic debate between myself and a team from Johns Hopkins. Much more coming soon...

Still wondering how I managed to get this published, I end with a stark warning for those who partook in the deadly con:

There is clearly much research on the COVID-19 vaccines, published in the biggest medical journals, which greatly contradicts the mainstream and early (as well as ongoing) claims concerning their safety and effectiveness, and even necessity, for all. There is much more not mentioned in this brief article, and there is no doubt more to come. It seems obvious to me that at least for the young and healthy, COVID-19 vaccines are most certainly not worth the risk, even when considering just a single adverse effect (myocarditis), no matter how rare it is purported to be – serious COVID-19 in the young and healthy is rarer still, and the same is even more true when considering the little to no benefits offered by what increasingly appears to be a feckless vaccine.

There have already been many legal actions, including victories (as with myself), initiated on behalf of the (somehow still alive) unvaccinated who were persecuted over a pharmaceutical product that they clearly did not need, and the vaccinated who have died and otherwise been injured as a result of vaccination. I anticipate that many more lawsuits are on the horizon, involving – amongst others – the vaccine manufacturers; the Government officials that approved, encouraged and even mandated the vaccines; and the many doctors and scientists who effectively betrayed their professions and public trust in encouraging the use of these flawed products based on very limited and even manipulated scientific evidence.

Of course, while the science is starting to catch up, and the lawsuits are continuing apace, we're still being told by our governments and mainstream media to roll up our sleeves, even those who are as young as six months.

Dr. Raphael Lataster is an Associate Lecturer at the University of Sydney, specialised in misinformation, and a former pharmacist. This article was first published in his Substack newsletter, Okay Then News. Read more on his research and legal actions, including his recent win against the healthcare vaccine mandate in New South Wales.

Tags: Conspiracy Theories COVID-19 The Science Vaccine

DONATE

We depend on your donations to keep this site going. Please give what you can.

DONATE TODAY

COMMENT ON THIS ARTICLE

You'll need to set up an account to comment if you don't already have one. We ask for a minimum donation of £5 if you'd like to make a comment or post in our Forums.

SIGN UP

Previous Post Next Post

Reform U.K. Plans Private Prosecution of Men in Manchester Airport Fight with Police

Why Won't Keir Starmer Name Hamas as Responsible for the October 7th Massacre?

☑ Subscribe ▼ Login

Please log in to comment

To join in with the discussion please make a donation to The Daily Sceptic.

Profanity and abuse will be removed and may lead to a permanent ban.