

Australia admits COVID vaccine risks outweigh benefits?



RAPHAEL LATASTER (BPHARM, PHD)

JUN 09, 2025



86



7



23

Share



With the US authorities announcing that healthy American children will no longer be recommended to receive COVID-19 vaccines, due to a lack of evidence ([source](#)), the Australian government does likewise, though with far more damning language: “Healthy infants, children and adolescents aged <18 years are not recommended to receive COVID-19 vaccine... COVID-19 vaccine is not recommended for healthy infants, children or adolescents who do not have medical conditions that increase their risk of severe illness. This is because the risk of severe illness was extremely low in this cohort over the course of the pandemic, and benefits of vaccination are not considered to outweigh the potential harms.” [Source](#).

Not being one to hype things up, this seems huge to me. Not only is the Australian government no longer recommending the vaccines to young and healthy children, they are just about admitting that for this group the risks outweigh the benefits. Technically the wording stops just short of that, but it is literally a single adverse event (very likely in the near future due to the known and unknown unknowns) that could lead to outright declaring that the risks of the COVID-19 vaccines do indeed outweigh the benefits. Somehow, this highly significant revelation didn't receive the same sort

of attention with the mainstream media as when the Australian TGA declared that COVID-19 vaccine “benefits outweigh the risks”, even as evidence against the vaccines continued to mount. [Source](#).

Okay then.

Extra: You may recall that I have argued via a *BMJ* journal that [the myocarditis risk alone appears to exceed the COVID-19 vaccines’ benefits, at least for the young and healthy](#). A [sentiment I reiterated](#) in my recent peer-reviewed article debunking the infamous Watson et al study (which claimed that the jabs saved tens of millions in just one year); an article that was [acknowledged by the US FDA](#) and [submitted into the official record by the US Senate](#). Another article specifically on the notion that the risks of the jabs outweigh the benefits, at least for the young and healthy, is forthcoming. And the notion should be obvious. Young healthy people statistically do not suffer from severe COVID. So even a very effective vaccine would yield effectively no benefits. Thus, even a very small risk would clearly outweigh the benefits. Throw in the evidence of [negative effectiveness](#) and... yeah. More legal actions are no doubt on the way.

Update: Following the references used by the Australian government I found that they were a couple of years old (not easy to find, but check [here](#)). So they knew, or should have known, about this for years, yet didn’t make appropriate recommendations. Legal actions, indeed.

Okay Then News (and the associated forum at CovidSkeptics.com) is my personal collection of evidences against mainstream narratives, made freely available to the public. Subscribe for free email updates, [here](#).

If you wish to donate or support me, as I fight for our rights, including doing the necessary

research, and attempt to pick up the pieces after they [took everything from me](#) (and [continue to](#)), you can sign up for a voluntary paid subscription, here.



86 Likes · 23 Restacks

Discussion about this post

Comments Restacks



Write a comment...



Ralph Homo Comfortus Jun 9

♥ Liked by Raphael Lataster (BPharm, PhD)

Thank you Raphael!

You are the tip of the spear!

Yes, "More legal actions are no doubt on the way." Such as false advertising of a pharmaceutical, perhaps?

Seems that the TGA did not approve the genetic vaccines even for preventing transmission, and yet many in government and elsewhere have been heard falsely promoting them for protecting Grannie, and for building 'vaccine-induced' herd immunity.

From what I understand, the Australian Therapeutic Goods Act 1989 is contravened if a person advertises a 'biological' (such as a genetic covid injection) that is 'included in the Register' (I believe these injections were included), for an indication (such as preventing transmission) that is not accepted

...

<https://www.legislation.gov.au/C2004A03952/latest/text>

Section 32BL 'Civil penalty for advertising biological for an indication'

A person contravenes this section if:

(a) the person, by any means, advertises a biological for an indication; and

(b) the biological is included in the Register; and

♡ LIKE (6) 💬 REPLY

📤 SHARE



Alison Jun 9



♡ Liked by Raphael Lataster (BPharm, PhD)

I shakes me head.....

♡ LIKE (4) 💬 REPLY

📤 SHARE

5 more comments...