




Written by [Steve Byas](#) on July 6, 2022

## U.K. Medical Experts Oppose Covid Vaccines for the Very Young

In an [open letter](#) to the government's health authorities published this week, scores of medical professionals in academia and the practice of medicine — both current and retired — pleaded with health authorities in the United Kingdom to reconsider the move to grant emergency use authorization for the Pfizer and Moderna Covid vaccines for preschool children.

"We would urge you to consider very carefully the move to vaccinate ever younger children against SARS-CoV-2 [commonly referred to as Covid-19] despite the gradual but significant reducing virulence of successive variants, the increasing evidence of rapidly waning vaccine efficacy, the increasing concerns over long-term vaccine harms, and the knowledge that the vast majority of this young age group have already been exposed to SARS-CoV-2 repeatedly and have demonstrably effective immunity," the letter begins. "Thus, the balance of benefit and risk which supported the rollout of mRNA vaccines to the elderly and vulnerable in 2021 is totally inappropriate for small children in 2022."



FatCamera/iStock/Getty Images Plus

This letter should give pause to the medical community in the United States, which mostly supports vaccinating the very young with the Pfizer and Moderna vaccines. Of course, we do not really know what percentage of health professionals actually do support this, as many keep silent, fearing they could be punished for thinking otherwise, perhaps even losing their licenses.

"We also strongly challenge the addition of COVID-19 vaccination into the routine child immunisation programme despite no demonstrated clinical need [and the] known and unknown risks."

The letter went on to cite Pfizer's own documentation presented to the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) in the United States that included "huge gaps" in the provided evidence for the drug's approval. For example, the protocol was changed mid-trial, as the original two-dose schedule exhibited poor "immunogenicity," with efficacy far below the required standard. This led to a third dose being added.

In addition, the letter noted that in trials "there was no statistically significant difference between the placebo and vaccinated groups in either the 6-23-month age group or the 2-4-year-olds, even after the third dose. Astonishingly the results were based on just three participants in the younger age group ...



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on July 6, 2022

---

and just seven” in the older group.

In fact, there were more infected children (225) in the group that *really was vaccinated*, as opposed to the 150 who were “vaccinated” with a placebo!

The letter continued, “It is incomprehensible that the FDA considered that this represents sufficient evidence on which to base a decision to vaccinate healthy children,” adding that the director of the Danish Health and Medicines Authority now considers that the decision to vaccinate children “was a mistake.”

The letter summarized the “overwhelming arguments” against this vaccination, including extremely low risk from Covid-19 to young children; poor vaccine efficacy; potential harms of Covid-19 vaccines for children; and the lack of informed consent.

The letter explained that in England, only six children under 18 years of age with no comorbidities have died from Covid. “There were no deaths aged 1-4 years.” Now, with the arrival of the omicron variant, “infections have been generally much milder” for all age groups. And, by June of this year, it was estimated that nearly 90 percent of those four years of age and younger have already had the SARS-CoV-2 infection.

With such low risk, the letter cautions, it is unwise to ignore the possible harm of the vaccines on children, including the potential of myocarditis (heart inflammation) in adolescents and young adults, especially in males after the second dose. There are also concerns about potential negative effects on the immune system. “The possibility of developing an impaired immune function would be disastrous for children, who have the most complete innate immunity.”

There is even concern, the letter added, about damages to the reproductive systems, including a reduction in sperm count.

Most ominously, “Even for adults, concerns are rising that serious adverse events are in excess of hospitalisations from COVID-19.”

Despite all of these concerns, parents are generally not warned about these findings. “The complete omission of information explaining to the public the different and novel technology used in COVID-19 vaccines compared to standard vaccines, and the failure to inform of the lack of any long-term safety data, borders on misinformation.”

Finally, the letter bemoaned that the push of these vaccines of questionable efficacy and potential serious side effects undermines public support for vaccines against serious diseases such as polio and measles.

With so much demonstrable scientific data arguing against extensive use of the vaccines in the general population — never mind for the very young — one wonders why governmental authorities in both the United States and other nations, such as the United Kingdom, have been so insistent on its widespread use.

While that question is speculative, it is not speculation that government, at any level and in any country, should not have this much control over the use of vaccines, especially those of debatable efficacy and safety. In the United Kingdom, the healthcare industry is socialist, with the National Health Service. While the healthcare industry in the United States is not yet socialized to the degree it is in England, the federal government has ventured far beyond the constitutional restraints imposed upon it.

We cannot imagine that James Madison could have envisioned that federal agencies, such as the



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on July 6, 2022

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), would be able to impose medical decisions on physicians, nurses, and pharmacists in the country.

In short, decisions regarding a person's health care should be made by the individual, in consultation with a physician. For example, physicians have always been able to prescribe already-approved medications off-label — meaning for uses other than their principal use. It is called the practice of medicine. But, from the very beginning, even before the vaccines were available, treatment for Covid-19 has been discouraged.

Rather than medical decisions being dictated by bureaucrats and politicians, they should be left to doctors and their patients. That is the constitutional and practical position. In other words, freedom works better in healthcare — as it does in all areas of human activity.





## Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

### What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.