



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on January 6, 2021

Is “The Vaccine Won’t Work Against NEW COVID” the Next Lockdown Justification?

Two stories currently big in the news may be intimately related, yet the connection is avoided like the plague. The first concerns the COVID-19 vaccine’s rollout and the message that, ultimately, we all have an obligation to take the needle.

The second is how there’s a new “super-contagious” coronavirus variant that was first detected in Britain but now is also present in the United States. The connection?

Since vaccines often are ineffective against virus strains *they weren’t derived from*, will we hear in a few months, “Sorry, but the vaccine doesn’t work against the China virus variant, so the lockdowns must continue”?



Asurobson/iStock/Getty Images Plus

Note that this would just be the Branch Covidians’ fourth or fifth lockdown-justifying goalpost move.

Making this more interesting is how research now shows that the new variant, called B117, might have been in the United States *since early October*, [reported](#) the *Daily Mail* Saturday.

In other words, it may not be that new at all. We’ve heard this before, too: The original SARS-CoV-2 strain was also thought a new import, last January, until [research indicated](#) that it also had likely hit our shores the previous year.

This matters because, do note, there was no panic and lockdown craze until we realized The Virus™, like the truth on the *X-Files*, “is out there.”

So we have to wonder, was Stanford University epidemiologist John Ioannidis correct when [he claimed last March](#) that if we didn’t know a new virus existed, we might just “have casually noted that flu this season seems to be a bit worse than average”?

Speaking of flu, the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) itself told us that the 2017-18 influenza vaccine was only 40-percent effective. Radio giant Michael Savage, also a trained epidemiologist, explained why on his show some years ago.

“The virus strain a flu vaccine is derived from,” he said (I’m paraphrasing), “will not likely be the one prevalent during flu season.” This was one reason Savage recommended *against* taking flu shots. (Note: I’m neither endorsing nor contradicting this position.)

But what about the China virus? Will the same problem manifest itself?

CNN Health reported December 23 that “genetics experts worry coronavirus vaccines might not work quite as well against UK variant.” On the other hand, the *New York Post* [informed](#) the next day that “Moderna [is] confident [the] COVID-19 vaccine will work against new strain.” Of course, what else



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on January 6, 2021

might we expect Moderna to say?

Whatever the truth, one thing is certain: Unless the vaccine works as billed, we can expect to hear yet another lockdown justification. Never mind how [studies show](#) that lockdowns not only don't save lives, but [actually cost lives](#). For the "best predictor of future behavior is past behavior," the "law" goes, and what we've seen previously is that the criteria for returning to post-pandemic normalcy have consistently changed as soon as they were met. Consider:

- First we were told we needed to "lock down" for two weeks to "flatten the curve" and ensure the healthcare system wasn't overloaded. Yet the system never was overwhelmed, and the models showing it could be — even those factoring in mitigation efforts — were revealed as gravely flawed. (Interestingly, a good point is made in the Monday *Glazov Gang* video below this list: that hospitals are actually strained *every two or three years* during bad flu seasons.)
- Enter Lockdown Justification B, put forth as if A had never existed. To wit: A state should experience a "decline in cases over a 14-day period" before reopening, as NBC News related it April 28. This didn't last long.
- We then moved on to Justification C, that "we will be facing rolling waves of restrictions and shutdowns until we have a vaccine," as *Scientific American* put it July 18.

Also attempted was the Mother of All Justifications: We can never return to normalcy. As World Health Organization Director-General Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus proclaimed this summer, "We will not, we cannot go back to the way things were," CNBC reported August 21. "Throughout history, outbreaks and pandemics have changed economies and societies," the outlet writes, summarizing his message.

Flip-flop Fauci and other health authorities seem to have backed off from this recently; we're hearing that maybe, fellow peasants, we can return to normal late this year. But some questions:

What is the probability that the China virus vaccine will be highly effective even in the face of one (and possibly more) new strain?

How many people will take the shot, anyway?

And if the vaccine's efficaciousness is limited, what's the chance that this will be used to justify continued lockdowns?

Anyone who can't answer the last question hasn't been paying attention.



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.