

In the Race for Immunity, Sweden Leads the Pack

By [Mike Whitney](#)

Global Research, May 15, 2020

Region: [Europe](#)

Theme: [Intelligence](#), [Science and Medicine](#)

In a pandemic, there is no substitute for immunity, because immunity provides the best protection against reinfection. That's why Sweden set its sights on immunity from the very beginning. They crafted a policy that was designed to protect the old and vulnerable, prevent the public health system from being overwhelmed, and, most important, allow younger, low-risk people to interact freely so they'd contract the virus and develop the antibodies they'd need to fight future infections. That was the plan and it worked like a charm. Now Sweden is just weeks away from achieving herd immunity (which means that future outbreaks will not be nearly as severe) while the lockdown nations- that are just now easing restrictions- face an excruciating uphill slog that may or may not succeed. Bottom line: Sweden analyzed the problem, figured out what to do, and did it. That's why they are closing in on the finish line while most of the lockdown states are still stuck at Square 1.

As of this writing, none of the other nations have identified immunity as their primary objective which is why their orientation has been wrong from the get-go. You cannot achieve a goal that you have not identified. The current US strategy focuses on stringent containment procedures (shelter-in-place, self-isolation) most of which have little historical or scientific basis. The truth is, the Trump administration responded precipitously when the number of Covid-positive cases began to increase exponentially in the US. That paved the way for a lockdown policy that's more the result of groupthink and flawed computer models than data-based analysis and nimble strategic planning. And the results speak for themselves. The 8-week lockdown is probably the biggest policy disaster in US history. Millions of jobs have been lost, thousands of small and mid-sized businesses will now face bankruptcy, and the future prospects for an entire generation of young people have been obliterated. The administration could have detonated multiple nuclear bombs in the country and done less damage than they have with their lunatic lockdown policy.

At present, 24 states have begun the process of reopening their economies. There is no uniform criteria for lifting restrictions, no standardized approach to opening one sector over the other, and no plan for dealing with the inevitable surge of new cases and deaths. It all looks like another disaster in the making but we'll reserve judgement until the results are in. What we know for certain is that no one in the Trump administration gave the slightest thought to the problems that might arise from eventually lifting the restrictions. We know that because we know that there was no "exit strategy", just make-it-up-on-the-fly and hope for the best.

In contrast, Sweden won't need an exit strategy because it never shut down its economy or quarantined its people to begin with. So the transition to normal life and stepped-up economic activity is not going to be as difficult. That's the benefit of strategic planning, it anticipates the problems one might encounter on the path one's goal. Here's a clip from an interview with Swedish an infectious disease clinician, Johan Giesecke, , who served as state epidemiologist of Sweden as well as Chief Scientist at the European Centre for Disease

Prevention and Control. Giesecke helps explain why the Swedish approach is different. It's a matter of perception as well as analysis:

"What we are seeing is a rather mild infection spreading around the globe. I think there is relatively little chance of stopping this whatever measures we take. Most people will become infected by this and most people won't even notice. We have data now from Sweden that between 98 and 99% of the cases have had a very mild infection or didn't even realize they were infected. So we have the spread of this mild disease around the globe and most of it is happening where we don't see it because it happens among people who don't get very sick and , spread it to someone else who doesn't get very sick... What we looking at (with the official number of cases and deaths) is a thin layer at the top of people who do develop the disease and an even thinner layer of people who go into intensive care and an even thinner layer of people who die. But the real outbreak is happening where we don't see it." ("Swedish scientist Johan Giesecke asks Australia how it plans to lift its lockdown without deaths", you tube...52 second mark to 1:48)

Giesecke's analysis veers from the conventional view of the virus which explains why the Swedish response has been so different. For example, he says: "I think there is relatively little chance of stopping this whatever measures we take."

This gets to the root of the Swedish approach. Sweden is not trying to suppress the infection which they see as a force of nature (like a tsunami) that cannot be contained but only mitigated. From the beginning, the Swedish approach has been to "control the spread of the virus", not to suppress it through containment strategies. There's a fundamental difference here, and that difference is expressed in the policy.

Second, "We have data now from Sweden that between 98 and 99% of the cases have had a very mild infection or didn't even realize they were infected." In other words, this is highly-contagious infection that poses little or no threat to most people. That suggests the economy can be kept open without endangering the lives of low-risk groups. The added benefit of allowing certain businesses to remain open, is that it creates a controlled environment in which the infection can spread rapidly through the healthy population who, in turn, develop the antibodies they need for future outbreaks. This all fits within Sweden's plan for managing, rather than avoiding, the virus.

Finally, "What we looking at is a thin layer at the top of people who do develop the disease and an even thinner layer of people who go into intensive care and an even thinner layer of people who die." The vast majority of people who die from Covid are over 65 with multiple underlying conditions. It's a terrible tragedy that they should die, but destroying the lives and livelihoods of millions of working people in a futile attempt to stop an unstoppable force like Covid, is foolish and unforgivable. The appropriate response is to protect the old and infirm as much as possible, carefully monitor the rise in cases to prevent the public health system from cratering, and keep the economy operating at a lower level. And that's exactly what Sweden has done.

FAUCI vs. PAUL: Operation "Obfuscate Immunity"

Not surprisingly, the issue of immunity came up during Dr Anthony Fauci's testimony on Capitol Hill on Tuesday. There was a heated exchange between Fauci and Senator Rand Paul

who challenged the infectious disease expert on the misleading information that the WHO has been spreading in the media. Here's an excerpt from the transcript:

Senator Rand Paul: "Dr. Fauci, Studies show that the recovering COVID-19 patients from the asymptomatic to the very sick are showing significant antibody response. Studies show that SARS and MERS, also coronaviruses, induce immunity for at least 2 to 3 years, and yet the media continues to report that we have no evidence that patients who survive coronavirus have immunity. I think actually the truth is the opposite. We have no evidence that survivors of coronavirus don't have immunity and a great deal of evidence to suggest that they do....

You've stated publicly that you'd bet it at all that survivors of coronavirus have some form of immunity. Can you help set the record straight that the scientific record, as it is being accumulated, is supportive that infection with coronavirus likely leads to some form of immunity, Dr. Fauci?"

Dr. Anthony Fauci: "Thank you for the question, Senator Paul. Yes, you're correct that I have said that, given what we know about the recovery from viruses such as coronaviruses in general, or even any infectious disease with very few exceptions, that when you have antibody present it very likely indicates a degree of protection.

I think it's in the semantics of how this is expressed. When you say has it been formally proven by long-term natural history studies, which is the only way that you can prove, one, is it protective, which I said and will repeat, it's likely that it is, but also what is the degree or titer of antibody that gives you that critical level of protection and what is the durability. As I've often said and again repeat, you can make a reasonable assumption that it would be protective, but natural history studies over a period of months to years will then tell you definitively if that's the case." ([Real Clear Politics](#))

This is a critical exchange that helps to underscore what an elusive and calculating political character Fauci really is. You will notice that his answer is completely scripted, completely circuitous and carefully avoids any mention of the word "immunity".

Rand Paul's question couldn't be more straightforward: Do Covid survivors have immunity or not? Yes or no?

And, the answer is: "Yes, they do. Covid survivors do have immunity."

But Fauci doesn't deliver that answer, after a long-winded rumination, Fauci finally offers the most opaque response he can conjure up, he says, "you can make a reasonable assumption that it would be protective." In other words, he carefully avoids a definitive answer. But, of course, that's understandable since the WHO has been spreading false rumors about herd immunity trying to muddy the science since it doesn't jibe with their pro-vaccine agenda. That's what this is all about, bashing natural immunity to clear the way for a vaccine. Check out this clip from an article at Business Insider:

"...leaders at the World Health Organization Monday expressed outrage at the idea that some people might have to die in pursuit of a far-fetched virus-fighting strategy called herd immunity.

"This idea that, 'well, maybe countries who had lax measures and haven't done anything will all of a sudden magically reach some herd immunity, and so

what if we lose a few old people along the way?’ This is a really dangerous, dangerous calculation,” the WHO’s Executive Director of Health Emergencies Mike Ryan said on a call with reporters.

Ryan didn’t mention any specific countries by name, but it was hard not to think about the high death rate in Swedish nursing homes as he mentioned that “in some countries, over half of the cases have occurred in longterm care facilities,” where people haven’t been “properly shielded.”...

“Humans are not herds,” Ryan said. “I think we need to be really careful when we use terms in this way around natural infections in humans, because it can lead to a very brutal arithmetic which does not put people, and life, and suffering at the center of that equation.”

Ryan was audibly troubled by the idea that the world would accept an infection spreading through a population, and even killing some people, to provide a kind of herd protection, especially one which scientists don’t even know exists. He said that’s not a calculus that any “responsible” country should be willing to take.” ([“Humans are not Herds”](#), Business Insider)

As you can see, the Gates Vaccine Gestapo has launched a propaganda campaign aimed at discrediting, obfuscating and ridiculing other methods for achieving immunity that don’t coincide with their grandiose ambitions to use vaccines as an entry-point for enhanced global tracking, surveillance and social control. Is anyone surprised by this?

But the fact remains that-as Paul says, “recovering COVID-19 patients ...show significant antibody response (and will likely have) immunity for at least 2 to 3 years.” Here’s more from Sweden’s chief epidemiologist Anders Tegnell who made this comment in an interview last week:

“It is quite certain that immunity does exist.... For all the cases we have had in Sweden, there has not been one single person who had this disease twice. And we have a very strict identification system. So there is no way we would miss a person who had it twice. I haven’t heard any reports from any countries where there has been a certified case who has actually had this twice. There’s been rumors about it. But in the end, they have been disclaimed.” ([“Key quotes: Sweden’s top epidemiologist challenges conventional wisdom on COVID-19”](#) ijnet)

Repeat: “there has not been one single person who had this disease twice.”

The science is clear, immunity is real and Sweden is on its way to achieving herd immunity within the month.

Sweden’s public health experts have loosened the grip of a vicious pandemic and delivered the Swedish people to a place of safety and security where they can get on with their lives without fear of contracting a lethal infection.

Hurrah for Sweden!

*

Note to readers: please click the share buttons above or below. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

This article was originally published on [The Unz Review](#).

Mike Whitney is a frequent contributor to Global Research.

Featured image is from Shutterstock

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Mike Whitney](#), Global Research, 2020

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Mike Whitney](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca