

Lockdown Advocate Admits Negative Impacts Were Never Considered

Another technocrat flees the sinking narrative.

By [Paul Joseph Watson](#)

Global Research, May 15, 2022

[Summit News](#) 12 May 2022

Theme: [Law and Justice](#), [Science and Medicine](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the “Translate Website” drop down menu on the top banner of our home page (Desktop version).

To receive Global Research’s Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

Visit and follow us on [Instagram](#), [Twitter](#) and [Facebook](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

A professor who advocated for longer lockdowns in his role as a SAGE government advisor now admits that the negative impacts of lockdowns were never included in SAGE modeling and that they should have been.

Professor John Edmunds was part of the SAGE team that told the government there would be 6,000 Omicron deaths per day in the absence of another lockdown late last year.

In reality, the death toll never got anywhere near that number as the doomsayers were proven spectacularly wrong yet again.

Now Edmunds admits that the economic harm and the knock-on health effects of lockdown were harms that “in principle” could have been factored into models “but in practice they were not.”

The professor called for an extended lockdown in Summer 2021 and said the government was “taking a risk” by lifting restrictions, but now says some of the alarmist death projections put out by SAGE were “truly eye-watering.”

“The epidemiological model is only one component [of decision-making] and I wondered and I worried that we’d had too much weight,” said Edmunds.

“There is of course an enormous economic impact from many of the interventions and other indirect impacts on psychological health and so on. Now these in principle could be included but in practice they were not,” he added.

“Joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth and all that – but you can’t help feel

the recantation is very convenient as we move on from the pandemic and people start to look back with more objectivity at all the crazy, costly things that were done in the name of ‘science’ and at the behest of modellers,” writes Will Jones.

Edmunds is another individual who, having once vehemently advocated for stricter and longer lockdowns, is now having to concede that they were a mistake and is fleeing the sinking ship that is the entire lockdown narrative.

As we recently [highlighted](#), figures from the World Health Organization show that Sweden had fewer COVID deaths per capita than much of Europe despite refusing to enforce strict lockdowns and mask mandates like numerous other nearby countries.

A study published in the Royal Society Open Science journal last month [found](#) that lockdowns in the UK caused around 60,000 children to suffer clinical depression.

A major [study](#) by Johns Hopkins University earlier this year concluded that global lockdowns have had a much more detrimental impact on society than they have produced any benefit, with researchers urging that they “are ill-founded and should be rejected as a pandemic policy instrument.”

Lockdown advocates were on the wrong side of history, something that should be paramount if health authorities once again try to lock down parts of society when the next pandemic hits, as Bill Gates has virtually guaranteed us will happen.

*

Note to readers: Please click the share buttons above or below. Follow us on Instagram, Twitter and Facebook. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

Featured image is a screenshot from the video

The original source of this article is [Summit News](#)
Copyright © [Paul Joseph Watson](#), [Summit News](#), 2022

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Paul Joseph Watson](#)

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