

DR. BYRAM W. BRIDLE

Associate Professor of Viral Immunology with a PhD in immunology and a post-doctorate in viral immunology. He has 82 published peer-reviewed scientific papers. He is highly recognized as a Canadian scientist with expertise in immunology, virology, and cancer biology. His research has focused on developing vaccines to prevent infectious diseases and treat cancers, and studying host immune responses to viruses. Because of his expertise, during the beginning of the COVID-19 outbreak he received funding from the Government of Ontario and the Government of Canada to develop vaccines against SARS-CoV-2. Dr. Bridle has received prestigious awards for his research and teaching. He has also received multiple citations as a top-tier reviewer for Canada's national medical research granting agency. He is the Chief Operating Officer for ImmunoCeutica, Inc., which focuses on the research, development, and distribution of immunoceuticals to naturally promote optimal immunological health. He sits on the Scientific and Medical Advisory Committee for the Canadian COVID Care Alliance and has been asked to serve as an expert witness in the areas of immunology and virology for courts throughout the world. Dr. Bridle was the first to warn the public that modified RNA shots could distribute throughout the body where they could potentially cause harm by multiple mechanisms of action.



CENSORSHIP UNDER THE GUISE OF PUBLIC HEALTH

The outbreak of COVID-19 saw the field of so-called 'misinformation' 'science' weaponized to promote censorship of dissenting professionals. Discussions are now occurring around the globe about implementing punishments for professionals deemed to have disseminated 'mis- or disinformation'. Criminalization is even being considered. This begs the question of 'who is to be the arbiter of truth'? The mantra of "follow the science" demands an examination of the principles underpinning 'misinformation science'. Based on brutal and seemingly biased treatment of genuine experts by 'misinformation gurus', it was hypothesized that pseudoscience dominates this field's knowledge base. However, this proved to be incorrect. There is a robust body of peer-reviewed published literature that provides sound rationales for guidelines to identify and correct potential misinformation. Surprisingly, many of these established guidelines are not put into practice by many 'misinformation experts'. Among the most egregious, is avoidance of the recommendation to engage in public discussions of dissenting viewpoints. A landmark study underpinning 'misinformation science' proved there was no harm in engaging in public discussions, even with 'science deniers'. It showed that concern about 'the backfire effect' has no basis. This is the fear that public discussions with 'misinformation' spreaders might provide a platform and legitimacy that could further spread 'misinformation'. Notably, the opposite conclusion has been drawn in the field; that "those who fail to show up cause the most harm". So, it is bewildering as to why so many people accusing others of propagating 'misinformation' have refused to engage in public discussions. Other contradictions exist between guidelines for 'misinformation experts' and their public behaviours. Disturbingly, 'misinformation science' appears to represent the future of censorship of open discussions of matters of global health. Yet it is being built upon hypocrisies, contradictions, and cowardice.