

Everything Is Fake and Nobody Cares, Episode 5

This complaint concerns the editorial framing and factual accuracy of the programme, which I believe breached BBC Editorial Guidelines on due impartiality and accuracy.

The programme presented itself as an open examination of Dr Aseem Malhotra's vaccine claims. In practice, it followed a repeated structure: Malhotra made a claim, the presenter expressed uncertainty, an institutional expert rebutted it, and the presenter summarised why listeners should regard the claim as misleading. Repeated throughout the programme, this created a strongly directive framing whilst maintaining the appearance of neutrality.

The language used reinforced this imbalance. Malhotra's position was associated with emotion, distrust, and 'stories', while establishment views were framed as 'evidence', 'data', and 'the vast majority of scientists'. This positioned one side as rational before listeners could independently assess the arguments.

My principal concern relates to the programme's treatment of a peer-reviewed paper in Vaccine analysing Pfizer and Moderna trial data. The paper concluded that serious adverse events associated with mRNA vaccines may have exceeded the reduction in Covid hospitalisations during the trial period.

Dr Viki Male stated that the paper's authors had been 'specifically told' not to use the findings in the way Malhotra was using them. The lead author disputes this and states that no such instruction appeared in the paper or peer-review process. If inaccurate, this materially misrepresented an important scientific publication.

I therefore ask the BBC to review whether the programme met its obligations regarding due accuracy and impartiality, particularly in relation to its treatment of the Vaccine paper and its overall editorial framing.