



## Echoes of Truth

<b>Type of case</b>	Broadcast Standards
<b>Outcome</b>	In Breach
<b>Service</b>	Loveworld Television Network
<b>Date &amp; time</b>	31 May 2024, 22:30
<b>Category</b>	Harm
<b>Summary</b>	This programme featured potentially harmful statements about vaccinations without providing adequate protection to viewers. In breach of Rule 2.1 of the Broadcasting Code.

## Introduction

Loveworld Television Network (“Loveworld”) is a religious channel broadcast on satellite in the UK. The licence for Loveworld is held by Loveworld Limited (“LL” or “the Licensee”).

*Echoes of Truth* is produced by the Global Youth Television Forum<sup>1</sup> (“GYTF”) and broadcast on Loveworld. It is a discussion programme in which youth presenters discuss a range of topical issues with a focus on Christian teachings.

Ofcom received a complaint that the *Echoes of Truth* episode broadcast on 31 May 2024 (the “Programme”) included “anti-vaccine views without challenge or balance” and allegations that “scientific research had found that vaccines were ‘never safe’”.

The programme was hosted by three presenters introduced as Princewill, Happiness and Audrey who began the programme by praying and speaking in tongues<sup>2</sup>. They discussed “*Redemption*” as

<sup>1</sup> Global Youth Television Forum is described on the Loveworld schedule as “an initiative established for nurturing young people for global leadership, raising leaders and building the future”: <https://loveworlduk.org/tvschedule/>

<sup>2</sup> Speaking in an unknown language during religious worship.

being Loveworld's Pastor Chris Oyakilome's<sup>3</sup> ("Pastor Chris") "*message of the year*" and thanked him for his inspiration. The discussion moved on to the World Health Organisation ("WHO") and what was described as a failure to effectively manage the Covid-19 global pandemic.

The presenters read out comments from viewers before introducing the "*Debunking the Lies*" segment which related to the mandating of vaccine passports that were in place in some countries during the Covid-19 pandemic. The presenters described this as an unnecessary breach of human rights and a means of forcing people to be vaccinated against their wishes. During this segment the presenters referred to statements taken from different articles including:

- remarks made by WHO physician, Dr Nohynek, about the efficacy of the Covid-19 vaccinations and vaccine passports;
- an article about the tax arrangements of the pharmaceutical company Pfizer; and
- an article about the potential remit of the WHO in future public health emergencies.

Within this context, the presenters made the following statements:

Audrey: *"Vaccine passports were just a scam to promote the globalist vaccination agenda".*

Princewill: *"To also get more people vaccinated".*

Audrey: *"As Pastor [Chris] has told us, they don't really stand for health. You may as well call them World Death Organisation. This year we have seen it".*

At approximately 65 minutes into the Programme, Princewill introduced a documentary called "*Vaccine Intrusions: The HPV & Polio Story*" ("the Documentary"). The Documentary lasted approximately 19 minutes and comprised footage taken from a variety of sources, including a range of different television programming, interviews with people who provided personal accounts of their vaccine experiences and clips taken from Pastor Chris' sermons.

The Documentary began with a brief clip taken from an archive news programme broadcast by a different broadcaster, with the newsreader speaking directly to camera as follows:

Newsreader: *"Attention parents of daughters: one out of every four girls in this country has been given at least one shot of a vaccine to prevent cervical cancer. But should parents be worried about the health risks?"*

The above clip was immediately followed by a clip showing what appeared to be a child's bedroom and a mother sitting next to her daughter who was lying in bed. The daughter had medical equipment around her neck and the mother referred to her as follows:

---

<sup>3</sup> Pastor Chris Oyakilome is founder and president of Loveworld Incorporated, also known as Christ Embassy. It is an Evangelical Christian denomination with a global network of churches.

*“She had the first HPV vaccination at school. Um, so for the last 13 weeks now she's only been able to blink and speak. She can't use any of her limbs. She's incontinent”.*

The Documentary then cut to black and white footage which showed a montage of different images: medical staff examining a child's legs; a young boy being given crutches; another young boy shown walking across a beam with rails on either side; and children lining up preparing to be vaccinated by medical staff.

The Documentary went on to show clips of an interview with Dr Raymond Francis and a sermon from Pastor Chris:

Dr Francis: *“Polio vaccine is the largest cause of polio in the world”.*

Pastor Chris: *“No scientific proof. No clear data has been produced, substantiated with scientific proof, evidence that vaccines actually works [sic]. There's been none to this day”.*

The title sequence for the Documentary then played which included a number of images associated with vaccinations, for example vials labelled 'HPV Vaccine' and children receiving oral vaccinations followed by the Documentary title “Vaccine Intrusions: The HPV and Polio Story”. The following statements were then made by a range of contributors appearing in succession in different clips:

Voiceover: *“The history of vaccination has spanned hundreds of years, replete with several fabricated and unscientific validations to assert its indispensability, but as well rattled with several stories of unprecedented ill health post-vaccination, especially in children”.*

Pastor Chris: *“If you were deceived before, don't be deceived anymore. And those of you who have just had babies, you better be careful because Satan is more vicious today than he ever was because his time is short and he's pushing them to get you vaccinated and get your babies vaccinated. You were deceived by the logic that if you, if you gave the person who was not sick, a little disease, you will become immune to that disease. It seems to make sense. But what we never asked ourselves was, what was the quality of the immunity before this so-called disease was passed into the person? And what was the measurement of his level of immunity after he got the vaccination? And what was the actual content of the vaccine? And what could have been in those vaccines that could have caused some other kinds of ailments or injuries? Did anybody check? Nobody checked”.*

Voiceover: *“Indeed, the world is beginning to find out the catastrophe that vaccines and vaccination enthusiasts have orchestrated since the introduction of vaccines to the world's health system. But what many more now need to understand is that there has been an age long design to systematically inflict people with diseases in the hopes of achieving the depopulation agenda within a specific time frame. While*

*many have become victims of vaccine injuries, let's zero in on two major ones: the polio and HPV vaccines”.*

Pastor Chris: *“The deception was very simple. They came and they said, what you all need here is vaccines. They knew that that community was getting water that was polluted from somewhere. After they recommended vaccines and got the government to sign up to those regulations to make compulsory, they sent another group to come and clean out the water, and they cleaned out the water and these people were OK. So they took vaccines and they were OK when somebody cleaned out the water. How do we know that was not where the problem was? That was where the problem was! But they said all the children must be vaccinated against polio, vaccinated against this and against that, and against that. Well, we went on vaccinating but the more we vaccinated, the more polio there was. Not only polio, several other things”.*

Voiceover: *“There's the Gates<sup>4</sup> founded and funded meningitis vaccine project, which led to the creation and testing of Men Afrovac, a 50 cent per dose immunisation against meningococcal meningitis. The test led to reports of between 40 and 500 children suffering seizures and convulsions and eventually becoming paralysed. There's the 2017 confirmation that the Gates supported oral polio vaccine was actually responsible for the majority of new polio cases, and the 2018 follow up, showing that 80% of polio cases are now vaccine derived. There's the 2018 paper in the International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, concluding that over 490,000 people in India developed paralysis as a result of the oral polio vaccine between 2000 and 2017”.*

Voiceover: *“Let's go over the contaminated polio vaccine of the 60s and how it introduced Simian Virus 40 into the human population, which I'm sure you've never heard of and that's by design. Not to be confused with the 1955 release of a knowingly tainted polio batch from Cutter Labs where even though the monkeys they tested it on came down with polio, the NIH<sup>5</sup> injected it into children anyway, and out of the 200,000 or so kids who received it, 40,000 became infected and paralysed with polio, and many died painfully”.*

Pastor Chris: *“And suddenly, in certain societies in Africa and Asia, you have lots of crippled people. Suddenly so many with polio. Then we're told that*

---

<sup>4</sup> We interpreted this to be a reference to the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation: <https://www.gatesfoundation.org/>

<sup>5</sup> The National Institutes of Health, a US medical research agency: <https://www.nih.gov/about-nih/who-we-are>

*they're coming again for another vaccine against polio. Against polio? There was no polio in those societies until they were vaccinated. Check the history. Meaning the vaccines brought polio”.*

Dr. Francis: *“According to a 2010 article in the New England Journal of Medicine, outbreaks of vaccine-caused polio have been occurring at a rate of once or twice per year since the year 2000. The oral polio vaccine, which is still used in many Third World countries, is made from a live polio virus, which carries a risk of causing polio. The virus and the vaccine can also mutate into a deadlier version, igniting new outbreaks. The US began using an inactivated polio vaccine in 1999 after parents of vaccine-damaged children were successful in lobbying for a change. The problem is that while the oral polio vaccine supposedly protects against wild polio, the wild virus is being replaced by the vaccine-derived polio virus, which is actually more dangerous than the virus it's supposed to be protecting against. In essence, this much heralded vaccine strategy has replaced one infectious disease with another even worse strain. What kind of success is that?”*

A clip was then shown of a mother (accompanied by her young daughter in a wheelchair):

Mother: *“So when I took her for her two-month visit, that was on March 6th of '03, she went, um and got her DPT, her polio, her hib and her PCV7<sup>6</sup>. And, within a couple of days of that, she was in full blown convulsions, unstoppable seizures. And, um, they did a PET scan and discovered her entire brain does not function except for her occipital lobe”.*

Interviewer: *“Is she paralysed?”*

Mother: *“She, she lays where she lays, and she sits where she sits. So, she's a rag doll. She wears a diaper. She's incontinent. She has never spoken a word. She moans and groans. She's very content and happy, and she gives me expressions, and I can tell when she's not happy or she's happy. Well, how can you say 'it's absolutely not the vaccine' if you can't tell me what it is, so you're already ruling out something. I noticed right away they were defending the vaccines”.*

Pastor Chris: *“They try to deny it, but they lured several African countries and Asian countries to go for so called immunisations that had terrible effects on*

---

<sup>6</sup> We understood “DPT” to refer to the vaccine for Diphtheria, Pertussis (whooping cough) and Tetanus, “Hib” to refer to the vaccine for Haemophilus Influenzae Type B and “PCV7” to the pneumococcal vaccine. These form part of childhood vaccination schedules in the UK (<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/routine-childhood-immunisation-schedule/routine-childhood-immunisations-from-february-2022-born-on-or-after-1-january-2020>) and in the USA (<https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/imz-schedules/child-easyread.html>).

*them. Sarah became sterilised from the so-called immunisations, and many were maimed with polio”.*

A clip titled *“HighWire with Del Bigtree”* was then shown. The clip showed a studio with two people, Del Bigtree and Suzanne Humphries, both seated at a desk behind microphones speaking directly to camera. While Del Bigtree was speaking an image was shown of different news headlines from *“AAP News, June 13, 2017”* as follows: *“Vaccine-derived polio cases reported in Syria”, “Syria is the second country with reported cases of cVDPV2 this year, along with the Democratic Republic of the Congo”* and *“Syria...along with the Democratic Republic of the Congo”*. This was followed by another image of a news headline which read: *“Circulating vaccine-derived poliovirus type 2- Democratic Republic of the Congo, disease outbreak news, 13 June 2017”*, the *“World Health Organization”* logo and part of a quotation which read *“...underscores the importance of maintaining high routine vaccination coverage...”*.

Del Bigtree: *“Polio in Syria and polio in the Congo, and what's it being caused by? The vaccine itself. They're calling it an outbreak of vaccine strain polio. When they test these kids. Why are they getting, why are they being paralysed? What they're finding is the virus that's paralysed them, or the polio, came from the vaccine itself. It has the fingerprint of the vaccine form of polio. So, in essence we essentially are causing polio outbreaks around the world”.*

Pastor Chris: *“But you know, they did a massive media work and covered it up”.*

Voiceover: *“A 2018 scientific study released in the International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health concluded that over 490,000 children in India developed paralysis as a result of the Gates supported oral polio vaccine that was administered between the years of 2000 and 2017. Using all the usual sleight of hand, US based media and fact checkers rushed to bury the story. But thanks to the meticulous work of a team of Indian researchers and doctors, the inconvenient truth lives on the NIH.gov website”.*

A written document then appeared on screen, with the title *“International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health”*. Within the document several passages were highlighted in yellow.

A short clip of a university graduation ceremony was briefly shown with the voiceover from the Documentary, along with several TV clips and a range of contributors appearing in succession in the clips:

TV Clip: *“It's my honour to introduce Bill and Melinda Gates”.*

Voiceover: *“Without any medical training, Bill and Melinda Gates founded the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunisation, through which they fulfil their agenda to vaccinate the world. The foundation has been sued by the governments of some of the poorest and most vulnerable nations for causing serious harm through experimental vaccine programmes”.*

- Dr Aaron Lewis: *“Of all the places that Mr Gates could have gone in the world, why did he settle on Africa? It's not because he cares about people that look like me. He cares about an agenda”.*
- KTN News clip<sup>7</sup>: *“African bodies have been used as lab rats for many years for Big Pharma”.*
- TV Clip: *“They are using us for trials, they are using us for testing but as an African, I say no more”.*
- Theo Wilson: *“Africans, they're tired of becoming the guinea pigs of the world. Their antennas are raised and they are telling each other all over social media. They're on high alert right now”.*
- Raymond De Souza: *“There is a policy of the American government, it's called the Kissinger Report<sup>8</sup>, which was produced in the mid-70s, and it explicitly states that the purpose of the foreign policy in Africa was to reduce the population because they have great mineral resources there. At the time, Kissinger and those involved with the Carter administration wanted to shrink the population, make sure that the Africans do not develop and do not use the resources for themselves because we in the States, we need them. There is a concerted effort of foreign powers to control the population of Africa”.*
- Voiceover: *“Some children did survive the botched vaccinations last month and will recover, but 15, all under the age of five, died from fever, vomiting and diarrhoea”.*

A clip then showed what appeared to be a press conference with a man seated behind a microphone in front of a branded backdrop on which the words *“United Nations Geneva”* were visible. He stated:

*“Human errors contributed to the unfortunate deaths of the children”.*

Clips were then shown of children followed by a split screen interview with Theo Wilson:

Theo Wilson: *“How can you believe Big Pharma but not believe these parents when they tell you that their children have been injured by Big Pharma? I don't care how big this corporate machine looks. As a parent, I can tell you, these people will never stop fighting for their kids”.*

A montage of images of injured children and press reports about the polio vaccine were shown.

---

<sup>7</sup> Ofcom understood this to be a news channel operated by Kenya Television Network.

<sup>8</sup> Henry Kissinger was an American Secretary of state between 1973 to 1977. During that time, he oversaw the Kissinger Report which was a national security directive under President Richard Nixon.

Voiceover: *“Another very disruptive vaccine intrusion that has been pushed yet again under the guise of preventing a certain type of cancer in young girls is the HPV vaccines. Different findings reveal the spike in cases of injuries to young girls who got injected with the HPV vaccines”.*

Pastor Chris: *“I understand that in some countries as well, they say that they want to vaccinate the young people, especially young ladies, against cancer. Another big lie”.*

A clip from an archive news programme from a different broadcaster was broadcast, showing images of a young woman identified in the clip as Amanda Ratner, with a voiceover as follows:

*“Three weeks after Amanda Ratner received the HPV vaccine, she experienced pain at the injection site and fell ill.*

The clip showed photographs of Amanda Ratner before footage of an interview with a man and a woman who we assumed to be Amanda’s parents. The man said:

*“She’s gone from the position of being a competitive and varsity lacrosse player in high school to somebody who’s chronically ill”.*

News reporter: *“Amanda now lives with an autoimmune disease”.*

An interview with a doctor on what appeared to be the programme *Good Morning America* was broadcast, with the caption *“New Fears With Cancer Vaccine, are the benefits worth the risk?”*:

Doctor: *“Most doctors I know have stopped giving this vaccine because of the safety issues around it now”.*

News reporter: *“As a gynaecologist, Dr Jacques Moritz sees the deadly effects of cervical cancer. He is also the father of an 11 year-old daughter”.*

Doctor: *“I’m not going to have my daughter vaccinated right now”.*

Interviewer: *“Why not?”*

Doctor: *“Because I think there’s other ways to prevent cervical cancer. The old standards, Pap smear, routine exams, and this vaccine I just don’t know enough about it yet”.*

Voiceover: *“Making the decision to vaccinate all the more difficult for many parents and paediatricians”.*

A clip which appeared to be taken from social media was shown of a woman standing behind a lectern and a microphone delivering a speech. The woman’s words were audible but also shown in text on the screen:

*“The people who want to vaccinate are often very aggressive, and they don’t want you to hear the other side. And that should make a light bulb in your head go off. Why don’t they want me to hear the other side? Why don’t they think I can*

*actually listen to both and come up with my own decision? But they will always tell you to vaccinate for everything. That alone, I believe, should be a red flag to you that I'm saying you listen to everything and then you choose. What you do is your responsibility. And that's not what the, what the people who are supporting this aggressive vaccination campaigns, more and more vaccines all the time to little babies".*

This was followed by what appeared to be a recording taken from social media of a different public meeting with a panel of people sitting facing an audience. As in the previous clip, the audio was also displayed in text shown on the screen together with a social media post which read *"I've never seen or heard of a reaction such as this from hpv shot"*. A man behind a lectern, who appeared to be concluding the session, said:

*"All the audience questions that we have, I'm going to leave the floor..."*

A female member of the audience at the public meeting interrupted the man and shouted the following:

*"No, I'm sorry. I'm gonna stand up, and I'm gonna say something. If the police come take me out, that's fine. You didn't answer any of our questions. We've been blatantly ignored since we got here, like you guys were expecting us. I got HPV Gardasil vaccine when I was 20 years old and I'm still suffering from it. I got Lupus, then I had chronic Lyme disease. Then I've had gallbladder attacks. Right now, I have two slipped discs in my back but I came here tonight because I don't want anybody to suffer the way I've suffered. I have had miscarriages. I can have no more children and you're gonna sit here and tell me it's safe and effective, it's not. It's not safe and effective. Her daughter's dead. Colton is dead. Thousands and thousands. I will leave. You don't have to remove me. No, I can't calm down when thousands of children are being injured. And you want me to calm down when 10 years of my life was stolen from me? Even out of a wheelchair? Sometimes I'm blind and I can't see. Do you know what that's like? And I haven't...you know how much debt I'm in? Do you know how much money I've put out? I've never received one penny. I'll leave. I don't even want to be a part of this any more".*

Pastor Chris: *"And with all of these reports, with all of these records, with all of this evidence, they still have the guts to tell the people to get vaccinated. So they say, it's nice, it's, it's OK. But all true scientific records show that the vaccines were never safe".*

Voiceover: *"Another finding reveals the complicities of government officials in the agenda of vaccine intrusions. What has happened over time is that vaccine instigators found a sinister premise to compel governments to make vaccines like the HPV vaccines compulsory requisite for admission into schools of learning".*

Pastor Chris: *"Just because it became a policy of government in a country doesn't make it right. They've made lots of errors, lots of mistakes".*

A clip was then shown labelled “KSBY NEWS EVERYWHERE”<sup>9</sup>, with the caption “NEW CA BILL MAY REQUIRE HPV VACCINE FOR 8<sup>TH</sup> GRADERS”:

News reporter: *“Should middle schoolers be required to get the HPV vaccine in order to go to school?”*

This was immediately followed by another archive news programme labelled OAN<sup>10</sup> with the caption “Happening Now” and “CALIF. BILL SEEKS TO REQUIRE STUDENTS TO GET THE HPV VACCINE”:

Newsreader: *“A California bill has been introduced in Sacramento to require students entering eighth grade to get the HPV vaccine”.*

A clip labelled “TrialSite News” was then shown with the caption “PARENTS IN GOLDEN STATE ‘UP IN ARMS’ ABOUT PROPOSED HPV VACCINE MANDATE IF SAFE AND EFFECTIVE”. A man was shown sitting behind a microphone. He said:

*“A California parent, for example, of a daughter now in a wheelchair named Kathy Robi, declared, this is not a vaccine that should be mandated. There is no evidence Gardasil will prevent cervical cancer in the long term. It is entirely theoretical, based on studies testing only surrogate end points, not cancer itself, and like any medical intervention, Gardasil has risks and those risks can be devastating. Are the risks, which can include death, worth it? I don't think so”.*

While the man was speaking, the following quotation from Kathy Robi was spoken in voiceover and also shown in text on the screen.

Voiceover: *“With all of the foregoing, people must understand that behind all forms of vaccine mandates prevalent is the depopulation agenda. So, the globalists are wielding the weapon of vaccines to summarily engineer a massive depopulation within a specific age group and projected time frame”.*

Pastor Chris: *“So God's people must not give them a chance. That's why we pray, and we have been very effective in our prayer, and we'll continue to pray. Don't give them a chance”.*

Voiceover: *“Finally, my brethren be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might, Ephesians six, verse 10”.*

The verse was also shown on screen.

The Documentary ended and the programme returned to a studio discussion between the same three presenters, Princewill, Happiness and Audrey.

---

<sup>9</sup> Ofcom understood this to be a TV channel serving the Central Coast of California in the US.

<sup>10</sup> Ofcom understood this to be One America News Network a US cable channel.

- Princewill: *"Welcome back. So did you see the plans for cervical vaccines for cervical cancer given to young girls? I look at that mother testify how it is that since her daughter took the vaccine".*
- Happiness: *"Her life has changed".*
- Princewill: *"It's been an entirely different outlook to life. The girl is just making sounds".*
- Audrey: *"But imagine the pain of that mother. You once had a lovely, beautiful girl, normal girl. After the vaccine, she's almost like a pillow".*
- Happiness: *"This is the definition of their new normal. This is the new normal that they are introducing into people's lives. Imagine a normal girl just having her life taken away like that. So you see, nobody is left out in their plan. We've seen it all in the new...The Great Reset by Klaus Schwab<sup>11</sup>. They've got plans for young people as well. It's not just, it's not just a set of people, even young people you can't imagine. You can't imagine, cervical cancer for young people. It's so, it's so sad".*
- Audrey: *"Worse than the polio vaccine, worse than the HPV vaccine".*
- Princewill: *"And notice the medical practitioner in the video that I mentioned. He's a medical practitioner said he's not going to recommend it for his own daughter to take because he knows that there is not enough information about it to show its efficacy. Nothing. No proof yet. So he's not gonna take that chance. And parents you should stand that way as well. Tell your daughters, your children, 'don't take any vaccine in school'. Because they've come subtly to schools. They come subtly to schools, and many parents may not have the time to read through the...they just sign and give consent, and you know they are giving them [vaccinations]. So you may tell your younger one, your children, and say, 'look, if anyone who comes say open your mouth, let me put something inside, say no'".*
- Happiness: *"I heard the cases of one of, one of the schools, in Nigeria. They evaded, like they chased away the vaccinators that came, you know, they usually have these vaccinators that move from school to school. They chased them and they say we don't know what's in the vaccine, can we, they said, they asking [for] more information just like our man*

---

<sup>11</sup> Klaus Schwab is the founder and chairman of the World Economic Forum. 'The Great Reset' refers to the idea proposed by Schwab that the Covid-19 pandemic represented a window of opportunity to "reflect, reimagine, and reset our world to create a healthier, more equitable, and more prosperous future". (<https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2020/06/now-is-the-time-for-a-great-reset/>).

*of God<sup>12</sup> always says ask questions, they started asking questions. OK, can we know this thing we are giving to them? Can we know this and that? They said they ask and they didn't, they didn't have, they just said, 'oh, our work is just to give the children the vaccines'. Can you imagine?"*

Princewill: *"So you may be giving them poison".*

Happiness: *"I mean, why this is not the process in the United States, you cannot just go to schools and start giving them, you know, vaccines. All those things they put in your mouths, some of them are not, are not accredited. They just pay people to just...and some of them are not even health workers. They are just normal people who are looking for jobs. That's what they do here in Africa. So we've got to stand, we've got to stand – school administrators, principals, educational board members, committees. Wherever you stand, you've got to stand because now they are not going to homes. They are using the schools. They are going to playgrounds, you know, they are doing a whole lot. They are doing a whole lot just to push their vaccines, you know, to champion their population reduction agenda".*

Princewill: *"We've seen how it is that all things indeed work together for good".*

Happiness: *"Yes, it does".*

Princewill: *"Because fast forward to how life was before the pandemic. Very few people would have questioned the efficacy of vaccines".*

Happiness: *"Or the government".*

Princewill: *"Who would have thought vaccines were injurious? No one would have had the mind to even investigate. If they had come to school to say we're gonna give polio vaccines, parents would have said 'OK, no problem'".*

Audrey: *"They would be happy because they think it's a solution".*

Princewill: *"They think it's, it's how it ought to be done. The government is working, the health ministry is doing their job. But after the, from Covid, it opened the eyes of many and thanks to our dear man of God as well".*

Happiness: *"Like the, like the scales falling off the eyes of the Apostle Paul".*

Princewill: *"So you see, Covid has actually been one of the worst opportunities for them. The worst opportunity, because they thought they had put the*

---

<sup>12</sup> Ofcom understood references to "man of God" by presenters during this Programme referred to Pastor Chris, see also footnote 3 above.

*world under but instead they had opened the eyes of the world to really see what they were doing. Before 2020 how many independent journalists did you have exposing the things that the deep state are doing? Not many. But after Covid, many people started speaking up and saying. More people started researching, more people started looking deeper, questioning, asking questions, reading between the lines. Before, anybody thought it was all sweet by and by, not many people were looking into the details. It was how life ought to be. You ought to be vaccinated as a child. You ought to have taken such and such medicine. It's how it ought to be. But Covid opened the eyes”.*

Audrey: *“Even those who were injured may not have linked it to the vaccine but thought something else happened. But now they're realising that ‘oh my, my child is autistic and when did they [sic] happen? Right after she took the vaccine”.*

Princewill: *“So now their eyes are opened. What the devil had planned for evil has worked in perfect orchestration for the good of the world. Now, more people are enlightened. More people are enlightened. This is exactly what happened with our Lord Jesus who says, had they known they would have not crucified the Lord of Glory. If the devil had known that insinuating Covid would have made the whole world see what the pharmaceutical industry is really for, he probably wouldn't have done it in the first place, would have liked to wait. But now the whole world knows what Big Pharma is really about. It's about big profits”.*

Happiness: *“And also the partnership between big pharma and big tech is about big, big profits”.*

Princewill: *“Big pharma, big tech and big government. Big government. So we have government officials who are there for themselves, you know, and what they can get, what they can get out of it. Glory to God. So, I hope you've seen that's how it is that in many nations vaccine passports were enforced. It may not have happened in your country, but it doesn't mean that it didn't happen. It's indeed happened. Several individuals lost their jobs. Many people were bankrupt. Many businesses, SMEs folded just because they were not, the owners were not vaccinated. They had not taken the substance into their, into their systems. And just referring one more time to that video that man of God showed us. We saw what was mentioned. I believe it was Melinda Gates when she was talking to the gentleman she said, ‘Africa is the main, you know, test bed. We need to reduce the population”.*

Happiness: *“We'll do that through vaccines”.*

In the final part of the programme, the presenters returned briefly to the subject of vaccine passports and summarised their thoughts on these before moving on to matters relating to the

Christian faith including examining the role of God in society, the importance of living a life of humility and their views on the purpose of life. The programme ended with prayers, with the presenters praying and talking in tongues. On screen were the words “PRAYING FOR THE NATIONS OF THE WORLD” followed by “PRAYING FOR OUR DEAR MAN OF GOD, PASTOR CHRIS”.

We considered this content raised potential issues under the following rule of the Broadcasting Code (“the Code”):

Rule 2.1: “Generally accepted standards must be applied to the contents of television...services...so as to provide adequate protection for members of the public from the inclusion in such services of harmful and/or offensive material”.

Ofcom requested comments from Loveworld on how this content complied with this rule<sup>13</sup>.

## Response

---

LL said that it “primarily serves a community of Bible-reading Christians who seek content that resonates with their faith-based values”, adding that its programmes aim to provide educational and spiritually enriching content rooted in Christian teachings. It said it is “deeply committed to presenting Christian teachings and values through a lens that emphasises historical and cultural education”.

The Licensee summarised various statutory provisions which it considered of relevance, namely Articles 9 and 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights and the Communications Act 2003. It noted that Article 10 “safeguards the right to freedom of expression” and “supports the dissemination of religious ideas and beliefs through broadcasting, balanced against public safety”. It added that Article 9 “[e]nsures freedom of thought, conscience, and religion, including the right to manifest one’s religion or beliefs”. LL argued that its broadcasting of religious content “directly manifests these rights, enabling the expression of religious views and the facilitation of public discourse on faith”.

The Licensee said that it adhered to the principles set out in the Communications Act 2003, “emphasising the importance of freedom of expression in broadcasting, thereby supporting our ability to engage audiences in meaningful religious discussions”. It also argued that previous Ofcom decisions, such as the decision relating to *Jerry Springer: The Opera*<sup>14</sup>, broadcast on BBC2 on 8 January 2005, demonstrated Ofcom’s recognition of “the importance of context and artistic expression, allowing controversial content when appropriately contextualised”.

LL said that it maintained “rigorous editorial standards to ensure our religious programming respects and does not exploit audience susceptibilities” and that it strived to offer “multiple viewpoints in our religious programming, promoting respectful and thoughtful exploration of religious subjects”.

---

<sup>13</sup> We also initially requested comments from the Licensee to assess compliance with Rule 4.6 of the Code which states that religious programmes must not improperly exploit any susceptibilities of the audience but decided not to investigate further under this rule.

<sup>14</sup> See Ofcom Broadcast Bulletin Issue number 34 published 9 May 2005: <https://www.ofcom.org.uk/siteassets/resources/documents/about-ofcom/bulletins/broadcast-bulletins/archive/pcb61/issue34.pdf?v=332687>.

Loveworld also said that it exercised “strict editorial control to prevent any form of exploitation” while also ensuring the content remained “sensitive to the emotional, spiritual, and intellectual states of our audience” and that it had effective feedback systems in place to “monitor and adjust content based on viewer responses”.

According to the Licensee, it broadcasts Loveworld UK both in the UK and internationally and applies standards that “respect both local and global religious broadcasting norms” ensuring that content is “tailored to diverse viewer sensitivities and maintains a consistent editorial standard”. LL noted that the international scope of its broadcasts meant that application of regulatory standards needed to be nuanced, “respecting global norms for religious expression”.

The Licensee also referred to Ofcom’s decision in relation to *The Great Global Warming Swindle*<sup>15</sup>, which was broadcast on Channel 4 on 8 March 2007. In that decision, according to LL, Ofcom stated “it is important, in line with freedom of expression, that broadcasters can challenge current orthodoxy. It is self-evident that there will be strong disagreements over the ‘facts’ on an issue such as the causes of global warming – where some scientists disagree”. The Licensee added that in that case, Ofcom also noted that although some people may wish to challenge the evidence and the conclusions drawn from the programme, Channel 4 had had the right to show it, “provided it remained within the Code and – despite certain reservations – Ofcom has determined that it did not breach Rule 2.2. On balance, it did not materially mislead the audience so as to cause harm or offence”.

LL also noted that Ofcom has imposed sanctions on it in the past and LL raised concerns about “potential disproportionate scrutiny”, seeking assurances from Ofcom that “regulatory actions are balanced and impartial, as required by Article 14 of the ECHR, which mandates non-discrimination”.

Finally, the Licensee asserted that its programming “fully complies with the Ofcom Broadcasting Code, respecting legal standards and viewers’ sensibilities” and proposed a meeting with Ofcom to discuss these issues further.

Ofcom reached a Preliminary View that the Programme was in breach of Rule 2.1 of the Code and invited LL to make representations in response. In its representations, LL acknowledged the concerns in relation to Rule 2.1 set out by Ofcom in the Preliminary View. In particular, LL said that it understood the need to “protect audiences from potentially harmful material and to ensure claims presented in programmes are substantiated, balanced, and contextualised”.

LL apologised for any distress or confusion caused by the content and said that as it serves a faith-based audience, it takes its “responsibility to provide accurate, balanced, and respectful programming very seriously”. To reflect its commitment to acknowledging Ofcom’s concerns publicly it said it had broadcast a formal apology on 13 December 2024 at 11:00 and 22:30, the same time *Echoes of Truth* had been broadcast:

“The program titled Echoes of Truth, which aired on 31<sup>st</sup> May 2024 on Loveworld UK, was produced by the Global Youth Television Forum (“GYTF”).

Please note that the discussions and views expressed during this program are solely those of the participants and do not reflect the opinions, beliefs, or stance

---

<sup>15</sup> See Ofcom Broadcast Bulletin Issue number 114 published 21 July 2008: <https://www.ofcom.org.uk/siteassets/resources/documents/about-ofcom/bulletins/broadcast-bulletins/archive/obb114/issue114.pdf?v=332395>.

of Loveworld UK as a station, particularly regarding matters such as vaccines or related health topics.

Loveworld UK remains neutral and does not endorse or oppose any specific views shared by independent program producers and does not in any way suggest to the public the conventional medical treatment is ineffective”.

LL said it “recognise[d] that previous challenges have highlighted areas for improvement” and that “[o]ver the past several years [it has] worked diligently to strengthen our compliance processes, ensuring that Loveworld continues to meet the expectation of the Broadcasting Code”. It added that Ofcom’s Preliminary View had been “particularly invaluable in helping [it] to fully understand Ofcom’s expectations in greater detail and in identifying additional measures required by Loveworld to prevent similar issues in future”. The Licensee said it was “committed to building on these insights to deliver programming that is balanced, informative, and respectful of [its] audience’s trust”. LL said it appreciated Ofcom’s analysis and in particular its “recognition of the importance of balancing [its] rights under Articles 9 and 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights with [its] responsibility to protect audiences”. It explained that this has “further informed [its] approach to aligning faith-based programming with the requirements of the Broadcasting Code”.

LL explained it had immediately undertaken a “comprehensive review of [its] editorial processes and programming practices” following receipt of the Preliminary View. It provided Ofcom with information about the introduction of the following initiatives:

- Enhanced editorial oversight: the introduction of a multi-tiered editorial review process for all content which addressed public health and sensitive topics. It said this ensures that all claims are backed up with robust evidence from credible sources, that alternative views or expert commentary is presented to audiences to provide balance, and that clear editorial guidance is provided to presenters to outline how to frame claims appropriately.
- Audience-specific protections: LL said it recognised the faith-based nature of its audience and had introduced viewer resources alongside disclaimers for contentious topics. It said this included links to reputable external information, such as public health resources and explicit disclaimers advising viewers to seek professional advice for health-related matters.
- Training for senior staff and presenters: LL said that it carried out in-person compliance training sessions between 11-17 November 2024 for all of its senior staff, presenters and producers involved in the Programme and other Loveworld programmes of this nature. It said that these sessions included workshops tailored to address Ofcom’s feedback and the practical application of Rule 2.1 and best practices for contextualising sensitive topics and balancing faith-based perspectives with evidence-based information. It said it had already led to a better understanding among its staff of how to handle potentially contentious subjects responsibly.
- Improved monitoring and feedback mechanisms: LL explained that it has improved its audience feedback systems to “identify and address concerns more swiftly”. It said it was also monitoring viewer feedback to ensure it met its audience’s needs and expectations.
- Quarterly compliance audits: the introduction of quarterly compliance audits to review content and processes. It said that these audits would ensure improvements are sustained over the long term.

LL said the above measures “demonstrate[d] [its] dedication to addressing Ofcom’s concerns comprehensively and ensuring future compliance” and that it viewed this process as an “opportunity to refine [its] practices and reaffirm [its] commitment to serving [its] audience with content that is accurate, balanced and respectful”.

Finally, LL said it remained fully cooperative and welcomed any further guidance from Ofcom in addressing this matter.

## Decision

---

### Rule 2.1

Reflecting our duties under the Communications Act 2003, Section Two of the Code provides protection for members of the public from the inclusion of harmful and/or offensive material.

Rule 2.1 requires that:

“Generally accepted standards must be applied to the contents of television...services...so as to provide adequate protection for members of the public from the inclusion in such services of harmful and/or offensive material”.

As noted by the Licensee, when considering whether a broadcaster has provided its audience with adequate protection from potentially harmful material, Ofcom must have regard to the broadcaster’s right to freedom of expression and the audience’s right to receive information and ideas as set out in Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights (“ECHR”). Ofcom must also consider the broadcaster and audience’s right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion and the right to manifest religion or beliefs as set out in Article 9 of the ECHR.

In considering this case, Ofcom has had particular and careful regard to these rights. Ofcom recognises and acknowledges the importance of debate and scrutiny on issues of public concern and emphasises that broadcasters are free to broadcast programmes which present controversial, challenging or critical discussions concerning, for example, government policies, public health bodies or debates about the safety and efficacy of vaccinations. However, in doing so, broadcasters must ensure that such programming complies with the provisions of the Code.

As set out in Rule 2.1, broadcasters must provide adequate protection for the audience from the inclusion of potentially harmful material. When considering whether a programme has complied with Rule 2.1, Ofcom must assess the nature of the content and whether there is a reasonable likelihood of it causing members of the public actual or potential harm. Context is important and the extent of any protection required will depend on all the relevant circumstances, including the service on which the material is broadcast, the degree of harm likely to be caused, the likely expectation of the audience and the effect of this material on viewers who may come across it unawares.

### **Potential harm**

We first examined the comments made in this Programme to assess whether they were potentially harmful to viewers. As set out in our Guidance to Section Two of the Code<sup>16</sup>, in considering whether

---

<sup>16</sup> See Guidance to Section Two of the Code: <https://www.ofcom.org.uk/siteassets/resources/documents/tv-radio-and-on-demand/broadcast-guidance/programme-guidance/broadcast-code-guidance/section-2-guidance-notes.pdf?v=322622>

a programme which contains health claims has the potential for harm, Ofcom takes into account a number of factors, such as: the severity of the situation (i.e. whether the claims relate to the most serious medical conditions); whether the material was targeted at a particularly vulnerable audience; and whether the claims were made by a speaker who is portrayed as having authority. We also take into account factors such as contextual information and whether there was a degree of challenge or the inclusion of opposing views<sup>17</sup>.

Ofcom recognises the importance of broadcasters being able to present challenging or contentious viewpoints in programmes, including in relation to public health policies. However, in this case we considered the Programme went beyond a debate of this nature and included serious claims that vaccines have been rolled out to populations without evidence of their efficacy and as part of a global agenda to achieve depopulation:

- *“[N]o clear data has been produced, substantiated with scientific proof, evidence that vaccines actually work. There’s been none to this day”;*
- *“Indeed, the world is beginning to find out the catastrophe that vaccines and vaccination enthusiasts have orchestrated since the introduction of vaccines to the world’s health system. But what many more now need to understand is that there has been an age long design to systematically inflict people with diseases in the hopes of achieving the depopulation agenda within a specific time frame”;*
- *“...people must understand that behind all forms of vaccine mandates prevalent is the depopulation agenda. So, the globalists are wielding the weapon of vaccines to summarily engineer a massive depopulation within a specific age group and projected time frame”;* and
- *“I understand that in some countries as well, they say that they want to vaccinate the young people, especially young ladies, against cancer. Another big lie”.*

Specifically, the Documentary appearing within the Programme which focused on the polio and HPV vaccines, also claimed that:

- *“Polio vaccine is the largest cause of polio in the world”;*
- *“The history of vaccination has spanned hundreds of years, replete with several fabricated and unscientific validations to assert its indispensability, but as well rattled with several stories of unprecedented ill health post-vaccination, especially in children”;*
- *“If you were deceived before, don’t be deceived anymore. And those of you who have just had babies, you better be careful because Satan is*

---

<sup>17</sup> Ofcom has published research [Health and wealth claims in programming: audience attitudes to potential harm](#), setting out audience views on the potential harm arising from programmes involving health or wealth claims.

*more vicious today than he ever was because his time is short and he's pushing them to get you vaccinated and get your babies vaccinated”;*

- *“You were deceived by the logic that if you, if you gave the person who was not sick, a little disease, you will become immune to that disease. It seems to make sense. But what we never asked ourselves was, what was the quality of the immunity before this so-called disease was passed into the person? And what was the measurement of his level of immunity after he got the vaccination? And what was the actual content of the vaccine? And what could have been in those vaccines that could have caused some other kinds of ailments or injuries? Did anybody check? Nobody checks”;*
- *“And suddenly, in certain societies in Africa and Asia, you have lots of crippled people. Suddenly so many with polio. Then we're told that, they're coming again for another vaccine against polio. Against polio? There was no polio in those societies until they were vaccinated. Check the history. Meaning the vaccines brought polio”;*
- *“When they test these kids. Why are they getting, why are they being paralysed? What they're finding is the virus that's paralysed them, or the polio, came from the vaccine itself. It has the fingerprint of the vaccine form of polio. So, in essence we essentially are causing polio outbreaks around the world”;* and
- *“Another very disruptive vaccine intrusion that has been pushed yet again under the disguise of preventing a certain type of cancer in young girls is the HPV vaccines. Different findings reveal the spike in cases of injuries to young girls who got injected with the HPV vaccines”.*

In the subsequent studio discussion, the presenters added that:

- *“Parents you should stand that way as well. Tell your daughters, your children, don't take any vaccine in school. Because they've come subtly to schools”;*
- *“They are using the schools. They are going to playgrounds, you know, they are doing a whole lot. They are doing a whole lot just to push their vaccines, you know, to champion their population reduction agenda”;* and
- *“Even those who were injured may not have linked it to the vaccine, but thought something else happened. But now they're realising that oh my, my child is autistic and when did they happen? Right after she took the vaccine”.*

In considering the potential for harm caused by the content, Ofcom took into account that polio is a serious viral infection that can be potentially life threatening, particularly for young children. Polio is described by the UK Government as a highly infectious vaccine-preventable disease which attacks the nervous system, can cause total paralysis within hours, and mainly affects children under the age

of 3<sup>18</sup>. Prior to the introduction of the polio vaccine in 1956, there were as many as 8,000 cases of polio in the UK in epidemic years.. Cases fell rapidly after the introduction of the polio vaccination to very low levels: between 1985 and 2002 a total of 40 cases were reported in the UK<sup>19</sup>. The polio vaccine is currently included in the NHS routine childhood vaccination schedule in the UK and is recommended by the health service as the best way of preventing polio<sup>20</sup>.

The HPV vaccine is currently recommended for children aged 12 to 13 and reduces the risk of getting human papillomavirus (HPV), a common virus that is spread through skin contact, usually when having sex, and which can cause several cancers including cervical cancer. NHS research suggests over time the HPV vaccine will help save thousands of lives in the UK<sup>21</sup>. Research published by Cancer Research UK in 2021 has shown that the HPV vaccine has reduced cervical cancer rates by almost 90% in women in their 20s who were offered it between the ages of 12 and 13<sup>22</sup>.

As set out in our Guidance to Section Two<sup>23</sup>, there is a higher level of potential harm where claims are made about the most serious medical conditions because the consequences of acting on advice relating to these conditions could be more significant. We considered both polio and cervical cancer to be among the most serious medical conditions and that the decision as to whether or not to take up either of these vaccines had the potential to carry significant health implications. Furthermore, as these vaccinations are given to children, it is vital that parents and carers are able to make properly informed choices on behalf of their children based on appropriately presented and contextualised information. As outlined above, Ofcom acknowledges the importance of broadcasters having the freedom to debate significant issues such as public health policies. We understand there are rare cases of vaccine-derived polio<sup>24</sup>, and evidence that vaccinations have caused serious side effects in some individuals. However, in our view, the Programme presented serious vaccine injuries – which it said included paralysis and autism – as widespread and endemic. While it is important that broadcasters are able to report on issues relating to vaccine side effects, we considered that the Programme also included numerous serious claims regarding the safety and efficacy of the polio and HPV vaccines, in particular.

Ofcom considered that these serious claims presented to viewers during the Programme had the potential to influence viewers’ decisions about vaccinations, which in turn could have significant consequences for their health and the health of their families. We therefore concluded that the health claims broadcast during the Programme had the potential to cause harm.

---

<sup>18</sup> See Gov.UK: <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/polio-guidance-data-and-analysis>

<sup>19</sup> See: <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a7a084140f0b66a2fbff665/Green-Book-Chapter-26-Polio-updated-18-January-2013.pdf>

<sup>20</sup> See NHS website: <https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/polio/>

<sup>21</sup> <https://www.nhs.uk/vaccinations/hpv-vaccine/>

<sup>22</sup> See Cancer Research UK: <https://news.cancerresearchuk.org/2021/11/03/the-power-of-science-hpv-vaccine-proven-to-dramatically-reduce-cervical-cancer/>

<sup>23</sup> See Footnote 17 above.

<sup>24</sup> See: <https://polioeradication.org/about-polio/the-virus/vaccine-derived-polioviruses/>

We considered the impact of these claims on the audience was further increased by accusations levelled at those providing the vaccine programmes (including governments and medical organisations) who were said to be engineering “*a massive depopulation agenda*”.

We also took into account that the potentially harmful claims were either made or endorsed by Pastor Chris, a figure of authority to viewers, and regularly referred to by the presenters as “*our man of God*”. In particular, during the Documentary, Pastor Chris maintained that “*all true scientific records show that the vaccines were never safe*”, that there was “[n]o scientific proof” that vaccines work, and that “*Satan*” is “*pushing them to get you vaccinated and get your babies vaccinated*”. As stated above, Ofcom’s Guidance to Section Two explains that if potentially harmful health claims are made by a speaker who is perceived by the audience as having authority, then there is more chance of them treating these claims as credible and making decisions based on them. Similarly, our research<sup>25</sup> indicates that potential for harm in religious programming is high as audiences are more inclined to believe in the authority of the speaker and any advice might be highly influential among a targeted and potentially vulnerable audience. In particular, our research found that documentaries shown on religious channels can carry greater potential for harm as viewers assume that the information provided has been well researched and can therefore be trusted. In this case, we noted the presenters introduced the Documentary as a programme from the “*man of God*” to “*help us see the light*” and later compared this revelation to the “*scales falling off the eyes of the Apostle Paul*”. When broadcast on a channel which “*primarily services Bible-reading Christians*”, these references would have been likely to have increased the authority of the Documentary and the claims made in it.

Furthermore, Ofcom considered the direct appeals to parents and carers further increased the potential harm as parents were openly encouraged to act on the information presented. At the beginning of the Documentary, Pastor Chris warned “*those of you who have just had babies*” to be careful because “*Satan is more vicious today than he ever was because his time is short and he's pushing them to get you vaccinated and get your babies vaccinated*”. Later in the Programme, the presenters urged parents to “[t]ell your daughters, your children, don't take any vaccine in school....tell your younger one, your children, and say, look, if anyone who comes say open your mouth, let me put something inside, say no”. The presenters went on to claim that schools and playgrounds are being used “*to champion their population reduction agenda*”. Ofcom noted that there was an absence of any opposing views, challenge or proper contextualisation to the serious claims, which further served to reinforce their authority and credibility.

Ofcom took account of the representations from the Licensee that it aims to provide educational and spiritually enriching content rooted in Christian teachings and is “*deeply committed to presenting Christian teachings and values through a lens that emphasises historical and cultural education*”. We emphasise that the Code does not prohibit programming which reflects the values and teachings of a particular religious community. However, such content must still comply with the Code and the broadcaster must ensure that audiences are appropriately protected from potentially harmful material.

### **Adequate protection**

As a result, and in reaching our Decision, we considered it was incumbent upon the Licensee, when broadcasting such content, to include adequate audience protection, in accordance with Rule 2.1. It is an editorial decision for the individual broadcaster as to how adequate protection might be

---

<sup>25</sup> See footnote 17 above.

achieved and our Guidance states that there are various methods broadcasters can consider. Broadcasters may choose to include a range of information to ensure that potentially harmful content is appropriately contextualised including, for example, challenge by a presenter or other guests. While each case will be different, it is important that broadcasters recognise that in order for protection to be adequate, the level of audience protection should be commensurate with the level of potential harm.

In considering whether the Programme provided adequate protection to its viewers, Ofcom recognised that Loveworld is a channel which aims to “provide educational and spiritually enriching content rooted in Christian teachings” and that it strives to “offer multiple viewpoints in our religious programming, promoting respectful and thoughtful exploration of religious subjects”. We were mindful of the expectations of viewers and agreed with the Licensee that in previous decisions Ofcom has confirmed that the Code permits “controversial content when appropriately contextualised”. We also agreed with Loveworld’s description of the relevant provisions of the ECHR; that Article 10 “supports the dissemination of religious ideas and beliefs through broadcasting, balanced against public safety” and Article 9 protects “freedom of thought, conscience, and religion, including the right to manifest one’s religion or beliefs”. However, these factors do not remove the Licensee’s obligations under the Code, or its responsibility to provide adequate protection to its viewers from potentially harmful material. This is especially the case where programmes present serious, potentially harmful claims about matters of particular importance to people’s lives such as their health.

We were very concerned that the claims regarding vaccine safety made in the Documentary and during the Programme were presented unchallenged, with the support of the studio presenters and without any other contextualising content or scientific scrutiny. While we acknowledged the Licensee’s assertion that it “strive[s] to offer multiple viewpoints in our religious programming”, we did not find any evidence of multiple viewpoints in the Programme or the Documentary. Where participants referred to denials of vaccine injuries or issues, these were swiftly dismissed (for example “*they say, it's nice, it's, it's OK. But all true scientific records show that the vaccines were never safe*”). We took account of our research into health and wealth claims in programming which found that there is a need to balance the rights of freedom of religion against the potential for harm in religious programming. While care needs to be taken not to undermine freedom of religion, it is possible to protect audiences by providing neutral warnings such as encouraging audiences to seek medical advice. While we found one reference in the Documentary which suggested to viewers that they should “*listen to everything and then...choose. What you do is your responsibility*”, we did not consider this singular phrase to constitute sufficient challenge or balance to the entirety of the remainder of the Programme. In reaching our Decision, we therefore concluded the level of protection provided to the audience was not commensurate with the level of potential harm.

Ofcom noted the examples of *Jerry Springer* and *The Great Global Warming Swindle*<sup>26</sup> provided by the Licensee. We accepted that both programmes contained controversial content and acknowledged that in both these cases the broadcasters were found by Ofcom to have appropriately contextualised their programming (although we noted that one part of *The Great Global Warming Swindle* was found in breach of Rules 5.11 and 5.12 relating to due impartiality). We therefore did not consider the circumstances of those decisions to be of relevance in this case.

---

<sup>26</sup> See footnotes 14 and 15 above.

We noted that in its initial representations before it was issued with Ofcom’s Preliminary View, Loveworld raised concerns about “potential disproportionate scrutiny” as Ofcom has previously imposed sanctions on it. As set out above, Ofcom was alerted to this content by a viewer complaint. We apply the Code in a balanced and impartial manner and without discriminating between licensed services. Ofcom took account of LL’s initial representations that it “fully complies with the Ofcom Broadcasting Code” and applies “standards that respect both local and global religious broadcasting norms”. However, in this case we considered that harmful claims relating to vaccine safety and efficacy were presented to the audience by figures of authority without any further information to substantiate, challenge or otherwise appropriately contextualise them.

We acknowledged that in response to our Preliminary View, Loveworld said it had broadcast a formal apology for the content on 13 December 2024 at 11:00 and again at 22:30 which it explained was the same time as *Echoes of Truth* had been broadcast. LL said this action reflected its commitment to acknowledging Ofcom’s concerns publicly. Ofcom welcomed LL’s public acknowledgement of the issues we had raised about this Programme and its decision to broadcast this statement during the same time slots as the original broadcast. However, we did not consider the public statement broadcast on 13 December 2024 served to provide adequate protection to the audience from the potential harm caused by the original Programme. This is because the public statement did not address any of the specific issues about the Programme or the potentially harmful claims it contained (for example, it did not indicate that viewers should seek medical advice before making decisions about their or their families’ health) and it was broadcast more than six months after the Programme had been shown.

Given all the factors above, we did not consider that the Licensee provided adequate protection to viewers from the potentially harmful material in the programme, in breach of Rule 2.1.

## Conclusion

---

Ofcom emphasises that broadcasters are free to transmit programmes which may be considered controversial and challenging, including in relation to public health policies. In considering this case, we had particular and careful regard to the rights set out in Articles 9 and 10 of the ECHR in relation to freedom of expression and freedom of thought, conscience and religion.

In this case, claims were made in the Programme about vaccines which reduce the instances and spread of serious medical conditions – those being polio and a viral infection which can cause several cancers – and claims were also made that the vaccination programme was part of a “*population reduction agenda*” and that there is “[n]o scientific proof. No clear data...that vaccines actually works [sic]. *There’s been none to this day*”. In our view these claims clearly had the potential to impact on viewers’ decisions about their health and the health of their families and were therefore potentially harmful. In accordance with Rule 2.1, the Licensee should have ensured that these comments were challenged or otherwise contextualised to provide adequate protection for the audience, which they were not.

Taking account of all the factors set out above, Ofcom’s Decision is that the Programme contained potentially harmful claims relating to vaccine safety and efficacy without adequate protection for the audience, and was therefore in breach of Rule 2.1.

We are particularly concerned that Loveworld has incurred another breach of Rule 2.1, its fifth breach of this rule since June 2020, and following Ofcom’s imposition of a statutory sanction in

December 2022 for the broadcast of potentially harmful content in September 2021<sup>27</sup>. It is a matter of great concern that this breach of Rule 2.1 has occurred despite the previous assurances made by the Licensee to Ofcom regarding its improved compliance procedures.

**Given the circumstances of this case, Ofcom considers that this breach is serious and – in light of the Licensee’s compliance history – repeated. We will therefore consider this breach for the imposition of a statutory sanction. This is the initial view of the breach decision-maker. It will be reconsidered by the Sanction Panel.**

**We acknowledged the steps the Licensee said it has already taken to improve its compliance with Rule 2.1 and to address the issues raised by Ofcom, including further training to its staff and presenters, improved monitoring and feedback mechanisms and enhanced editorial oversight of content which might contain public health or sensitive topics. We also acknowledged LL’s decision to broadcast a public statement on two occasions which it explained was to publicly acknowledge Ofcom’s concerns. These representations will be considered by the Sanction Panel during the sanctions process.**

**Breach of Rule 2.1**

---

<sup>27</sup> See Ofcom [Sanction Decision, Loveworld Limited](#) published on 5 December 2022.