

the **bulletin**

No68

Embargoed until
0001 Tuesday 30 September 2003

As an independent organisation, the Broadcasting Standards Commission considers the portrayal of violence, sexual conduct and matters of taste and decency in television and radio programmes and advertisements. It also provides redress for people who believe they have been unfairly treated or subjected to an unwarranted infringement of privacy.

Complaints about standards and fairness

To consider and adjudicate on complaints the Commission has the power to:

- require recordings of broadcast material;
- call for written statements;
- hold hearings about the detail of what has been broadcast.

All the Commission's findings are reported in this regular bulletin. An on-line version is available on www.bsc.org.uk

The Commission can also require broadcasters to publish summaries of its decisions either on-air or in a newspaper or magazine and report on any action they might have taken as a result.

Fairness Complaints Page 1-2

Standards Complaints Page 3-21

The Commissioners

The Lord Dubs of Battersea (*Chairman*)

The Lady Warner (*Deputy Chairman*)

David Boulton

Uday Dholakia

Geoff Elliott

Strachan Heppell CB

Rt. Rev. Richard Holloway

Rev. Rose Hudson-Wilkin

Sally O'Sullivan

Maggie Redfern

Kath Worrall

Paul Bolt *Director*

For information contact:

Robin Hull, Communications Manager 020 7808 1017

Web site: www.bsc.org.uk

fairness

Complaints about unjust or unfair treatment can only be made by participants in programmes who were the subject of the treatment or by those who had a direct interest in the treatment's subject matter. Complaints of unwarranted infringement can only be made by those whose privacy was infringed. In considering the facts of the case, the Commission always studies written exchanges of evidence and sometimes holds a hearing with both the complainant and the broadcasters present.

Copies of full adjudications on all the following complaints – whether upheld or not – are available from The Broadcasting Standards Commission, 7 The Sanctuary, London SW1P 3JS. Please enclose a stamped addressed envelope. Alternatively you can email your request to adj@bsc.org.uk

Upheld

The Breakfast Show

LBC Radio, 20 February 2003

Complaint from Automotive Supplies (a partnership)

The Broadcasting Standards Commission has upheld a complaint of unjust or unfair treatment from Automotive Supplies about an edition of The Breakfast Show broadcast by LBC Radio, during which the presenter related details of an incident in which she had locked her possessions in her motorbike. The presenter said that employees of Automotive Supplies had refused to allow her to use their telephone to contact a locksmith.

The Commission considered that, by using the programme to broadcast only her own version of the incident, the presenter misused her position. She failed to mention in her account of the incident that the firm had allowed her to make one free call before refusing further

use of their phone. It noted that the firm was repeatedly named, albeit slightly incorrectly, and its address broadcast, along with the presenter saying on air that she wanted to “make them squirm”. Although a colleague of the presenter commented that it was “only fair” to give the firm an opportunity to respond, and said that this would be done later in the programme, an editorial decision was taken that this was unnecessary.

The Commission found that in all these matters the programme was unfair to the firm.

Accordingly, the complaint was upheld.

Upheld

The Commission directed LBC to broadcast the summary on LBC Radio on 22 September 2003. It also directed LBC to publish the summary in the Evening Standard on 22 September 2003.

Panorama: *Bent Cop*

BBC 1, 3 December 2000

Complaint from Mr Robert Clark

The Broadcasting Standards Commission has upheld in part a complaint of unjust or unfair treatment from Mr Robert Clark about an edition of Panorama entitled Bent Cop broadcast by BBC1 on 3 December 2000. The programme looked at the story of a former police officer whose confessions of crime had been part of a major drive against police corruption. Mr Clark had been convicted and imprisoned for offences arising from this and described by the judge as the prime mover.

The Commission considered that it was acceptable to portray Mr Clark as being present during two incidents at which he had in fact been present. However, it took the view that the programme should not simply have presented Mr Clark as guilty of offences, allegedly committed during those incidents, which he had denied and of which he had not been convicted. This was unfair.

The Commission noted that Mr Clark refused to talk to the programme-makers prior to his convictions and that post-conviction attempts were made to contact him through friends, family and his solicitors. The

programme-makers were told there would be no comment. It also noted that his solicitors had declined to comment on his behalf during the course of the trials. But since the programme clearly implied he was guilty of offences of which he was not convicted, the Commission took the view that the programme-makers should have tried to contact Mr Clark directly post-conviction, informed him of the substance of all relevant and material allegations that were to be included in the programme and provided him with an adequate and timely opportunity to respond to these. The failure to do so was unfair to Mr Clark.

The Commission considered that it was clear from the programme that Mr Clark continued to deny the charges of which he was convicted and noted that, at the time of broadcast, his appeals, which were in the event unsuccessful, had not yet been decided. The Commission also considered it likely that viewers would have understood that Mr Clark, an experienced police officer, was acting on legal advice in deciding how to respond during his police interview. In these respects, the Commission found no unfairness.

Accordingly, the complaint was upheld in part.

Upheld in Part

Insight: *Out of the Ashes*

UTV, 12 December 2002

Complaint from Mr Neil Graham

The Broadcasting Standards Commission has upheld a complaint of unjust or unfair treatment from Mr Neil Graham about Insight: Out of the Ashes, broadcast by UTV on 12 December 2002. The programme alleged that Mr Graham had had a relationship with Mrs Julie McGinley while both of them were in prison.

The Commission, while accepting that UTV felt unable to identify their confidential sources, considered that the allegations were extremely serious for Mr Graham. It noted that further inquiry by UTV would have revealed a clear discrepancy in the dates during which the alleged

relationship was supposed to have taken place and it considered that the information provided by the sources was not in itself sufficient to justify making the allegations, which would clearly have been denied had they been put to Mr Graham. In all the circumstances, the Commission found that Mr Graham had been treated unfairly in the programme.

Accordingly, the complaint was upheld.

Upheld

The Commission directed UTV to broadcast the summary on 28 August 2003 at 2300 on ITV1. It also directed UTV to publish the summary in the Belfast Telegraph on 28 August 2003.

First Sight: On a Knife Edge

BBC2, 7 February 2002

The Broadcasting Standards Commission has upheld a complaint of unwarranted infringement of privacy from Mr Tom Pontifex about First Sight: On a Knife Edge broadcast by BBC2 on 7 February 2002. The programme examined the work of the Helicopter Emergency Medical Service and included footage of the Service providing medical attention to Mr Pontifex at the scene of a multiple stabbing at Euston Station.

*Upheld***Model Behaviour**

Channel 4, 4 October 2002

Complaint from Ms Nicola Spence

The Broadcasting Standards Commission has upheld a complaint of unjust or unfair treatment from Ms Nicola Spence about an edition of Model Behaviour which documented the search for two supermodels. Ms Spence was featured in the programme and was referred to as “the transsexual” by the judges.

The Commission noted that Ms Spence was not aware of the reference to her as “the transsexual” until the programme was broadcast.

The Commission accepted that, as a participant in a televised modelling competition, Ms Spence could reasonably be expected to have foreseen that she might be the subject of critical comments by the judges about her looks. It considered, however, that the description “the transsexual” was inaccurate and considerably more hurtful than the type of remark that Ms Spence could reasonably have anticipated.

In these circumstances, the Commission found unfairness to Ms Spence.

Accordingly, the complaint was upheld.

Upheld

The Commission directed Channel 4 Television to publish the summary on Channel 4 on 19 August 2003. It also directed Channel 4 Television publish the summary in The Radio Times on 19 August 2003.

TV3 Direkt

TV3 Sweden

Complaint from Advokatfirman Vinge KB (Lawyers) on behalf of Bostads AB Poseidon (a company)

The Broadcasting Standards Commission has upheld a complaint of unjust or unfair treatment from Advokatfirman Vinge KB on behalf of Bostads AB Poseidon about an edition of TV3 Direkt broadcast by TV3 Sweden, which included a report on steps taken by the company to stop tenants from fixing satellite dishes to the outside of their properties.

The Commission found unfairness to the company in the inaccurate and misleading statements in the programme that the company’s tenants had been threatened with eviction for simply possessing a satellite dish. In the Commission’s view the programme failed to represent fairly and accurately the action taken by the company and the proper reasons for the prohibition of dishes.

The Commission was firmly of the opinion that the press reporting of the company did not justify the description in the programme of the company as “scandal-prone” and therefore found unfairness to the company in this respect.

The Commission also found that the programme-makers failed to outline clearly the substance of all relevant and material allegations to the company and that the company had not been given an adequate and timely opportunity to respond or comment on the material included in the programme.

Accordingly, the complaint was upheld.

Upheld

A full copy of the adjudication can be obtained by sending a stamped addressed envelope to: the Broadcasting Standards Commission, 7 The Sanctuary, London, SW1P 3JS. A copy of the summary is available on the Commission’s website at www.bsc.org.uk.

The Commission directed TV3 Sweden to broadcast the summary on TV3 Sweden on 13 August 2003. It also directed TV3 Sweden to publish the summary in Göteborgs-Posten on 13 August 2003.

Not upheld complaints

<i>Broadcast</i>	<i>Programme</i>	<i>Date of complaint/Complainant</i>	<i>Nature of complaint</i>
SC4 26.2.03	Y Byd Ar Bedwar	17.3.03 Mrs Annette Corrigan	Unjust /unfair treatment
Channel 4 6.8.02	Ken Dodd in the Dock	4.11.02 Lewis Silkin (Solicitors) on behalf of Mr Ken Dodd and Ms Anne Jones	Unjust/unfair treatment and unwarranted infringement of privacy
BBC1 04.03.03	Watchdog	25.3.03 Mr Damian O'Connor on his own behalf and on behalf of Models Direct	Unjust or unfair treatment
BBC1 7.10.02	Inside Out	19.11.02 Cutts Brothers Limited	Unjust or unfair treatment
BBC Radio 4 02.07.02	File on Four	9.9.02 Professor David Southall on behalf of Professor Sir Roy Meadow	Unjust or unfair treatment

Resolved complaints

Meridian Focus: *Cheat Lines*

ITV (Meridian), 3 September 2002

The Broadcasting Standards Commission received a complaint of unjust or unfair treatment from the Telecommunications UK Fraud Forum Limited (“TUFF”) on behalf of the members of the telecommunications industry about Meridian Focus: Cheat Lines broadcast by Meridian Television on 3 September 2002. Following the commencement of relevant legal proceedings the Commission decided that it would not be appropriate to proceed further with the complaint.

Swag

Channel 5, 23 March 2003

The Broadcasting Standards Commission received a complaint from Mr Israel Harriott of unjust or unfair treatment about Swag, broadcast by Channel 5 on 23 March 2003. The Commission arranged a hearing, which was cancelled as Mr Harriott indicated that he wished to withdraw his complaint. In the circumstances, the Commission decided that it would be inappropriate to proceed with consideration of the complaint.

The Today Programme

BBC Radio 4, 23 June 2003

The Broadcasting Standards Commission received a complaint from Mr Daniel Glover of unwarranted infringement of privacy about The Today Programme, broadcast by BBC Radio 4 on 23 June 2003. The BBC upheld his complaint to the BBC's Programme Complaints Unit. As a result, the complainant informed the Commission that he considered this to be a satisfactory conclusion. The Commission decided it would not be appropriate to proceed further with the complaint.

The Today Programme

BBC Radio 4, 23 June 2003

The Broadcasting Standards Commission received a complaint from Mr Howard Somerville of unwarranted infringement of privacy about The Today Programme, broadcast by BBC Radio 4 on 23 June 2003. The BBC upheld his complaint to the BBC's Programme Complaints Unit. As a result, the complainant informed the Commission that he considered this to be a satisfactory conclusion. The Commission decided it would not be appropriate to proceed further with the complaint.

Wales This Week

HTV, 11 July 2003

The Broadcasting Standards Commission received a complaint from Mr Haydn Williams on his own behalf of unjust or unfair treatment and unwarranted infringement of privacy and of unwarranted infringement of privacy on behalf of his son, Max Williams (a minor). The Commission arranged a hearing, which was postponed at the request of Mr Williams. Mr Williams failed to confirm that he would attend a hearing on the new date arranged. In the circumstances, the Commission, decided that it would be inappropriate to proceed with consideration of the complaint.

Living with Michael Jackson

ITV 1 (Granada), 3rd February 2003

The Broadcasting Standards Commission received a complaint of unjust or unfair treatment and unwarranted infringement of privacy from Theodore Goddard on behalf of Mr Michael Jackson about Living with Michael Jackson broadcast by Granada Television on 3 February 2003. Following the commencement of relevant legal proceedings the Commission decided not to proceed with consideration of the complaint.

The Broadcasting Standards Commission also received a complaint of unwarranted infringement of privacy from Theodore Goddard on behalf of Gavin, Davellin and Star Arvizo about the same programme. The complainants indicated a wish to withdraw and the Commission decided that it would not be appropriate to proceed further with the complaint.

standards

Complaints about standards (violence, sex, or issues of taste and decency such as bad language or the treatment of disasters) can be made by anyone who has seen or heard the broadcast. In reaching a decision to uphold or not uphold a complaint, the code and research into public attitudes are considered alongside the material and its context. Standards complaints are considered by a Standards Panel in the first instance, and can be referred to the Standards Committee and/or the full Commission.

Resolved complaints

King of Skate

Extreme Sports Channel, 28 March 2003, 1800-2000

The Complaint

A viewer complained about swearing in a programme watched by children.

The Extreme Sports Channel said that it agreed that it was completely inappropriate for a programme broadcast at that time of day to include such language. There were two versions of this programme, one for broadcast pre-Watershed with the language edited, and one for late night broadcast. Unfortunately the versions had been incorrectly labelled and the post-Watershed version had been played by mistake. The broadcaster listed a number of steps that had been taken to improve its programme compliance procedure and extended its apologies to the complainant.

Outcome

A Standards Panel watched the item, noting the broadcaster's apology and action taken to prevent a re-occurrence. In the circumstances, the Panel considered that it was inappropriate to continue with consideration of the complaint.

CN 11210

Girls Behaving Badly

Paramount Comedy, 30 May, 7 & 8 June 2003, 2000-2030

The Complaint

Two viewers complaint about crudity, sexual content and antisocial behaviour, inappropriate for pre-Watershed transmission.

Paramount Comedy said that this acquired programme had been shown in prime time and daytime periods in the US. It had judged the humour of hidden camera comedy to be an appropriate alternative to the soap operas broadcast on terrestrial channels at this early evening time. However, it was clear from viewers' responses that many felt it to be in bad taste, and the programme had immediately (from 10 June) been switched from 8 pm to post – 10pm.

Outcome

A Standards Panel watched these episodes of the candid camera comedy programme. In view of the broadcaster's apology and swift action to avoid giving any further offence, it decided that it would be the inappropriate to proceed with further consideration of the complaints.

CN 11598/11644/11645

Bid Up Savings

Bid Up TV, 12 June 2003, 1920-2000

The Complaint

A viewer complained about an insensitive comment that mocked people suffering from epilepsy.

Bid Up TV apologised for the distressed caused by the comment and said that it had taken the opportunity to remind the presentation team to take into account any viewer group which could take offence at any comments or quips and the unsuitability of any disability being used in the context of a joke or description of a product.

Outcome

A Standards Panel noted the broadcaster's apology and action taken to prevent a re-occurrence. In the circumstances, the Panel considered that it was inappropriate to continue with consideration of the complaint.

CN 11672

Channel 4 News

Channel 4, 18 June 2003, 1900-1955

The Complaint

A viewer complained about the broadcast of detailed, distressing footage when children could be watching.

Channel 4 said that the report about an Iranian man who had set himself on fire was an important news story. The team was aware of the sensitive nature of the story and the newsreader had given a warning about the footage before it was shown. However, when the item was broadcast, senior editorial staff at Channel 4 and ITN took the view that a much shorter extract should have been used which did not show the point at which the man actually set himself on fire. Channel 4 apologised to the complainant and said that such footage should have been referred to an experienced compliance lawyer for consideration of its suitability. Unfortunately this procedure was not followed on this occasion and steps had been taken to ensure that it did not happen again.

Outcome

A Standards Panel watched the item and noted the footage in question. In view of the broadcaster's apology and action taken to prevent a re-occurrence, the Panel considered that it was inappropriate to continue with consideration of the complaint.

CN 11696

Lights, Camera, Accident

Five, 11 May 2003, 2000-2030

The Complaint

Thirty viewers complained about distressing images which appeared to show the mistreatment of a toddler by an adult.

Five said that the clip shown had been within a segment of the programme entitled 'BAD PARENTING' and that it would have been clear to anyone watching that this was not the sort of behaviour one would expect from any reasonable parent. The footage was clearly not commissioned for the programme, or even filmed in this country and it is likely that sensibilities regarding treatment of children in the Eastern bloc (from whence the footage originated) were less easily offended.

Five added. "Nethertheless, being mindful of our obligations as a public service broadcaster, we would not wish to cause unnecessary offence to viewers. The NSPCC guidance we have received will be applied to any future programmes of this genre featuring children and we have elected to remove the item entirely from any future broadcast of this programme."

Outcome

A Standards Panel watched this programme. In view of the broadcaster's apology and subsequent action, it decided that it would be inappropriate to proceed with further consideration of the complaints.

CN 11436.30

Live Floor Show

BBC2, 15 February 2003, 2255-2355

The Complaint

A viewer complained about a joke alluding to sexual intercourse with 14-year-old girls.

The BBC pointed out that the programme was a late-evening comedy show, which viewers realised was likely to include material which was 'close to the edge'. However, it agreed that the double entendre complained of had gone beyond acceptable limits.

Outcome

A Standards Panel watched the sequence in question, which was part of one of the stand up routines included in this late-night comedy programme. It noted the broadcaster's acknowledgement that it was unacceptable, even in this context, to make light of children being sexually molested. It concluded that in the light of this response it was inappropriate to proceed further with consideration of the complaint.

CN 10922

Ed Douglas Breakfast Show

BBC Southern Counties Radio, 2 February 2003, 0600-0900

The Complaint

A listener complained about insensitive criticism of people suffering from depression.

The BBC said that the presenter had questioned whether depression was in some cases as serious as people made out. Although his remarks had perhaps been in dubious taste, the presenter's own acceptance later in the programme that he had made a mistake and his apology had been sufficient to ameliorate any offence caused to listeners.

Outcome

A Standards Panel listened to the programme and acknowledged the presenter's apology and acceptance of his mistake. It took the view that in light of this response, it would be inappropriate to proceed further with the consideration of the complaint.

CN 11238

Football Heaven

BBC Radio Sheffield, 26 May 2003, 1800-1900

The Complaint

A listener complained about the use of swear words on two occasions in this programme in which football fans talked about recent matches.

The BBC said that the decision to let the first word go by without comment, taken on the spur of the moment during a live broadcast, had been correct. However, the second term had not been suitable for this type of programme. It would have been better had the presenter apologised at once. The managing editor had told the presenter that it had been a mistake not to apologise and not to have distanced the programme and the station from this type of language.

Outcome

A Standards Panel listened to the programme. It considered that the use of the phrase "pisses off" had not exceeded that acceptable for broadcast in this programme. However, it agreed that the second term had been unacceptable and acknowledged the broadcaster's recognition of error and subsequent action. It took the view that in light of this response, it would be inappropriate to proceed further with the consideration of the complaint.

CN 11614

Breakfast

BBC1, 28 April 2003, 0600-0900

The Complaint

A viewer complained about a reference to sex toys in a breakfast-time interview.

The BBC said that this was an unfortunate and unforeseen reference in a live interview. The presenter had intervened immediately to close down the line of discussion, and indeed the interview as a whole. The reference was not advertised or explained. As a result of this firm but good-humoured intervention, the impact of the lapse had been minimised.

Outcome

A Standards Panel watched the interview concerned. It took into account the broadcaster's recognition of error and the prompt and effective action taken by the presenter. In the circumstances it considered that it was inappropriate to proceed further with consideration of the complaint.

CN 11400

Upheld complaints

The News Quiz

BBC Radio 4, 23 November 2003, 1230-1300

The Complaint

A listener complained about a homophobic reference.

The Broadcaster's Statement

The BBC said that the term complained of in its slang sense was not a synonym for homosexual – it can also connote nothing more than effeminacy. It is not a straightforward term of homophobic insult in the way others might be, and a good deal gentler than most.

The broadcaster said that the unusual context (a question about a National Trust/Royal Horticultural Society report on climate change) probably also played a part; the incongruity of a joke involving sexual stereotypes in these circumstances was more a source of humour than the stereotypes themselves.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel listened to this edition of the well-established topical quiz programme. It noted a word play based on 'pansy' and took the view that although the panel member had attempted a light-hearted joke on the issue in question, the humour, based on a negative sexual stereotype, had gone beyond acceptable boundaries for broadcast. The complaint was upheld.

Upheld

CN 10387

Trailer for Taken

BBC2, 18 January 2003, 1710

The Complaint

A viewer complained about frightening content unsuitable for broadcast before the Watershed.

The Broadcaster's Statement

The BBC said that it was never easy to make judgements about the scheduling of trails to promote a later programme, as children's reactions differed and parents had differing views as to what was acceptable for their families. It said that a trail shown during the day or early evening had to achieve two objectives, to convey the nature of the programme so viewers could decide if it was likely to appeal to them and were not caught unawares, and also to remain acceptable for a family audience. It was a difficult balancing act. In this case, the schedulers tried not to place the trail at a time when the youngest children were likely to be watching, but felt it was suitable for family viewing and aimed to place it between programmes with predominantly older audiences.

The broadcaster said that it thought most of the scheduler's judgements were correct and the trail was suitable for the majority of its pre-Watershed placings. However, it was concerned that there were one or two occasions when the transmission decision did not take full account of the possibility that younger children might be particularly likely to see the trail, although that would have been less to be expected in this particular programme junction (between Colombo and World Indoor Bowls). The BBC accepted that the menacing atmosphere, and the sound of someone experiencing pain, went beyond what many parents would consider appropriate for such children to see, and apologised to the complainant for the distress her son was caused.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel watched this trailer and it agreed that the menacing content was unsuitable for broadcast at this juncture. Accordingly, the complaint was upheld.

Upheld

CN 10689

SM:TV Live

ITV1, 8 March 2003, 0925-1130

The Complaint

Two viewers complained about sexual content inappropriate for the time of transmission.

The Broadcaster's Statement

Granada Television said that the tone of the comic sketches had been fairly constant throughout and had an element of wordplay, some occasional innuendo and double entendre. The producers took care in pitching this type of humour at a level where older children would understand any secondary meaning, but where the primary "innocent" meaning remained firmly in place.

It said the sketch did employ some innuendo to create an "accidental" ribald meaning. However, all the script references were consistent with a gardening and DIY show premise and the presenters used visual signifiers reinforcing the ostensible meaning of what they were doing.

Granada said that "marrows" were not commonly used in a vulgar sense and given the clear visual context it did not consider the words "prick" and "knobs" were used gratuitously or offensively. It said the quickfire slapstick style, and the visual and verbal ingenuity of the sketch would not have caused widespread offence or exceeded viewers' expectations, given the established tone and parameters of the programme's brand of humour.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel watched the gardening and DIY comedy sketches. It took the view that the string of double entendres and innuendo had exceeded that acceptable for inclusion in a programme aimed at a child audience. The complaints were upheld

Upheld

CN 11043.2

Hellraiser's Handbook

Bravo, 6 March 2003, 2335-0005

The Complaint

A viewer complained about nudity and scenes of sexual activity.

The Broadcaster's Statement

Flextech Television said that the series was targeted at men aged between 16 and 34 years of age and was broadcast well after the Watershed. It focussed on the glamorous world of rock and roll and the associated myths and legends. This edition in the series included a light-hearted examination of a myth relating to Marianne Faithful. The fun piece of consumer research demonstrated effectively that the myth was farcical in its allegation that sexual satisfaction could be obtained in the manner suggested in the myth.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel viewed this edition of the programme targeted at a young male audience, noting its earthy humour. It acknowledged that much of the programme's content was in keeping with the tone set by the series and while not to everyone's taste would have been unlikely to have caused offence to the majority of viewers. However, in the Commission's view scenes showing a porn actress inserting a variety of chocolate confectionary in her vagina, although partially obscured, had been explicit and prolonged and had exceeded acceptable boundaries for broadcast on an unencrypted channel. The complaint was upheld.

Upheld

CN 11197

Fear Factor

Sky One, 25 March 2003, 2000-2100

The Complaint

A viewer complained about the mistreatment of animals for entertainment purposes.

The Broadcaster's Statement

BSkyB said that stunts were researched and controlled, and occasionally had included worms, which were eaten in certain parts of the world. Whilst the stunts were not encouraged and may not have been to each and everyone's programme taste, within this particular programme format, they do not seem to cause general offence in the UK or abroad.

BSkyB added that it remained sensitive to the need for fair and ethical treatment of animals. All stunts involving animals were approached with extreme sensitivity. Animal handlers were on the set of Fear Factor at all times to ensure their safety.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel watched this edition of the game show, in which contestants faced a challenge involving the consumption of live insects. The Panel considered that the graphic and extended footage of the consumption and treatment of the insects, purely for the purposes of entertainment, had exceeded acceptable boundaries. The complaint was upheld.

Upheld

CN 11212

Buffy the Vampire Slayer: Seeing Red

BBC2, 8 May 2003, 1845-1930

The Complaint

Seven viewers complained about homosexual content. Two were also concerned about the depiction of an attempted rape and one mentioned violent content inappropriate for pre-Watershed broadcast.

The Broadcaster's Statement

The BBC said that most episodes of Buffy were filled with all kinds of bizarre events, often involving cartoon-like violence and sometimes encounters which were more serious. In this episode, it didn't feel Spike's confrontation with the heroine exceeded expectations for most viewers.

This time slot was aimed at viewers at an age where they could take in their stride the fantasy and portrayals of a limited amount of intimacy in relationships.

Tara and Willow's status as an 'item' had been established since series 4. Although the scene between the two young women was not a brief one, it did have particular dramatic significance, as it set up the powerful finale to this episode – Tara's shooting by Warren. For those who were not regular viewers, their sexual

orientation had been made clear in the recapitulation sequence at the start of the episode.

Certainly, no sexual activity was shown, and both participants remained adequately covered throughout. The protagonists were young women in their twenties in a long – term relationship. Especially in the light of what happens later in the episode, most of those watching would, the BBC felt, have found the opening sequence disturbing for its poignancy rather than its frankness.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel watched this episode of the well-established sci-fi fantasy series. It noted the opening sequences which contained brief homosexual scenes and references through the episode. It also noted violent sequences, predominantly, between the two main characters, Buffy and Spike. The Panel took the view that the cumulative effect of homosexual references and violent sequences which included fighting, an attempted rape and a shooting had meant that the episode strayed from the fantasy element that audiences would have expected and had gone beyond acceptable boundaries for the time of transmission. The complaints were upheld.

Upheld

CN 11437.7

Your Face or Mine?

Channel 4, 16 May 2003, 1800-1830

The Complaint

A viewer complained about an explicit sexual comment inappropriate for the time of broadcast.

The Broadcaster's Statement

Channel 4 said that this game show challenged contestants to predict how gorgeous – or gruesome – people really thought they were. Each show featured a different couple who were asked to judge how good-looking they and their partner were compared to members of the audience, friends and ex-partners. This comment occurred during the second part of this episode, in which the presenter said that the woman who appeared in a picture looked like a man. He then went to speak to the woman, who was a member of the audience. Following the comment that if the woman were a man, she'd be twice the man the presenter was, he replied "what, are you saying she has a bigger cock than me?".

Channel 4 considered that the comment was in keeping with the irreverent and quirky tone of the programme. The humour was not intended to be salacious or gratuitous, but funny because it was an anatomical reference to a body part that the woman clearly didn't have.

The Commission's Finding

The Standards Committee watched this edition of the series and noted the comment in question. It took the view that while the comment might have been in keeping with the tone of the programme, it crossed the boundaries of acceptability for broadcast in the early evening. The complaint was upheld.

Upheld

CN 11495

Trailer for Jism

Zee TV, 27 May 2003, various times

The Complaint

A viewer complained of inappropriate sexual behaviour portrayed in a trail for the film, broadcast before the Watershed.

The Broadcaster's Statement

Zee TV, a subscription based premium channel with a Watershed of 8.00p.m., said the film – a well known blockbuster from Bollywood – has a classification of 15 and was scheduled to start after 8.30p.m.. The trail was

Jonathan Ross

BBC Radio 2, 19 April 2003, 1000-1300

The Complaint

Two listeners complained about the graphic description of bodily functions. Another listener complained about an offensive remark regarding children with disabilities.

The Broadcaster's Statement

The BBC acknowledged that some people would have found the remarks about breaking wind distasteful, but it did not consider that they had been unacceptable in such a well-established programme, whose audience was largely adult. As to a remark about children on "a Variety bus", there had been no cruel or malicious intent on the presenter's part, the reference had been meant to characterise, in a good-humoured way, the lack of obvious physical strength of one of his colleagues. It had not been directed at disabled children. The BBC said that the presenter's element of self-deprecation in tone and content would have made a major contribution to neutralising any potential widespread offence in both regards.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel listened to the programme. It took the view that the references to flatulence would not have exceeded the expectations of the majority listening. However, it considered that, notwithstanding the presenter's well-established approach and style, the use of the allusion to disabled children in a manner intended to disparage a colleague had exceeded acceptable boundaries for transmission. This aspect of the complaint was upheld.

Upheld in Part

CN 11354.3

scheduled throughout the day and had been edited appropriately.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel watched the trail. It considered that, notwithstanding the publicity surrounding the film and the fact that it appeared on a premium channel, some of the sexual content in the trail had exceeded acceptable boundaries for transmission during the daytime. The complaint was upheld.

Upheld

CN 11571

News

Sky News, 12 July 2003, 1500

The Complaint

Fourteen viewers complained about the insensitive and offensive treatment of an air crash in which two pilots died.

The Broadcasters's Statement

Sky News said it believed that it had handled the story effectively and sensitively as details of the story emerged over a period of time. The reporter on the scene and the presenters in the studio combined to tell viewers what they knew and to update the story as more information became available.

Sky had its own outside broadcast unit at the event and showed long-distance pictures of the aftermath very shortly after the crash. It also spoke to an eye-witness who described what happened. About half an hour after the story broke it was given video footage of the crash taken by a production company that was recording the

whole airshow. This was transmitted with, Sky believed, an appropriately serious and respectful commentary.

Sky News believed it was an important news story which had been reported fairly and without undue sensation. It would not have been right or realistic to hold the story back until the next of kin had been informed, which could have been hours later or even the following day. It understood the upsetting impact that the story would have had on some viewers.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel watched the item, which included footage of a vintage airplane crashing at an airshow. The Panel considered that the repeated use of the footage showing the moment of impact, in addition to that of the wreckage, had been gratuitous. This was exacerbated by the insensitive nature of some aspects of the commentary and visual treatment of the tragedy. The complaints were upheld.

Upheld

CN 11772.14

19 September 2003

Following the publication of a Finding for CSI: Crime Scene Investigation in Bulletin 67, Five contacted the Commission seeking clarification of the decision. The following Finding has therefore been amended to clarify the point at issue.

CSI: Crime Scene Investigation: *Let the Seller Beware*

Five, 11 February 2003, 2100-2150

The Complaint

A viewer complained about the sanguine and detailed examination of a mutilated corpse which they considered inappropriate in the context of this series. The viewer also questioned whether a warning had been provided.

The Broadcaster's Statement

Five pointed out that only the face and wounds of the body had been shown, not the naked cadaver. The close examination of bodies, and use of special effects to create visually vivid flashbacks, were a well-established feature of the series, which was widely known and praised for its accuracy in depicting the work of forensic scientists. The material shown had been necessary to the story, and had

not been presented sensationally or salaciously. Nevertheless, Five would take care in future to alert viewers to any particularly graphic or gory material.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel viewed this episode of the long running crime series about the cases tackled by a forensic science team. It recognised the well-established reputation of the series for detailed, and on occasion lurid, exposition of physical injuries, and the associated emphasis in the drama on the necessary detachment displayed by the scientists. The Panel did, however, consider that the graphic scene in question should not have been shown without a warning so soon after the Watershed. On that basis, the complaint was upheld in part.

Upheld in Part

CN 10891

Not upheld complaints

The Basil Brush Show

CBBC, 13 January 2003, 1500-1520

The Complaint

A viewer complained about sexual content.

The Broadcaster's Statement

The BBC said that the incidents complained of were essentially no different from the kind of thing that could be seen in any children's pantomime. The atmosphere was one of anarchic fun, dominated by Basil's cheery wordplay and raucous "Boom-boom".

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel watched this edition of the children's entertainment programme. It took the view that neither the scenes of a woman putting money down her top and dancing nor those of a man who stripped to his boxer shorts had been intended as sexual gestures and that they had not exceeded acceptable boundaries for the time of broadcast. The complaint was not upheld.

Not Upheld

CN 10639

Easy Money: *The Money Shot*

BBC2, 23 January 2003, 2150-2230

The Complaint

Two viewers complained about obscene sexual content.

The Broadcaster's Statement

The BBC said that this story of a would-be porn "star" and her ageing partner/ director/producer had not been titillating. The ethos of the series in which the programme appeared was primarily investigative and just enough had been shown to make clear what the line of "work" in this case involved.

The effect on the personality and emotions of those living in the type of environment portrayed was clear throughout and the overall impression the programme conveyed was of sadness and squalor.

Proper efforts had been made to alert viewers to what they were likely to see through the Radio Times and through an announcement before transmission warning of nudity, scenes with sexual content and strong language right from the start. The programme had begun nearly an hour after the Watershed and its content had been approved at a senior editorial level before transmission. In these circumstances, the BBC did not consider that the programme was likely to have offended many viewers.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel watched the programme. It noted its investigative nature and the warnings given before transmission. The Panel considered that, in these circumstances, the programme had not exceeded acceptable boundaries and was unlikely to have exceeded the expectations of the majority of the audience for a programme of this nature broadcast post-Watershed on this minority channel. The complaints were not upheld.

Not Upheld

CN 10727.2

Barbara: Kirsty

ITV1, 16 March 2003, 1900-1930

The Complaint

A viewer complained about sexual content inappropriate for the time of transmission.

The Broadcaster's Statement

Carlton said that much of the humour in the scene in which the lead character found her son handcuffed to the bed, was derived from the way he introduced his new girlfriend, Kirsty, to his parents, and the way they chatted forgetting their embarrassing location. It was a deliberately comical scene and at no time did the dialogue refer to sexual matters. The couple were not seen in bed together and there was no nudity.

In the scene where Kirsty jumped out of bed telling her boyfriend she did not want their wedding to be tacky, the humour was generated from her outfit which was tasteless and cheap in contrast to her vision of the wedding. There was no nudity nor any overt sexual references.

The other sexual innuendo in the show was set in the context of this comedy about interactions between the family and the often ludicrous situations they found themselves in. It was presented in a light-hearted tone for comic effect, none of the innuendo was salacious and there was no nudity or sexual activity shown.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel watched this episode of the sit-com, which focused on the family's reaction to the lead character's son and his new girlfriend. It noted various sexual references, but took the view that, within the context of this comedy programme, the mild and light-hearted content was unlikely to have caused widespread offence and had not exceeded acceptable boundaries for broadcast for the time of transmission. The complaint was not upheld.

Not Upheld

CN 11119

Seven Days at War

BBC1, 26 March 2003, 1900-2000

The Complaint

A viewer complained about the use of unsuitable music to accompany scenes of explosion and casualties.

Broadcaster's Statement

The BBC said that it had been the custom for many years for news programmes to make use of music to announce the beginning and end of their transmissions. This series of "roundup" programmes broadcast during the war in Iraq extended that by including brief segments of music to indicate that the coverage was moving on to a different story or a particular significant development. It said that there was no more specific connection with the subject-matter than that. And the music was subdued and similar to that with which audiences were already familiar.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel watched this edition of the extended News 24 review programme looking at the impact of the Iraq war with live reports and video footage of archive materials from the news during the previous seven days. It considered that the music was simply subtle background music and was not inappropriate and was unlikely to have offended the majority of the audience. The complaint was not upheld.

Not Upheld

CN 11194

Hellraiser's Handbook

Bravo, 20 March 2003, 2335-0005

The Complaint

A viewer complained about of nudity and tasteless humour.

The Broadcaster's Statement

Flextech Television said that the series was targeted at men aged between 16 and 34 years of age and was broadcast well after the Watershed. It focussed on the glamorous world of rock and roll and the associated myths and legends. This edition in the series included a light-hearted examination of a myth relating to the Queen single "Fat Bottomed Girls". The fun piece of consumer research sought to establish whether or not an expert could distinguish between a "used" and "new" bicycle saddle.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel viewed this edition of the programme targeted at a young male audience, noting its earthy humour. It considered that scenes depicting a naked woman riding a bicycle and subsequent scenes showing a bicycle expert smelling two saddles to determine which one had been used had been keeping with the tone set by the series. It took the view that while the relatively inexplicit content would not have been to everyone's taste it would have been unlikely to have caused offence to the majority of viewers. The complaint was not upheld.

Not Upheld

CN 11198

40

Channel 4, 10 April 2003, 2200- 2305

The Complaint

A viewer complained about a violent sexual scene.

The Broadcaster's Statement

Channel 4 said that "40" was a three part drama, which focussed on the relationships and dark secrets of a group of friends turning 40 and revealed what could happen when a group's carefree and experimental past caught up with them. Amongst the cross-section of stories was that of Robert's relationship with Kristina, an illegal immigrant whom he rescued and used to indulge his abusive sado-masochistic tendencies. It was crucial to the story to explore issues of sexuality and violence that were key to contemporary society.

The scene in question portrayed the character Kristina's ultimate and violent revenge on the man who had inflicted such pain on her and many others, as well as providing a form of self release from her tortured and abused past. The scene was the conclusion of a story that had developed across the three episodes. Channel 4 felt that the scene was editorially justified, as it portrayed the absolute peak of these characters' stories. It was essential for this scene to be realistic in order to convey the depths of Kristina's despair and the agony that Robert had wrought. However, the portrayal was neither gratuitous nor unduly graphic.

As this was the third episode, the tone of the drama and the characters had been well defined and the broadcaster gave a pre-transmission warning.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel watched this episode of the drama, which followed a group of friends through various life experiences. The Panel noted the scenes in which a woman stabbed a man during sexual activity in order to exact her revenge. It took the view that in the context of the final episode of a contemporary drama, broadcast post Watershed on a minority channel, the content had not gone beyond acceptable boundaries for broadcast. The complaint was not upheld

Not Upheld

CN 11291

Iraq Special: *Twenty One Days at War*

BBC1, 9 April 2003, 1930-2000

The Complaint

A viewer complained about disturbing content broadcast before the Watershed.

The Broadcaster's Statement

The BBC said that it did not believe the sequence complained of required any specific warning, for the following reasons:

- It was almost identical in tone and content with a report first shown some days earlier and repeated several times subsequently, which would by this time almost certainly have been seen by the majority of the BBC news audience.
- It was shown considerably later in the evening than the original report on its first transmission.
- It included no close-ups of death or injury, and the blood on the lens clearly came from someone who had survived the attack, given that he was continuing to do his job.
- It had been preceded, within the same programme, by several others whose contents had been far from pleasant. The "Battle of Baghdad" sequence right at the start of the programme had said the Iraqis "occasionally struck back and even drew blood" to the visual accompaniment of footage of a loaded stretcher and a burned-out coalition vehicle. And in the "Battle of Basra" section which came next, Ben Brown's commentary described "Iraqi corpses all around" and "air filled with the putrid stench of death", over a brief shot of one of the bodies.
- It was a news programme in a time of war. By definition, its contents were going to be to some extent unpleasant. Few viewers would surely have expected otherwise.

The Commission's Statement

A Standards Panel viewed this edition of the news programme and noted the footage in question. It took the view that, as part of the coverage of an ongoing conflict, the reports had been in the public interest and their treatment of their subject had not exceeded acceptable boundaries for transmission. The complaint was not upheld.

Not Upheld

CN 11302

Vee-TV

Channel 4, 19 April 2003, 0955-1025

The Complaint

A viewer complained about sexual and violent content.

The Broadcaster's Statement

Channel 4 said that Vee-TV was a magazine-style 'deaf series' aimed at younger viewers that included a 'deaf soap' drama. 'Rush' which dealt with contemporary issues. The scenes in question were important elements of the plot.

The footage of one of the characters lapdancing had not involved any nudity and the scene of money being tucked into the top of her stockings had been brief in duration. The footage of two characters engaged in a fight had not been explicit, it being night time and the cameras having been positioned up close so that only a part of a character's body was visible at a time. The scene had been brief and the fight no longer than was necessary for dramatic veracity.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel watched the programme and noted that the scenes in question were brief in duration and inexplicit. It considered that they were integral to the storyline and had not exceeded acceptable boundaries in the context of this established programme broadcast on a minority channel. The complaint was not upheld.

Not Upheld

CN 11339

The Bill

ITV, 30 April 2003, 2000-2100

The Complaint

A viewer complained about a scene of suicide, which they considered was inappropriate for pre-Watershed viewing.

The Broadcaster's Statement

Carlton said that it continued to tackle difficult and sometimes controversial issues which confronted the police regularly, including suicide, both attempted and actual. They said that although the young man was briefly depicted jumping from the building and falling to the ground, no impact was seen and the aftermath was only seen in long shot.

Carlton did not accept that that the scenes were graphic, explicit or inappropriately shocking.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel watched this edition of the well-established series. It took the view that the suicide scene of a young man jumping of a building was neither gratuitous nor graphic and had not exceeded acceptable boundaries for the time of transmission. The complaint was not upheld.

Not Upheld

CN 11401

Drama on 3: Parade's End

BBC Radio 3, 18 May 2003, 1830-2115

The Complaint

A listener complained about swearing.

The Broadcaster's Statement

The BBC said that a warning about strong language had preceded the programme, and that the first use of the f-word had occurred at 19:50, by which time the adult nature of the subject-matter had been plain. Listeners were prepared to accept strong language when justified by the context. This had been such an occasion: a

ITV Evening News

ITV1, 7 May 2003, 1830-1900

The Complaint

A viewer complained about violent content.

The Broadcaster's Statement

ITV said that the item concerned a violent initiation ceremony at an American school which had been filmed on amateur video and had become a talking point across America. It had raised important issues concerning discipline, violence and punishment.

The images of the fighting had been blurred throughout and the faces of the victims and attackers obscured. The commentary had been measured and restrained and violent images restricted. Reaction from parents and condemnation from some of the pupils had been included. The introduction to the item made it clear that the pictures showed teenage girls beating up younger pupils and that they had shocked America.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel watched the programme. It noted that the footage of the fighting was limited and that an indication had been given of the nature of the material. In these circumstances, the Panel considered that the item had not exceeded acceptable boundaries for a news report. The complaint was not upheld.

Not Upheld

CN 11427

dramatisation of Ford Madox Ford's experiences in the First World War trenches. Strong language had been used sparingly and without gratuitous effect.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel listened to the programme. It considered that, in the context of this drama, the limited use of strong language, which had been preceded by a clear and unambiguous warning, had not exceeded acceptable boundaries for this programme broadcast on a service aimed at adults. The complaint was not upheld.

Not Upheld

CN 11536

Dead Ringers

BBC Radio 4, 11 January 2003, 1230-1300

The Complaint

Two listeners complained about sexual content inappropriate for the time of transmission.

The Broadcaster's Statement

The BBC said that while the sequences complained of did employ a sexual frame of reference, the allusions were far from explicit.

It said that research showed that the Radio 4 audience was almost entirely adult at all times of day, and while the output might have raised an eyebrow or two, the jokes would be well within what listeners found acceptable.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel listened to this edition of the well-established comedy programme, noting the sexual innuendo in two sketches, one of a spoof advert for a BBC digital radio station and the other a sketch about the style of a celebrity chef. It took the view that the light-hearted sketches and innuendo had not exceeded acceptable boundaries for broadcast on a service aimed at an adult audience. The complaints were not upheld.

Not Upheld

CN 10656.2

No Nonsense Sports Breakfast

Talksport, 28 February 2003, 0600-1000

The Complaint

A listener complained about racist remarks.

The Broadcaster's Statement

Talksport said that the presenter had not discussed Arabs in general, but people who committed atrocities and had pointed to different standards of behaviour between elements of the Arabic world and the way of life in the Western world.

Sexy Beast

Channel 4, 30 March 2003, 2200-2340

The Complaint

A viewer complained about obscene language.

The Broadcaster's Statement

Channel 4 said that it recognised that the film dealt with themes that would not have been to some viewers' tastes but it considered that most viewers would not have been surprised by the repeated use of very strong language in a film of this nature.

It said that the film was scheduled to start transmission well after the Watershed at 10pm and was preceded by a clear and unambiguous warning as to the language and content of the film.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel watched this British gangster film about a former crook who put his life of crime behind him in Spain until a former associate arrives from London to persuade him to do one last job. The Panel took the view that the incidents of swearing were unlikely to have exceeded the expectations of the majority of the audience and had not exceeded acceptable boundaries for the time of transmission, broadcast late at night on a minority channel and preceded by a clear warning. The complaint was not upheld.

Not Upheld

CN 11245

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel listened to the programme. It considered that in the context of this programme, the presenter's treatment of the subject of atrocities in Iraq, although close to the limit of acceptability, had not exceeded acceptable boundaries for transmission. The complaint was not upheld.

Not Upheld

CN 11206

Swag

Five, 27 April 2003, 2030-2100

The Complaint

A viewer complained about tasteless content that encouraged criminal behaviour.

The Broadcaster's Statement

Five said that the programme had proved to be extremely popular and that the embarrassment and humiliation meted out to those caught on camera fell very short of "rough justice". The broadcaster said that the programme did not encourage criminality. The only person capable of forming criminal intent in such situations was the would-be thief and it was at his expense that the entertainment was derived. All those who were identified in the programme had given their written consent, those who did not had their identities obscured.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel watched the programme. It considered that the filming of dishonest and opportunist people taking advantage of situations set up by the programme-makers, whilst not to everyone's taste, had neither exceeded acceptable boundaries nor encouraged criminal behaviour. The complaint was not upheld.

Not Upheld

CN 11409

The Peterloo Massacre

Channel 4, 4 May 2003, 1930-2100

The Complaint

A viewer complained about graphic scenes of mutilation and swearing inappropriate for the time of transmission.

The Broadcaster's Statement

Channel 4 said that the violence of the incident was an historical fact and to have avoided the brutality of the incident and its tragic consequences would have been to sanitise and distort one of the most shameful incidents in British history. The images of the massacre were clearly dramatised images of the incident and whilst filmed in an impressionistic style, had not been realistic. Although some of the images reflected the savagery of the massacre, the obvious artifice of the images would have removed any real possibility of genuine shock at seeing them.

Channel 4 said that the language used to set the scene in the minds of the viewers was attributed to John Lees, a cotton spinner, who used words that reflected his working class vernacular. Words such as "arsehole" and "shit" were not used out of context in his scatological description of working class conditions in Manchester in 1819. Having followed Channel 4 News, together with it being an historical documentary, meant that it was unlikely to have been viewed by a large number of younger viewers.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel watched the programme. It considered that the depiction of violence had been relatively brief and inexplicit and that the language used, not considered strong by the Commission's own research, was acceptable in the context of this programme broadcast at that on a minority channel. The complaint was not upheld.

Not Upheld

CN 11416

I'm a Celebrity – Get Me Out of Here!

ITV1, 11 May 2003, 2100-2230

The Complaint

Eighteen viewers complained about cruelty to animals.

The Broadcaster's Statement

Granada Television said that the 'bush tucker trials' were a key feature of the series. In the trial, the chosen celebrity was required to submit to a gruelling challenge, whereby the celebrity's squeamishness and endurance were tested to the extreme, in order to win food for the group. Each trial was always edited to create the maximum effect. As such, the extensive preparations and precautions for the trial, including the safety briefing to the celebrity taking part, would rarely be included, and certainly not in full.

The production team had worked closely with the Australian RSPCA for the bush tucker trials, during both pre-production and filming. In addition, professional animal handlers were always present on site during the trials. The production team took every precaution to ensure that no animals were hurt in the making of the series.

The eels and fish were not 'dropped', but slid through a water chute. The run and velocity of the water chute was no different from what they might experience in the wild.

The production team retrieved at the end of the challenge the exact number of eels and fish that were used during the challenge. None of the goldfish or eels that were used

in the eel helmet trial was harmed and afterwards they were returned to the habitat that they share.

In relation to the 'critter pants' trial, Granada said that every effort was taken to make the critters as comfortable as possible. The aim was to make the contestant uncomfortable. The insects, many of which are bred for feeding reptiles, shared the pants for a very short amount of time, were retrieved immediately after the contestant ended the trial, and were separated again into their individual containers.

Handling rats by their tail was a common method of transport recommended by the rat breeders present on set and whose rats were used.

Every trial was carefully tested and developed, in consultation with the Australian RSPCA, to ensure that the animals did not suffer.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel watched this edition of the programme, noting the 'bush tucker trials' – one involving fish and eels and a second including insects. It noted that the trials were a well-known part of the reality show when a group of celebrities had to undertake various challenges to test their endurance. In this context, it considered that the scenes were unlikely to have caused offence to regular viewers as no obvious harm came to the fish and insects involved. The complaints were not upheld.

Not Upheld

CN 11440.18

Electric Six Song – GayBar

MTV2, 23 May 2003, 1025

The Complaint

A viewer complained about the sexual content of this video, which they felt was inappropriate for the time of broadcast.

The Broadcaster's Statement

MTV Networks Europe said that the lyrics and sexual imagery in the video had raised some concerns for them. They said they felt that the video was not suitable for the "after school" slot when large numbers of children could be expected to be watching television unsupervised.

However it felt that the sexual references in the lyrics and the visual innuendoes were relatively inexplicit and that the video was therefore suitable for broadcast at other times of the day.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel watched the pop video. It noted the ribald innuendo in the video and in the lyrics but concluded that the time of broadcast would have ensured that the vast majority of children would be at school and would therefore be unavailable to view this broadcast. The complaint was not upheld.

Not Upheld

CN 11574

Trailer for Six Feet Under

Channel 4, 25 May 2003, 1030

The Complaint

A viewer complained about sexual images in a trail shown pre-Watershed.

The Broadcaster's Statement

Channel 4 said that the trail gave a broad spectrum of the themes of the programme including the stress of dealing with death and running an independent business, the breakdown of relationships, issues with homosexuality and the efforts of one of the characters to re-invent herself. The brief scene in which two male characters were seen kissing was affectionate, not overtly sexual and did not go beyond anything which would be deemed suitable for the time of transmission. The scene in which a male strips a female character, in which her naked back is seen, did not include any explicit nudity and the language used by a further female character to

describe her sexual relationship with her boss did not go beyond a simple description.

Channel 4 added that whilst they regretted any offence that may have been caused it felt that the trail was entirely appropriate for the time slot and did not go beyond what could have been seen in many other trails and programmes shown at this time.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel watched this trail for the dark comedy set in a funeral home. It noted the trail which comprised of brief clips, including the content complained of, from the programme to the broadcast later. The Panel considered that the brief and inexplicit content of the trail would have been unlikely to have caused offence to the majority of viewers. The complaint was not upheld.

Not Upheld

CN 11552

White Girls are Easy

Channel 4, 30 May 2003, 1930-2000

The Complaint

Three viewers complained about racial stereotyping, sexual discrimination and that the programme's title was derogatory.

The Broadcaster's Statement

Channel 4 said that the programme was the last in a series by new talents which gave them the opportunity to present polemics on a variety of subjects in a fresh, provocative and sometimes humorous way. The introduction by publisher and broadcaster, Dotun Adebayo, made the aim and purpose of the programme perfectly clear from the outset.

White Girls are Easy was deliberately intended to be a thought-provoking yet entertaining polemic which explored issues of race, relationships and popular culture. As signposted in his introduction, Dotun Adebayo explored the racial myth that 'white girls are easy' and asked whether or not his life would have been any easier if he had married a white woman. In his exploration he elicited views from black men and single white and black women about their attitudes to relationships and inter-

racial dating. In doing so he naturally touched on racial stereotypes but in pursuing his argument his views were challenged throughout with a range of alternative arguments and perspectives. In deconstructing racial myths, those myths have to be explored in the first place. Accordingly, Channel 4 said that it considered that the title, whilst provocative, was not racist and was perfectly appropriate for the content of the programme.

Channel 4 added that it considered that the programme successfully achieved the difficult balance of exploring serious issues about inter-racial relationships in an entertaining and thought-provoking way.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel watched this documentary which took the relationships between black and white men and women as its theme. It considered that the programme achieved a serious and sensitive examination of the subject matter. It considered that neither the way in which the programme tackled the issues nor the content would have been likely to have caused offence to the majority of the audience. The complaints were not upheld.

Not Upheld

CN 11581.3

The Vice

ITV1, 26 May 2003, 2100-2230

The Complaint

Three viewers complained about rape and drug taking, which they considered were inappropriate for the time of broadcast.

The Broadcaster's statement

Carlton Television said that *The Vice* was now a well-established show in its fifth series and consistently dealt with challenging and sensitive material. The overall tone and subject matter of *The Vice* was often dark and the show regularly dealt with sleazy themes such as prostitution and pornography. However, the broadcaster said that the subject matter and treatment were always responsibly and appropriately dealt with.

The scene of a prostitute posing while under the influence of drugs included no nudity, was depicted in a negative light and showed no more than was necessary to establish the dramatic legitimacy of the story. Carlton

said that the portrayal of drug abuse had neither endorsed nor encouraged the behaviour and that the overall tone condemned rather than promoted the irresponsible abuse of drugs and had not presented recreational drugs as socially acceptable.

The rape scene was kept short, excluded any graphic detail and was left entirely to the imagination of the adult audience. Carlton said that the subject matter was handled in a responsible manner and that the level of detail covered in the drama was appropriate.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel watched this edition of the well-established series. It took the view that the scene in which a man raped and filmed a drugged, scenes of drug taking and of a prostitute posing for a camera were neither gratuitous nor graphic and had not exceeded acceptable boundaries for the time of transmission. The complaints were not upheld.

Not Upheld

CN 11599

That Friday Feeling

Kingdom FM, 30 May 2003, 1600-2000

The Complaint

A listener complained about racial stereotyping

The Broadcaster's Statement

Kingdom FM said that the idea behind the Friday show was to be irreverent and perhaps slightly more adventurous than the remainder of the station's output. However, the comment that Australians were from convict stock was a satirical one-liner aimed at the irreverent lyrics just sung by an Australian group and was certainly not meant to be perceived as a racist or derogatory remark about Australians in general.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel listened to the programme. The Panel noted the light-hearted nature of the comment and considered that it was unlikely to have reinforced negative stereotypes about Australians or caused offence to the majority of listeners. The complaint was not upheld.

Not Upheld

CN 11627

Breakfast

BBC1, 19 June 2003, 0600-0900

The Complaint

A viewer complained about distressing images in a news report.

The Broadcaster's Statement

The BBC said that the item, about a demonstrator at a protest in London who had set herself on fire, had been preceded by a warning about distressing images. The images shown, filmed from middle distance, showed smoke and then a prone body on a set of steps. No injury was shown, and there was not anything to connect the smoke to the body except the words of the story – the pictures did not identify the one as the source of the other. The words made it clear that the victim had sustained injuries which were not life-threatening.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel watched this edition of the news. It noted an item about a demonstration in which a member of the public had set herself on fire. It considered that the images broadcast, which did not show the details of the act, were in the context of a serious news report and that given the pre-transmission warning, they would have been unlikely to have caused offence to the majority of the audience. The complaint was not upheld

Not Upheld

CN 11694

DoubleTake

BBC2, 24 March 2003, 2130-2200

The Complaint

Three viewers complained about offensive content.

The Broadcaster's Statement

The BBC said that this was a programme that embarked on flights of fantasy in pretending to expose the more private moments of people in the public eye. The transmission was part of a post-Watershed "Comedy Night" sequence of programmes aimed at young adults, a type of audience that had become relaxed about down-to-earth humour. There was a widespread acceptance that public figures, including members of the Royal Family, were legitimate targets for satire.

The dog-burial sketch was not unique in finding humour in a supposed moment of grief or in exploiting the death of a pet. The Michael Jackson sketch was bizarre rather than distasteful and no child was distressed in the making of it, which for the child actor involved nothing more than a variation on face-painting.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel watched the programme and noted the long-lens "snatch" style of the footage, which resulted in an impressionistic depiction in the sketches. The Panel considered that the satirical treatment of the topics in question had not exceeded acceptable boundaries and was unlikely to have caused offence to the majority of the audience for a humorous programme of this nature, broadcast on a minority channel after the Watershed. The complaints were not upheld.

Not Upheld

CN 11156.3

Real Men

BBC2, 12 & 13 March 2003, 2100-2230

The Complaint

Two viewers complained about the use of child actors in a drama about child abuse.

The Broadcaster's Statement

The BBC said that this was a serious work, depicting the children as individuals with a wide range of emotional response rather than just as victims. The production team fully appreciated this would involve a level of involvement by child actors which called for particular care and sensitivity. The parents of all the children who took part were fully consulted about the general context – child abuse, and what it involved – and the production team took care only to use actors who understood what the term meant.

The director took pains to ensure the children felt safe and supported and to provide appropriate answers to any questions they had on the subject.

The broadcaster strongly disputed that there was anything in Real Men which condoned paedophilia, let alone encouraged it. Paedophile adults were shown as, at best manipulative, at worst downright evil, and the consequences for both victim and persecutor were shown as little short of disastrous.

Both episodes of Real Men were preceded by announcements making the nature of the drama clear and were also followed by an Action Line number, which attracted a large number of calls.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel watched the two part drama, noting its serious intention. Whilst it acknowledged that the drama had been harrowing it considered that it responsibly highlighted the issue. The Panel noted the broadcaster's assurance that the children had been given sufficient preparation for the demanding roles. The Panel was satisfied that the programmes had been suitably sign posted and viewers were given the opportunity to call a helpline number after the broadcast. In the circumstances, the Panel considered that the content had been acceptable. The complaints were not upheld.

Not Upheld

CN 11123.2/11124.2

BBC News

BBC1, 6 April 2003, 2200-2215

The Complaint

Three viewers complained about a report during the Iraq conflict which showed blood splattered on a camera.

The Broadcaster's Statement

The BBC said that news coverage of violent events during war invariably involved difficult editorial decisions. During the course of the Iraq conflict there were a number of "friendly fire" incidents, and this was one of the very few whose immediate aftermath was captured on camera. The number of fatalities on this occasion was unusually high. A convoy of Kurdish soldiers and US Special Forces was travelling through Northern Iraq and the BBC's World Affairs Editor, John Simpson, and his team had joined them. Tragically, an American air strike went wrong, hitting this convoy rather than some Iraqi vehicles elsewhere on the same road. At least fifteen people were killed, among them a translator working for the BBC and three US soldiers.

The introduction to the item had included a warning that viewers might find some of the pictures upsetting. Care had been taken to avoid the most distressing images. It was the consequences of the attack, not the attack itself, which were depicted, and shots of people who had been injured were brief or indistinct and distant. It was clear that the blood spots on the camera lens came from someone who was not seriously hurt as he was shown carrying on doing his job.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel watched this edition of the BBC's evening News Bulletin, noting the report and scene complained of. It considered that the item had sought to portray the realities of war and, given the clear pre-transmission warning, had not exceeded acceptable boundaries for broadcast. The complaints were not upheld.

Not Upheld

CN 11270.3

Today

BBC Radio 4, 8 February 2003, 0700-0900

The Complaint

A listener complained about a racially insulting and unsubstantiated suggestion that those of mixed race had been the result of the rape of black female slaves by white men.

The Broadcaster's Statement

The BBC said that the tentative expression of expert opinion as to the high percentage of European paternal lineage from DNA tests on 200 black British volunteers had not been racially-demeaning, but an aspect of the relationship between black slaves and white "masters".

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel listened to the programme. It considered that, in the context of a seriously-intentioned discussion about the heritage and identity of black Britons, the discussion of the suggestion had not exceeded acceptable boundaries. The complaint was not upheld.

Not Upheld

CN 11030

BBC News

BBC1, 8 April 2003, 1615

The Complaint

A viewer complained about disturbing images.

The Broadcaster's Statement

The BBC said that news coverage of violent events invariably involved difficult editorial decisions. The "friendly fire" incident was an important story to include in the programme and a warning was given to alert viewers that some of the images would be upsetting. The BBC said that it was the aftermath of the incident and not the incident itself that was depicted and any shots of wounded people were either brief or indistinct and distant.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel watched the programme. It acknowledged that a pre-transmission warning was given before the footage of the incident was shown and that the content had been edited to avoid including the most disturbing and graphic images of the incident. The Panel took the view that the images had not gone beyond acceptable boundaries for coverage in a news programme. The complaint was not upheld.

Not Upheld

CN 11279

Jam

Channel 4, 16 April 2003, 2345-0010

The Complaint

A viewer complained about an offensive sketch.

The Broadcaster's Statement

Channel 4 said that the programme featured a series of seamless, nightmarish monologues and dark broken dramas. The programme's unsettling black humour was derived from its uncompromising and scathing commentary on society's cruelties and absurdities. Sometimes the series made the audience laugh, more often its black view of humanity left the viewer unsettled, but it was deeply moral in tone and serious in intent. This was the third time that this series had been shown and the programme's reputation for tackling sensitive issues in a satirical, provocative and unsettling format had already been well-established.

The programme was preceded by a clear and unambiguous warning. The sketch in question was not intended to trivialise infant death but to highlight the desperation and tragic absurdity of a mother who had lost her baby and had yet to come to terms with it. The satirical critique was not at the mother's expense, but at that of the plumber, who was prepared to exploit her vulnerability and desperation for gain, irrespective of the moral turpitude.

Channel 4 said that, given that this sketch had previously been the subject of an upheld Finding by the Commission, it had been moved to later in the schedule.

The Commission's Finding

The full Commission watched this edition of the repeat series, noting its previous Finding. It recognised that the dark nature of the sketch would not have appealed to everyone watching. However, it was persuaded that there would now be a greater awareness amongst the general audience of the nature of Chris Morris' work, particularly following the 'Brass Eye' series. The Commission concluded that, in this different context, and given also the late-night scheduling and clear warning, the content had not exceeded that acceptable for broadcast on a minority channel. The complaint was not upheld.

Not Upheld

CN 11352

RI:SE

Channel 4, 9 May 2003, 0655-0900

The Complaint

A viewer complained about a news item which they found offensive.

The Broadcaster's Statement

Channel 4 said that the news item showed a young man being injured as he jumped from the top of a building and then hit the side of a swimming pool. The story was a major one in America and had received nationwide coverage. The story was the latest in a long line of news stories about people copying stunts from MTV's Jackass. It was felt to be an important story for RI:SE to cover because those sort of stunt-based shows were very popular with the show's target audience.

Channel 4 added that it felt the story was covered responsibly, setting out factually what had happened, and that the footage was used to demonstrate how the stunt had gone badly wrong. It added that a voice over had explained, should viewers be in any doubt, that the person attempting the stunt was lucky to be alive.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel watched this edition of the breakfast programme. It noted a news item about a stunt, carried out by a member of the public, which had gone terribly wrong. It considered that the item had been handled sensitively and responsibly by the broadcaster. It also considered that the grainy quality of the video footage and focal length were such as to lessen the graphic nature of the actual fall and subsequent collision. The complaint was not upheld.

Not Upheld

CN 11460

Coronation Street

ITV1, 12 March 2003, 2030-2100

The Complaint

Eleven viewers complained about violence before the Watershed.

The Broadcaster's Statement

Granada said that this episode involved the culmination of a long-running story-line concerning the evil character Richard Hillman. Over previous episodes Richard had been shown to go to extraordinary lengths to achieve what he wanted and to escape his troubles including murder and attempted murder. Granada said that the need to remove Richard Hillman's character had not influenced the high standards of judgement involved regarding compliance. This episode was regarded, as with all episodes within the series, as a pre-Watershed drama. Due to the seriousness of the of the story, the demise of Richard Hillman was not interwoven with lighter moments as was often the case with Coronation Street.

Granada went on to say that there had been intense scrutiny of the story throughout its development and a constant evaluation of tone and impact of the piece as a whole. On air promotions were introduced to the drama over two weeks in advance of transmission as "Killer Corrie". This was reinforced with character interviews in newspapers and TV listing magazines. A pre-transmission warning also preceded the programme.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel watched this episode which included the climax of the long-running story-line involving "Richard Hillman". Whilst accepting that there was a tense atmosphere in the episode, the Panel considered that in view of the well-established characterisation of Richard Hillman, the well publicised story-line and the pre-transmission warning, the content was unlikely to have caused offence to the majority of the audience. The complaints were not upheld.

Not Upheld

CN 11081.10/11237

Simon Mayo

BBC Radio 5 Live, 2 June 2003, 1300-1600

The Complaint

A listener complained about an interview with a loyalist terrorist.

The Broadcaster's Statement

The BBC said that Michael Stone, who had murdered three people and had injured more than sixty others at Milltown cemetery during the funeral of three IRA men in 1988, had not been given an easy ride by the presenter and he had been challenged about his rôle in the Northern Ireland conflict. Listeners had been left to draw their own conclusions about the depth and nature of his expressed regret.

Top Gear

BBC2, 20 October 2002, 2000-2100

The Complaint

Four viewers complained about various aspects of this programme: two about a segment on "beating speed cameras" and two about bad language.

The Broadcaster's Statement

The BBC said that the segment on beating the speed camera served a useful purpose of dispelling any hope that speed cameras could be evaded in this way, rather than encouraging anyone to attempt it. All the parts of the segment were on a private race track and the car was driven by a professional racing driver. The language used was a further example of the robust and idiosyncratic style of Top Gear which the audience expected.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel watched this edition of the motoring programme. It noted the segment concerning speed cameras and instances of mild bad language. The Panel took the view that the item about speed cameras had not encouraged speeding and that the mild bad language used was unlikely to have offended the majority of viewers to this well-established programme, shown on a minority channel. The complaints were not upheld.

Not Upheld

CN 10160

Not Upheld

CN 11604

CCTV

BBC3, 24 & 26 February 2003, 2000-2030 & 2030-2100

The Complaint

Two viewers complained about the promotion of cruelty to animals in these programmes.

The Broadcaster's Statement

The BBC said that the edition of the programme broadcast on 24 February 2003 included two games that involved fish. The unusual circumstances and settings of the games, a fish market and an aquarium, made it highly unlikely that viewers would try to replicate them. The "goldfish game" had required six blenders operated by remote control.

The BBC said that the edition of the programme broadcast on 26 February 2003 contained a brief excerpt from another round of the "goldfish game".

The BBC said that it had been made clear both before and after the games that the goldfish was not harmed. Not everyone had been willing to take part in the game and one couple had been upbraided for supposedly killing the fish before being informed that no harm had come to it.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel viewed the programmes which both included a number of games in which members of the public competed to win prizes. One such game invited members of the public to correctly identify which of a series of blenders contained a live goldfish and then attempt to "blend" the fish. Successful contestants were led to believe that they had "blended" the goldfish when in fact no harm had come to it. The Panel considered that it would have been clear to viewers that no harm had come to the fish and took the view that the programmes had in no way condoned cruelty to animals, noting in one instance that contestants who had refused to compete had been praised. In the circumstances the Panel took the view that the programmes would have been unlikely to have encouraged imitative behaviour and had not exceeded acceptable boundaries for broadcast at that time. The complaints were not upheld.

Not Upheld

CN 10978/10983

BBC News

BBC1, 24 March 2003, 1800-1830

The Complaint

Two viewers complained about distressing images of captured American soldiers.

The Broadcaster's Statement

The BBC said that the images of captured American soldiers were first broadcast by Iraqi television. Al-Jazeera and a number of other broadcasters, including the BBC, subsequently broadcast them as they were received. The decision to show them was not taken lightly. The presenter said that Al-Jazeera was showing "interviews" with captured American soldiers and continued "...they're just coming in to us." In fact, senior editorial managers thought carefully before showing these pictures. The soldier who was interviewed was clearly uninjured, and was doing well in trying to cope with the poor English of his interrogator. A second shot, showing a man lying down, was so brief that it was impossible to tell anything about him, but examination of un-transmitted material clearly showed that he was alive.

The broadcaster added it believed that, as a general principle, reporting how prisoners of war were being treated was an entirely legitimate part of war coverage, and that pictures had a contribution to make. The Iraqi TV footage was of US service personnel being questioned in front of television cameras, the cameras were not simply observing events but were an integral part of what was happening. What viewers saw, therefore, was also an example of the kind of brutal treatment of individuals for propaganda purposes that the former Iraqi regime had always been identified with. The BBC said that it believed that most people watching would have been sufficiently informed to appreciate that.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel watched this edition of the evening News. It noted the footage of an interview with a captured American soldier, and brief images of another lying down. The Panel considered that the images, which were already in the public domain, were in the public interest because they clearly showed how the methods employed by the Iraqi military in the treatment of their prisoners. They were also unlikely to have exceeded the expectations of the majority of the audience. The complaints were not upheld.

Not Upheld

CN 11163.2

DoubleTake

BBC2, 7 April 2003, 2130-2200

The Complaint

A viewer complained about swearing.

The Broadcaster's Statement

The BBC said that "Double Take" was a programme that pushed boundaries as it fantasised about the private moments of people in the public eye. There was a pre-transmission warning of the strong language to follow, and the programme was scheduled in a regular "Comedy Night" slot aimed at young adults.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel watched this edition of the supposed "hidden camera" programme. It noted two sketches featuring a 'public figure' attempting to charm a woman before verbally abusing a subordinate. The Panel took the view that whilst the language would not have been to everyone's taste, it had not exceeded acceptable boundaries for broadcast when clearly signposted and broadcast post-Watershed on a minority channel. The complaint was not upheld.

Not Upheld

CN 11312

Ulster Says Sex

BBC Radio Ulster, 19 April 2003, 1130-1200

The Complaint

A listener complained about inappropriate sexual content.

The Broadcaster's Statement

The BBC said that this had been the third in a four-part series that examined attitudes to sex in Ulster. The audience profile was predominantly adult and there was no evidence that children had listened to this series in large numbers. The subject had not in itself been inappropriate for a daytime programme and had been consistent with audience expectations. Explicit or obscene references had been avoided.

The Commission's Finding

The Standards Committee listened to the programme. It considered that, in the context of a seriously-intentioned series about contemporary attitudes to sex in Ulster, the inexplicit and non-graphic sexual content had not exceeded acceptable boundaries for this programme aimed at an adult audience. The complaint was not upheld.

Not Upheld

CN 11348

DoubleTake

BBC2, 14 April 2003, 2130-2200

The Complaint

A viewer complained about sexual scenes and swearing.

The Broadcaster's Statement

The BBC said that "Double Take" was a programme that pushed boundaries as it fantasised about the private moments of people in the public eye. There was a pre-transmission warning of the strong language to follow, and the programme was scheduled in a regular "Comedy Night" slot aimed at young adults.

The Commission's Finding

A Standards Panel watched this edition of the supposed "hidden camera" programme. It noted scenes which contained strong language, and of implied sexual activity. The Panel took the view that the scenes and language used were unlikely to have offended the majority of viewers to this programme, shown post-Watershed on a minority channel and preceded by a clear warning. The complaint was not upheld.

Not Upheld

CN 11408

The complaints summarised below were not upheld and no statement was required from the broadcaster. Complaints may not be upheld because the content was considered likely to be within the expectations of the audience for the type of programme; or the programme was appropriately labelled or scheduled, or the content was deemed acceptable within the context in which it was broadcast.

CN 9649	Alan Beswick religious offence	BBC Radio GMR	24.07.02	0900
CN 10539	Only Fools and Horses racist content	BBC1	25.12.02	2140
CN 10643	Messiah 2: Vengeance is Mine (Part 1) violent content	BBC1	11.01.03	2100
CN 10801	The Hunt for Britain's Paedophiles images and descriptions of abuse	BBC2	27.01.03 28.01.03	2320
CN 10809	Witchcraze swearing and violent content	BBC2	29.02.03	2100
CN 10949*	Advertisement for Velvet Toilet Tissue nudity	ITV1	various	various
CN 11005	This Morning animal cruelty	ITV1	28.02.03	1030
CN 11023	BBC News scenes of people in distress.	BBC1	05.03.03	2200
CN 11049	Behind the Ass use of children to cause harm	MTV	07.03.03	2245
CN 11121	Israel's Secret Weapon racist content	BBC2	17.03.03	2320
CN 11230	DoubleTake offensive content	BBC2	31.03.03	2130
CN 11246	The Salon sexual innuendo language and scheduling	Channel 4	23.03.03	1330
CN 11284	Stand Up America swearing and religious offence	BBC2	15.03.03	2230
CN 11285	Johnny Vaughan Tonight offensive language	BBC2	04.04.03	2200
CN 11295	Cavegirl sexual content	BBC1	01.04.03	1645
CN 11304	Panorama violent content	BBC1	06.04.03	2215
CN 11305	Girls In Love inappropriate sexual content	ITV1	08.04.03	1630

*Related Cases 10994/10997/11066/11299

Complaints concerning standards

CN 11310	Scott Mills sexual innuendo	BBC Radio 1	30.07.03	0700
CN 11319	BBC News distressing images	BBC1	21.93.03	2030
CN 11325	In Deep: Character Assassins violent content	BBC1	04.03.03	2100
CN 11333	EastEnders encouragement of sex before marriage	BBC1	11.04.03	2000
CN11357 *	Your Face or Mine? encouragement of superficial attitudes / sexual content	Channel 4	April 2003 May 2003	1755 1800
CN 11411	Lenny Henry in Pieces profanity	BBC1	25.04.03	2100
CN 11414	Live with...Christian O'Connell homophobic content	Five	02.05.03	1930
CN 11420	The 100 Greatest Movie Stars sexual content	Channel 4	04.05.03	2100
CN 11430	The Simpsons: Homer and the 18th Amendment offensive content	BBC2	07.05.03	1800
CN 11447	Newsnight racist and offensive content	BBC2	07.05.03	2230
CN 11481/ 11503	Cambridge Spies homosexual content and swearing	BBC2	16.05.03 09.05.03	2100
CN 11482	The Killing Zone anti-Semitic content	Channel 4	18.05.03	2100
CN 11486	Top Gear insensitive and inappropriate content	BBC2	11.05.03	2000
CN 11491	The Day Britain Stopped distressing and offensive content	BBC2	13.05.03	2100
CN 11493	Lights. Camera, Accident animal cruelty	Five	18.05.03	2000
CN 11494	The Weakest Link offensive questioning	BBC2	16.05.03	1715
CN 11496	GMTV disturbing imagery	ITV1	18.05.03	0600
CN 11498	BBC News disturbing imagery	BBC1	16.05.03	2200
CN 11500	Queer as 18th Century Folk homosexual scenes	Channel 4	08.05.03	2100

*Related Cases 11373/11393/11419.3/11459/11508

CN 11507	Terror in Moscow disturbing imagery	Channel 4	12.05.03	2100
CN 11513	The Fast Show Farewell Tour profanity	BBC2	04.05.03	2230
CN 11519	TV's Naughtiest Blunders 6 animal cruelty	ITV1	13.05.03	2215
CN 11537	Crash of an Internet Porn King: Operation Landslide disturbing imagery	BBC2	20.05.03	2100
CN 11544	Murphy's Law: Kiss and Tell sexual content	BBC1	19.05.03	2030
CN 11548	Kevin and Perry Go Large sexual innuendo and scheduling	BBC1	17.05.03	2105
CN 11554	Rise animal cruelty	Channel 4	22.05.03	0655
CN 11555	Hollyoaks racist comment	Channel 4	27.05.03	1830
CN 11567	V Graham Norton derogatory remarks about the elderly	Channel 4	21.05.03	2200
CN 11576	Dismissed sexual content	MTV	20.05.03	1330
CN 11582	Call My Bluff racist content	BBC1	27.05.03	1230
CN 11584	Club Reps – The Workers homophobic comments	ITV1	29.05.03	2230
CN 11605	The Wright Stuff offensive content	Five	02.06.03	1000
CN 11606/ 11656	Rockface offensive and sexual content	BBC1	25.05.03 15.06.03	1745
CN 11626	Danger! Incoming Attack dangerous and offensive content	Five	08.06.03	1930
CN 11629	Your Face or Mine? racist content	Channel 4	17.05.03	1200
CN 11638	The Simpsons sexual content	Sky One	08.06.03	1930
CN 11639	Serious Jungle offensive content	BBC2	09.06.03	0700
CN 11640	Emmerdale homosexual content	ITV1	09.06.03	1900
CN 11642	SM:TV Live sexual content	ITV1	17.05.03	0925

Complaints concerning standards

CN 11648	White Girls are Easy racial stereotyping and sexual discrimination	Channel 4	02.06.03	1930
CN 11663	Scott Mills sitting in for Chris Moyles homophobic remarks	BBC Radio 1	16.06.03	1500
CN 11665	Rob Ellis offensive content	Rock FM	03.06.03	2100
CN 11666	Emmerdale tasteless and sexual content	ITV1	16.06.03	1900
CN 11668	So What Do You Do All Day? immoral content	BBC2	12.06.03	1930
CN 11673	RISE sexually offensive content	Channel 4	16.06.03	0655
CN 11675/ 11680	The Saturday Show irresponsible content	BBC1	21.06.03	0900
CN 11683	V Graham Norton offensive content	Channel 4	13.06.03	2235
CN 11687	Big Brother's Little Brother glamorisation of alcohol	Channel 4	18.06.03	1800
CN 11688	Trailer for BBC4 sexual imagery	BBC1	16.06.03	2200
CN 11693	GMTV inappropriate content	ITV1	18.06.03	0600
CN 11698	Question Time racially offensive content	BBC 1	30.05.03	2235
CN 11699/ 11700	News racist content	BBC News 24	23.06.03 24.06.03	0010 2125
CN 11704	Chris Moyles religious offence	BBC Radio 1	23.06.03	1500
CN 11715	Trailer for Six Feet Under Sexual content	Channel 4	27.06.03	2130
CN 11719	Wimbledon 2003 religious offence	BBC1	26.06.03	1630
CN 11733	Call My Bluff inappropriate sexual content	BBC1	30.06.03	1230
CN 11737	Trisha verbal abuse of a child	ITV1	19.06.03	0925
CN 11738	This Morning offensive comments concerning the Royal family.	ITV1	30.06.03	1030
CN 11750	24 violent content	BBC2	06.07.03	2200

CN 11758	This is Dom Joly sexist content	BBC3	01.07.03	2130
CN 11764	Dead Ringers racist content and religious offence.	BBC2	07.07.03	2100
CN 11769	Bo' Selecta! sexual content	Channel 4	11.07.03	2315
CN 11770/ 11778	Bad Girls homosexual content.	ITV1	10.07.03 03.07.03	2100
CN 11773	4 in a Field: Radio 4 at the Glastonbury Festival swearing and offensive content	BBC Radio 4	08.07.03	2300
CN 11775	V Graham Norton offensive content	Channel 4	07.07.03	2230
CN 11776	V Graham Norton animal cruelty	Channel 4	08.07.03	2235
CN 11783	Cavegirl sexual stereotyping	BBC1	15.07.03	1645
CN 11784	The Shield: The Partners graphic violent content	Five	15.07.03	2250
CN 11791	Coronation Street graphic scene of child birth	ITV1	06.07.03	1930
CN 11804	Advertisement for Sony Theatre System frightening content.	various	various	various
CN 11808	News offensive content	Sky News	16.07.03	1450
CN 11812	BBC News disturbing content	BBC1	18.06.03	1300
CN 11866	Top of The Pops offensive and suggestive dancing	BBC1	25.07.03	1930
CN 11906	News distressing imagery	Sky News	01.08.03	1920
CN 11910	Monkey Dust offensive content	BBC2	31.07.03	2320
CN 11932	The News Quiz Offensive comments	BBC Radio 4	26.07.03	1230

Broadcasting Standards Commission

7 The Sanctuary, London SW1P 3JS

t: 020 7808 1000

f: 020 7233 0397

e: bsc@bsc.org.uk

w: www.bsc.org.uk