

Analysis of complaints.....	1
Standards of service.....	1
Summaries of upheld complaints .....	2
Document, Radio 4, 30 July 2007.....	2
Costing the Earth, Radio 4, 30 August 2007.....	2
The Restaurant, BBC Two, 30 August and 6 September 2007 .....	3
Breakfast, BBC One, 17 September 2007 .....	3
Panorama: How I Became a Muslim Extremist, BBC One, 1 October 2007 .....	4
Street Doctor, BBC One, 22 October 2007 .....	4
Breakfast, BBC One, 26 October 2007 .....	4
The Politics Show, BBC One (West Midlands), 2 December 2007 .....	5
The ONE Show, BBC One, 10 December 2007 and related website .....	5
Miranda Hart's House Party, Radio 4, 15 January 2008.....	6

## Analysis of complaints

From 1 January – 31 March 2008 the Unit reached findings on 50 complaints concerning 48 items (normally a single broadcast or webpage, but sometimes a broadcast series or a set of related webpages). Topics of complaint were as follows:

**Table 1**

<b>Topics of Complaint</b>	<b>Number of Complaints</b>	<b>Number of Items</b>
Harm to individual/organisation (victim complaint)	3	3
Harm to individual/organisation (3 <sup>rd</sup> party complaint)	1	1
Infringement of complainant's privacy	1	1
Party political bias	2	2
Other bias	13	13
Factual inaccuracy	9	9
Offence to public taste	2	2
Offensive language	2	1
Violence	1	1
Sexual conduct	2	2
Sensitivity and portrayal	7	6
Racism		

## **Summaries of upheld complaints**

**Document, Radio 4, 30 July 2007**

### **Complaint**

The programme featured allegations by a former Colonial Service officer who had served in the Ministry of Labour in Lagos at the time of the 1959 Nigerian elections that there was a pattern of electoral malpractice by officers of the Colonial Service aimed at securing the outcome preferred by the UK. The Overseas Service Pensioners' Association complained that the allegations were neither substantiated nor properly challenged or appropriately balanced. The Association also complained that a statement by a historian that the British tried to manipulate elections to their advantage "*in almost every single colony*" was unwarranted, and went without challenge or rebuttal.

### **Ruling (updated 6 July 2009)**

There was no direct corroboration for the allegations concerning the Nigerian elections, and the ECU established that the author of the leading contemporary study of the elections (whom the programme-makers had not succeeded in contacting) maintained unequivocally that he had found no evidence of the kind of electoral malpractice alleged. Although the programme included a rebuttal from a former official, this was not enough to offset an overall impression that the allegations were more credible than the evidence in fact suggests. It was legitimate to include a claim by a reputable historian about other British colonies, but the claim is vigorously contested by some, and the programme should have reflected this. In this respect, there was a breach of the Editorial Guidelines on Accuracy, which require that the BBC's output be "*well sourced, based on sound evidence [and] thoroughly tested*", and a consequent breach of the Guidelines on Impartiality, as it resulted in a less than balanced treatment of a controversial point.

### **Upheld**

#### **Further action**

The Editor, Documentaries (Audio & Music Factual) has discussed with the programme team the need to ensure that balance is properly maintained on controversial topics, in particular to make sure an impression is not given that allegations are more credible than evidence presented suggests. He will revisit the subject with the team before the next series of Document goes into production.

**Costing the Earth, Radio 4, 30 August 2007**

### **Complaint**

A representative of the wind farm industry complained that the programme's treatment of the subject had been inaccurate and unbalanced, and that it had inappropriately presented as "experts" two speakers who represented viewpoints critical of the industry.

### **Ruling**

The programme explored legitimate concerns about the extent to which the Government's regime of financial support for wind-generated power was leading to developments on unsuitable and ultimately uneconomic sites, and these concerns were put to the relevant Minister for comment. It was also legitimate to present the programme's two principal critics

of the Government position and its consequences as experts in their field. However, there were four occasions in the programme on which they made comments which should have been either balanced by another viewpoint or appropriately qualified.

### **Partly upheld**

#### **Further action**

The production team has been reminded about the need for fully balanced arguments in tackling controversial and complex issues.

### **The Restaurant, BBC Two, 30 August and 6 September 2007**

#### **Complaint**

Part-way through this series, in which aspiring restaurateurs competed to win the chance of running a restaurant in partnership with Raymond Blanc, a viewer complained that the Tesco brand had featured excessively.

#### **Ruling**

It transpired that Tesco was the only supermarket chain willing to allow filming at the short notice required by the production schedule, so it featured in several last-minute shopping trips by the contestants. The ECU found that, although there had been editorial justification for filming in Tesco, the prominence of the name and brand in two of the programmes had exceeded what was editorially justified.

#### **Upheld**

#### **Further action**

The finding has been discussed by the commissioning and production teams and the relevant programmes will be edited ahead of any future repeat to address the concerns raised.

### **Breakfast, BBC One, 17 September 2007**

#### **Complaint**

A viewer complained about an interview with a representative of Ecowatts about the thermal cell his company was developing. Ecowatts claims that, by virtue of a process not yet understood by science, the cell produces a net energy gain, and this claim was uncritically accepted in the item.

#### **Ruling (updated 2 June 2009)**

Ecowatts acknowledges that it is working in a scientifically controversial area. The fact that its claims have attracted some criticism should have been reflected in the item.

#### **Upheld**

#### **Further action**

The Editor of **Breakfast** has discussed the issues arising from the finding with her programme team, reminding them of the importance of checking and cross-checking facts; corroborating claims made by contributors, wherever possible; and ensuring that any

references to a product, brand, service or organisation are editorially justified and not open to misinterpretation as endorsement.

## **Ruling**

The therapy is not the product of peer-reviewed science, and there was no editorial justification for featuring the company which offered it in this uncritical context.

## **Upheld**

## **Further action**

The Editor of **Breakfast** has reminded the team that claims made by companies and/or individuals of scientific breakthroughs - though legitimate areas for investigation and coverage in news programmes with a magazine format such as **Breakfast** - should only be broadcast where appropriate checks have been made. Teams should seek to find peer-reviewed scientific research where possible, so that undue - and uncritical - prominence is not given to a commercial service. Teams should also remember to draw upon the advice and guidance of the Newsgathering Specialist correspondents within News.

## **The Politics Show, BBC One (West Midlands), 2 December 2007**

## **Complaint**

A viewer who campaigns for “safe standing” areas in football grounds complained about the suggestions that the use of fencing in English grounds to segregate rival fans was a direct result of what happened at the Heysel Stadium in 1985, and that the Hillsborough disaster was caused by an influx of ticketless supporters.

## **Ruling**

Neither suggestion was correct. Fencing was already in widespread use by 1985, and Lord Taylor’s report on the Hillsborough disaster concluded that ticketless fans were not a significant factor.

## **Upheld**

## **Further action**

The Editor of the programme discussed with the reporter concerned the need to guard against inaccuracies arising from the attempt to present complex issues in a concise and accessible form.

## **The ONE Show, BBC One, 10 December 2007 and related website**

## **Complaint**

A viewer complained about a report on biometrics in the programme and related material on the programme’s website, which he believed amounted to propaganda for the Government’s policy on identity cards.

## **Ruling**

The item as broadcast was duly balanced, and reflected the concerns of civil liberties groups about the technology in question. However, the programme’s website provided a link only to an external website promoting the latest developments in the biometrics industry, and this did not comply with the requirements of BBC guidelines on balance in links to external websites.

## **Partly upheld**

### **Further action**

The production team were reminded of the need to ensure appropriate balance when linking to external sites from a BBC programme-related website.

### **Miranda Hart's House Party, Radio 4, 15 January 2008**

#### **Complaint**

Two listeners complained of a disparaging reference, in a humorous context, to a woman with a cleft palate. Both referred to a previous finding about **Mark Lamarr** (Radio 2, 29 July 2006), where the complaint had been upheld on the basis that the humour implied that cleft palate was risible.

#### **Ruling**

The cleft palate reference was derogatory, and in this instance the condition was somewhat more directly the butt of the humour than in the case of the previous finding.

#### **Upheld**

#### **Further action**

The management of Radio 4 will discuss the finding with the independent production company concerned, with a view to ensuring that its producers are fully aware of the issues arising from it. The attention of all programme commissioners in BBC Audio & Music has been drawn to this and the previous finding referred to by the complainants, and they have been reminded of the editorial standards which apply in such cases.