

①

5th. March 1986

REPRODUCTION OF _____ LBC RADIO PROGRAMME.

GILL PYRAH
(PRESENTER)

On Monday the Independent Broadcasting Authority (the IBA) announced that as from April it's going to examine all types of violence in its monitoring of films on television and that it's going to sponsor research into the effects of violence on younger viewers. Whatever the outcome of Winston Churchill's Obscene Publications Bill, one thing is sure, because radio and television come into our homes there will always be the call for them to be kept clean and wholesome. Mary Whitehouse is foremost in the campaign to keep obscenity off our screens and she's LBC's guest this afternoon to propose the motion for our debate and it is this: The Obscene Publications Act should be extended to cover radio and television. Ted Goodman will oppose her on this occasion, he's from the campaign against censorship and of course you're invited to join in our debate on this number 353 8111 and please ring up on Voteline to vote on the motion, that number is 583 1920. Mary Whitehouse proposes the Obscene Publications Act should be extended to cover radio and television. Mrs Whitehouse.....

2

REPRODUCTION OF REPORT FROM LBC

MRS. WHITEHOUSE: I'd like to start by saying that it shouldn't have to.

You know, the codes under which all broadcasting authorities work make it quite clear that there are certain limits that need to be set, they talk about the need in the early hours to protect children, they talk about the power of television to teach patterns of behaviour and so forth and so on, but if those codes had been adhered to there would have been no need whatsoever for this Act. Now let me go on a bit further and say this, it was Sir Hugh Green who as Director-General of the BBC who said "television is the most powerful medium ever to affect the thinking and behaviour of people". If that is true, as many many people believe it is true, we really do have to ask ourselves what it is television is saying and doing in front of us and if I could just add one other point; there are ^{internationally} now/over 700 pieces, reputable pieces of research which show a link between televised and social violence. Now I'm not going to blame all the violence in our society on television, what we're saying is this: here is one element in our increasing violent society that something could be done about, and because the broadcasting authorities have singularly failed to fulfil not only their codes but also the controls established by the Broadcasting Act which says that nothing that is likely to offend against good taste and decency, to offend public feeling or to incite crime and disorder, should be shown on television. That's not what Mary Whitehouse says, that's what the Broadcasting Act says and it's because they failed to fulfil that, that we now have and indeed that clause in Winston Churchill's Bill went through Committee this morning, so we're well on the way to getting broadcasting under the Obscene Publications Act.

(3)

* GILL

Mary Whitehouse proposing our Motion this afternoon -
The Obscene Publications Act should be extended to cover
radio and television, what do you think? Join in the debate
on 353 8111, ring the phone Voteline on 583 1920 and the
number of votes are in already 41% agree with Mary Whitehouse
59% so far are in disagreement.. That means they are with
Ted Goodman, whom we'll now hear opposing the Motion, he's
from the Campaign Against Censorship. Ted

TED GOODMAN: Well, as Mary Whitehouse says, you already have laws restricting
what can be shown on television and what can be broadcast on
radio, and that is why when the 1959 Obscene Publications Act

TED GOODMAN:
(cont)

was passed, it purposely excluded television and sound broadcasting, because the BBC was already governed and independent radio and television was subsequently governed, by laws which actually imposed stricter controls. The BBC is governed by its charter and independent television and independent radio are governed by the Broadcasting Act 1981, and each of these two state that ^{is to be included} nothing/in programmes which offend against good taste or decency to encourage or incite crime ~~or to lead to disorder or to be offensive to public feeling~~ or to lead to disorder or to be offensive to public feeling, cable television is governed by the Cable and Broadcasting 1984, Section 25 of which prohibits ^{obscene} programmes. Now these existing laws which are separate from the Obscene Publications Act and are different,, are in force, and as Mrs.Whitehouse knows, because she did take the matter to the Court of Appeal last year against the independent broadcasting authorities, so we have present laws which are enforceable and are adequate, by bringing in the Obscene Publications Act you will bring in a separate contradictory law in addition to, not in substitution to, the existing laws, and so you will extend chaos, because the Williams Report which reported to Parliament in 1979, stated that the existing ^{obscenity} laws in this country were chaos and should all be abolished and replaced by a comprehensive law which was based on logic. Instead of doing that, you're going against the unanimous findings in the Williams Report and bringing in new obscenity legislation extending the present unsatisfactory legislation to cover television and radio in addition to the existing laws and contradicting them. The result will be chaos, but not only will it be chaos, it will be harmful chaos because the Obscene Publications Act carries criminal sanctions of imprisonment and it has no exemption for news broadcasts or for documentaries, so you're going to render the people who produce such things liable to imprisonment or prosecution and also there's no exemption for people who in good faith deliver films to the BBC or ITV or programmes for independent broadcasting. Before they've been approved, they will be caught by the Obscene Publications Act so you will spread the chill factor of people in broadcasting and television who will be frightened of the criminal sanctions contained in the Obscene Publications Act which has already been denounced as chaos by the Williams Report so you'll add to legal chaos and it'll create great harm for broadcasting.

MRS.WHITEHOUSE: Yes, well, the point that I was going to make about this Bill, listening to my friend Mr.Goodman here, he really is over-complicating the matter vastly. Everybody as he says,, agrees that the present obscenity law is a mess; about that, there is no question, but what Mr.Churchill's Bill is is a private members' Bill, a private members' Bill always deals with one

GA

- 3 -

MRS.WHITEHOUSE:
(contd)

smallish issue. The Obscene Publications Act could not be repealed and replaced by a major law via a private members' Bill, that is the first thing to say. The second thing to say, and this has been very much stated in debate in the House, and it's worth mentioning, that however much may be said on the opposite side, that the clause which would now bring broadcasting under the Obscene Publications Act, has been passed in Committee. It is really quite nonsensical where you have all the other media come under the Obscene Publications Act or legislation, and broadcasting is exempt, and you see, while I would agree and we have never said otherwise, that the number of programmes likely to be covered by this Act would be very small, we have to look to the future. We're moving into the era of cable and satellite television, and in the States for instance, there are 40 cable channels that are devoted to nothing at all but pornography and when you get pressure, and I know that we have legislation to help with our cable and satellite, but when you're going to get pressure from Europe, from America via cable and satellite, what will be the inevitable consequence will be competition and when you get competition, you almost invariably get a lowering of standards, and you see what I really feel we need to do is bring this discussion down to the elemental factor of the impact of grossly violent television or violence at all, particularly upon the young and we do live in a society now, as a matter of fact, listeners may be interested to know that since 1956 when television became universal in this country, the figures for violent crime have increased 1700%. Now, that has to do with people, and I'm not suggesting for a moment and never have, that television is solely responsible, what I am suggesting is that ^{if} television makes a contribution to the suffering behind those figures, then we need to take some steps to control the extremes which do come on television, and are likely to increasingly come

Waha

PHONE-IN FROM
DANNY

SA

Mrs.Whitehouse, I don't understand your logic by saying that if you bring in censorship you have a safer society. In Nazi Germany they brought in a censorship against these things and they had a more dangerous society, so where's the logic of it?

MRS.W.

I think you make things altogether too simplistic. The whole development of Nazi Germany was in fact, historically true; it was the Weimar Republic before Hitler and the licentiousness of the Weimar Republic which turned people in on themselves, which made them desensitize them and they didn't care what was happening, there were no limits set; that was the climate within which Hitler came to power and I do want to emphasise to you and indeed it was emphasised in the House this morning, that there is no

question of any kind of political censorship, we have been always totally opposed to political censorship.

Danny But Mrs.Whitehouse, it follows automatically, you see you're arguing my case for me by saying that the Wiemar Republic was a free republic, Nazi Germany came in and stopped what they thought was licentiousness you see, and created a worse sort of situation.

Mrs.W. Well, you're not suggesting for a moment that some kind of control in this field, and forgive me, let me emphasise again because it's the heart of the matter, there are people always at risk, there are children at risk from the availability and we're not just talking about broadcasting of course, from pornography in our society, but children at risk, children as young as two, three and four years of age.

Danny Well, they're at risk when they cross the road aren't they?

Mrs.W. Oh, well, does that make it right? Come on.

Danny Well, do you want to stop cars going along because they kill children?

Mrs.W. Oh believe me, that's a bit silly. I think I'd like to hear from Ted Goodman.

TED GOODMAN Yes, I would like to take up Mrs.Whitehouse on some of the points she's making, This question of violence on the media, there is no conclusive proof. Japan has much more violence on the media than anything in this country and has very little crimes of violence.

Mrs.W. A very tightly-controlled society.

Ted Goodman Well, so is this one and you're trying to make it even more tightly controlled. On the subject of pornography, in Denmark ^{Professor} Ruchinsky of the Criminal Research Institute, has proved that sex crimes go down in countries where pornography is legalized, which is now in most of the Western World, except in Britain.

Mrs.W.

6A

Now, can I come back to Kuchinsky, which is very important. This is a classic example of the kind of propaganda which has been put out over the whole of the scene. The story about Kuchinsky whom I have met, I met him in Denmark, I asked him these questions, and what Kuchinsky did was visit thirty sex-shops. He stood in the door and eyeballed the people who went in and came out, his research was actually non-existent, we're still waiting how many years, fifteen years later, for the actual result of his research. I'm sorry, but don't mention Kuchinsky, Kuchinsky as an argument is totally discredited, he was discredited in America before the American Presidential Commission, he's been discredited everywhere he's gone, even Williams.

Mrs.W. If you read Williams Report very carefully, you will see
(contd)

T.Goodman With respect, the Williams Report rejects your arguments, and it rejects

T.Goodman Well, I'm afraid it is not true and the BBC themselves have put out publications to this effect, they've done research, research has been done worldwide, Kuchinsky did ten years research, he co-operated with the police, he sought the reporting of criminal offences, you can't rubbish all the reports that you don't agree with.

Mrs.W. But he still hasn't published his results.

T.Goodman Well he has, with respect.

PHONE-IN FROM JANET Whilst I wish Mary Whitehouse well in principle, and I support what she is doing, I have a small daughter and I think that things coming across on television are disgusting, particularly in the early evening, may I suggest that this Private Members' Bill would not be necessary if Lord Thompson and John Whitney as Head of IBA and perhaps Stuart Young as Head of BBC, implement these 1981 Broadcasting Acts. The BBC was put on the Statute Book and didn't operate really on a charter, now I have letters from a member of the staff at IBA saying that they agree with this sort of violence like rape on Crossroads, and you seem to be thwarted. I mean Norris McWhirter had to go to Court and take out a private prosecution about it.

* GILL PYRAH
(PRESENTER)

8

I'm sorry, let's just clear up what you have to say, you say you've got a letter from the IBA saying they agree with violence like rape on Crossroads. Janet - that's right. Gill - do you actually have a letter ^{from someone} saying that they think it is socially useful to examine for example the aftermath of a rape case in something like Crossroads so that people can understand the devastating effect it can have on someone.

*
Mrs. W.

9
What they said to me is that they do not think it is wrong to show a rape at 6.35 in the evening, they don't think it is wrong, ^{because} they take no notice of the Act which says when children are watching and they think it could be quite useful to have a discussion on rape at that time in the evening. There is also on Thames Television a programme called Help which precedes it, and they have a discussion on AIDS, herpes, the menopause and things that you would sooner discuss with your own children when the time is appropriate, not having it booming across in your living-room and this is breaking the Act frankly and Lord Thompson

T. Goodman Well if it is you can enforce it in the Court.

Janet You can't.

T. Goodman You can, Mrs. Whitehouse took it to the Court of Appeal.

Mrs. W. Can I just answer that - this year, as a matter of fact this week, I had a letter from the Director of Public Prosecutions, because of this Bill going through the House I sent to him the tapes of the play Sebastian and the play Jubilee and I have had a reply, you may have seen my letter in yesterday's Times and the DPP made it perfectly clear that although broadcasting comes under the Broadcasting Act, it is not a criminal offence

- 10

Mrs. W.
(contd)

to break that Broadcasting Act, and there is nothing that the DPP can do about those two programmes and if I can go on from there because this is really what is at the heart of all this matter, is the fact that both broadcasting authorities do have the most enlightened codes. Now one of the things they say in their codes, they warn producers against using any domestic object as a vehicle of violence right, now in Jubilee you had a policeman who was attacked by punk rockers, he was at bay and he picked up a pop bottle a domestic object freely available, smashed it against the edge of the pavement, and then pushed the broken edge of the bottle into the face of the nearest punk rocker. Now, can I just take the matter of the code of the guideline they are supposed to observe in other programmes, well, those of you who are listening if you take just that one point I've made, the use of a domestic weapon as a vehicle of violence, you will perhaps remember for yourself or after this see for yourself, the times domestic objects freely available are used as weapons of violence. Now it's only because they have consistently refused to fulfil the codes that the broadcasting authorities have put together for their guidance. This was said over and over again in the House this morning.

* GILL PYRAH
(PRESENTER)

11

Ted Goodman, can I ask you, you have stressed already that there are laws which govern these things and if people think the broadcasting authorities are falling outside the law they can independent cases to court. How successful are they likely to be, can you name cases where individual citizens ^{actually} have said "I object, something has been on my television" and gone to court and had some *decision* made.

*
T. Goodman

Well, Mrs. W can give you chapter and verse, The Law Report on the 4th April 1985 in the Times Regina -v- Independent Broadcasting Authority x Party Whitehouse which got up to the Court of Appeal says it all and we would have thought that with legalities the fact that she took it to the Court of Appeal shows that she had a case in fact.

(12)

Mrs. W.

I didn't take it to the Court of Appeal, the IBA took it to Appeal.

T. Goodman

Well, you won in the Divisional Court then it went to the Court of Appeal and it was reversed, so

Mrs. W.

Can we be clear what it was we were after? We were not after trying to take criminal action against the IBA, we were asking for a declaration that in showing scum, , they had failed in the duties laid upon them by the Broadcasting Act. We won that law, Justice Watkins in the High Court agreed entirely, the IBA made an appeal, they didn't appeal against the verdict, what they appealed against was the strong condemnation of John Whitney the Director-General, that he should have taken the advice of the independent broadcasting authority, that's what they appealed against.

PHONE-IN BY
JESSICA

All I want to say is that we've always had violence in society, long before the advent of television. We had Jack the Ripper, in gaslight murdering prostitutes in the most brutal fashion, and there are innumerable crimes that can be mentioned, and I think that as long as human beings exist, there will always be crime. I wonder why Mary Whitehouse thinks that if by her efforts, television is finally reduced to the level of children and mental defectives, and in any event, parents should be responsible for controlling their childrens' television watching time, why does she

Jessica
(contd)

think that somehow she's going to stop the level of crime, and what does she mean by obscenity? I don't understand all this zealoutry of all her listeners and viewers association, and how many people, we have millions of people in this country, apparently 55 million people in Britain and how many members do we have in the listeners' and viewers' association and what is their motivation I ask myself?

* GILL PYRAH
(PRESENTER)

14.

Jessica, we have one too many questions there, let's take the two main ones, one point being there's always been a violent society as far as Jessica is concerned and television doesn't make any difference and her second point is surely it's up to parents to make sure that children don't watch anything they shouldn't.

*

Mrs.W.

15. Yes, well, I'm sorry Jessica wasn't listening earlier on because if she had been, she would have heard me say that for instance, the level of violent crime stayed just completely on the same level from 1922 up to 1956 apart from a slight increase during the war. Now from '56 up to '83 that level of crime and violence had increased by 1100%. Now then, can I please bring this down to what it is we're really talking about - I want to say first of all that we're talking not about cinema, we're talking about television, that comes into the home. Now, if Jessica has nothing else to do but sit by her television set and switch off every time something comes on that is unsuitable, shall I say for her grandchildren because it sounded rather like that, then that's fine because ^{she} can do that, but what about the parents who have got every other kind of activity to follow, and what's more, you don't know you've got to switch off until the thing has happened, Now if I can bring all this down to what is the heart of the concern, Pye television did some research into childrens' viewing habits. Now, Jessica and others may say that it shouldn't be like that, maybe it shouldn't but what are the facts that you've actually got - 42% of your 11-14s watching after 10 o'clock at night, you have 45% of your 15-17s watching after 11 o'clock, 6% of whom are still watching at close-down. Now, what are they watching? They may watch a lot that is very good, but one of the things they may have watched is one of Goddard's Cinema, where they saw a woman masturbating a man, a woman performing oral sex on a man, there were four-letter words I won't mention but they were the four-letter words for the vagina, the penis, sexual intercourse, and so on. Jessica, let me ask you a question - would you be happy for children that young to watch that kind of thing? Would you let your children watch it?

Jessica

Can I answer that? Mrs.W.Yes, directly, would you or wouldn't you?

Jessica

Can I tell you something Mrs Whitehouse, I have listened to the programme in its entirety, I don't need affirming from you. Mrs.W.I'm asking you a question

Jessica

I've been listening to you for years, you don't listen to people, your mind is closed you know, I have spent my entire life in institutional child care caring for children, and I have had more than 16 children at a time under my control where I have to prepare the television programme for children's viewing, that was my responsibility. Don't preach at people, just allow Ted Goodman to have something to say as well.

T.Goodman Yes, well I would just like to point out Mrs.Whitehouse wants to bring in the Obscene Publications Act which will criminalise the television programmes and broadcasting and will render the producers and directors liable to criminal prosecution under law, which as she states, is already a mess,so they'll be so frightened of contravening that law which carries imprisonment, that you're going to reduce all television to everything which is suitable for children, which is outrageous. You're saying that if children watch at midnight you must have.... well this is ridiculous, also your figures are wrong, the crime-wave of 1950s, the television in this country started in 1936, well ahead of that, so you can't blame it all on television.

Jill: I think this cause and effect argument is rather dangerous, you might as well say that crime has increased since the introduction of frozen food and it would be ludicrous to jump to the conclusion that frozen food was suddenly causing mass crime. Jessica, thank you very much for joining the Wednesday Debate, John's on the line now from Barnet. Good afternoon, John.

John Good afternoon, Jill. This is one simple straightforward question, no fudging of law, no fudging of what is obscene or what is violent. The last speaker, she makes you wonder, we must be living in two worlds, the two sides in this argument. On language, if I had to write down and repeat the television language and send it through the post or speak it in public, I would be prosecuted. A soccer fan last season was sent to prison for swearing at the referee, players are sent off for swearing, surely this must call for the Churchill Bill, for instance, do we have one law for television and radio and another for the public?

16A
T.Goodman No we don't, because the man at the soccer match was I should think prosecuted for insulting behaviour, I mean, ^{watching} television is one thing, creating a disturbance at a football match is another, does that mean you must never have any cowboy films or anything where anybody performs any simulated act of illegality on television? If so, we won't even be able to have Shakespeare on television.

John You talk nonsense, it's so ridiculous, we're talking about vested ^{interest} public, obscenities on television and that you're one of them.

T.Goodman We didn't, you don't have obscenities on television.

Jill Well John, Ted Goodman has answered your point, thank you for calling. Phone vote has shifted slightly now, 43% are with Mrs.Whitehouse, 57% are with Ted Goodman. Here's Chris from Upper Norwood, good afternoon.

Chris Good afternoon, Jill. I would like to say that I am completely and utterly against Mrs.Whitehouse's Bill. Mrs.W. It isn't my Bill.

Chris It is up to me what I watch on my television, and not up to some old lady dictating and telling me what I can and cannot watch or whatever, because there are three other channels which I can turn to.

Janet Of course the point is Chris it's not really up to you is it, it's the people who decide what they're going to put on those channels for you to choose between. If you were going to a shop and were going to choose films to put on the video that would be a different matter but you aren't making the decisions as to what comes on the television.

Chris No, but it's up to me whether I want to watch it or not. Chris, thanks very much for calling. Let me remind others of the number, 353-8111. We'll move on to another caller, they haven't really been given enough air time this afternoon. Alan in Southend-on-Sea, good afternoon.

Alan Good afternoon, Jill, and good afternoon Mrs.Whitehouse. Mrs.W.Hallo,Alan. I agree with Mrs.Whitehouse 100% that we want to protect the young from any forms of violence other than the obvious things such as Terrortoons but what we want to do is to find out, I'd like to find out,who is going to do the censoring and on what national basis does Mrs.W.believe that she is right because talking to a normal people, a cross-section in the normal way of life, most people believe that broadcasting only reflects the type of raw and difficult society, the stressful society, that we have at the moment, so do we not have to strike a balance between being reasonable to ordinary folk to have freedom to see what they want to see or have we got to have everything attenuated by good-intentions but potentially rather over-zealous intentions of Mrs.Whitehouse.

Mrs.W.

Well, can I answer that question first of all, but I'd really ^{rather} like to come back on what Ted said a minute or two ago, when he said we don't have obscenity on TV, I must say that really reveals your own standard if I may say so, But coming to your question now, you see this idea that the association for which I speak has any power to censor is, forgive me, absolute nonsense. We have no power, I wouldn't touch it with a barge-pole, what we do, and when I put out a statement I put it out solely for the members of our association, we say that if in our view at a particular time, a broadcast programme has failed to fulfil the obligations laid upon them, not by me, but by Parliament, they have an obligation not to offend against good taste and decency, people may like it or not like it, but that is the fact and all that we do is say at a particular moment, we believe in our terms, you did. Now those people who disagree, have got just as much right and opportunity as we have - write in and say 'I think that was fine, let's have more of those four-letter obscenities, I think it's splendid for children to be able to hear those kind of things'. You know, it's a free society, we have got the right to make our voices heard.

17A

T.Goodman With respect, you're doing more than that. Even under existing law, you've been involved in court cases which you have taken against, incidentally, the Independent Broadcasting Authority, so you already try to impose your standards.

Mrs.W. This is nonsense. You see, these things slip glibly off your tongue.
(All talking at once)

T.Goodman Well that's that under the new law the Director of Public Prosecutions will do it, and the people will be so frightened of contravening the Obscene Publications Act, which as you've admitted, is a complete mess, so that all err on the side of caution, so the effective restrictions will be more because there will be criminal sanctions attached so the effect will be censorship.

Mrs.W. I mean, you see there's so much nonsense lies behind this glib presentation of what the situation is. As far as Con was concerned, which is the last case, as I've said earlier if you had been listening, we didn't bring criminal action, we asked simply for a legal declaration. T.Goodman. You brought criminal proceedings. Mrs.W. Yes, but you said criminal action. T.Goodman Well they will be, you want to make them criminal by taking The Obscene Publications Act to television ~~xxx~~ ^{that's} your purpose. Mrs.W. No, you talk your way out of anything, what I'm trying to put quite clearly is this, that over we asked for a judicial declaration. Now, who makes the declaration, not me, but the jury and the judges concerned, they interpret the Act, the way you're talking, anybody would think we shouldn't have an Act of Parliament, that those who want to broadcast should be absolutely free to say or to do anything they want and should not be controlled by any law. If they are controlled by a law, then the judges have to decide on behalf of us all, not on behalf of me, whether or not in a particular programme, a producer fails to fulfil his obligations, that's what it's about.

J111: What you're asking for in effect ^{for judges to make a decision about} then, is ^{what is suitable to} be shown on television rather than television management.

18A

Mrs.W. No, I would much,much,much rather that the broadcasting authorities themselves fulfil their obligations that are laid upon them, but I mean with these that I've got in front of me here, I wouldn't dream of reading it over the air, I can't read it over the air because I would have legal action taken against me, but I mean the ITV programmes for choirboys, one stream of four-letter osbscenity, now that goes directly against not only the guidelines but the broadcasting act, and if the broadcasters and the IBA don't control, they've really got only themselves to blame that we are in the situation where we are now, that we're having a private members' bill now to control it, well it's only a bill at the committee stage, to control ~~the~~ excesses.

Jill: Ted Goodman, I'd be interested to know from you whether or not you think there ought to be separate legislation governing fiction and news or documentary coverage, whether unpleasant acts are described in the news, whether ^{see}we film footage on war situations and so forth, whether that should be excluded from any regulations covering what cannot or cannot be shown on television.

T.Goodman: Well definitely, in fact, unfortunately in an attempt to do that this morning in the committee stage was defeated, and therefore, news broadcasts and documentaries will not be exempt from this process of trying to bring a criminal law into broadcasting.

Jill: Why do you say that there should be that definite distinction?

T.Goodman: Well, because the point is that if this is your reporting fact as Professor Williams pointed ^{about} out, Winston Churchill's attempt to extend the Obscene Publications Act to broadcasting as it was introduced, it would have prevented evidence of war crimes ever being displayed therefore people could deny their validity.

Jill: But if you're claiming that it shouldn't be shown in fiction because you are going some way to agreeing that this might have a brutalising or upsetting effect

T.Goodman: No, I'm not going, I'm just saying that no way was this an exemption to an act which we oppose in any event.

Jill: But let us take the case that people have decided that certain things should not be shown in fiction because they will be upsetting to younger viewers, why is not upsetting if those things are shown to be factually true? Surely, that's more upsetting than saying that this is only a story.

T. Goodman Yes, but with respect, already under the guidelines the newsbroadcasters, the news editors show this ^{bill} will reach the Statute Book and I shall be very surprised if crimes of violence then fall and then we shall be given the lie that they were all caused by television.

19A

Jill: You see there's another thing; I might as a viewer, object to the image for example of women. There's a role that they are put into in certain ways in a way that they may be mentally abused and yet I can't complain that that is obscene, I can simply say that I don't like the fact that children will be watching and grow up with the idea that that is what a woman is for.

T. Goodman Well, I think you're curing it yourself, more women in the media such as yourself. If you get more women directors, producers and presenters hopefully they will present a different image. I accept that until recently it was a male-dominated profession but you yourself are starting

to put that right.

Jill

But I don't think it's going to settle any arguments, you know, where should the line of censorship be drawn. If I say I have an individual objection to that I don't want to see it, should I have the authority to say, I will therefore exercise leverage and pressure on the law that already exists, and say for that reason I don't think anybody should be allowed to put these views across.

T. Goodman

Well I agree, that is true. You have a control over your children and guidelines help you to exercise that control, in other words you must tighten up that control after 9 o'clock at night. If you choose not to, that's your decision, you can't blame the programme producers for not having children's material all the time, and therefore you must be responsible for your children. As for adults, they should be as far as possible, free to choose what they wish to choose for themselves.

Jill

Ted Goodman, that brings us to the end of the Wednesday Debate. Thank you very much indeed for joining me. The final vote is this: 40% agree with Mary Whitehouse that the Obscene Publications Act should be extended to cover radio and television; 60% disagreed.