

[Home](#)[About ESLJ](#)[ESLJ Team](#)[ESLJ Issues](#)[Volume 7
Number 1](#)[Gies](#)[Submission Standards](#)[Call For Papers](#)[News](#)[Conferences](#)[Copyright](#)[Exclusivity](#)[Links](#)

Not signed in
[Sign in](#)

Powered by [Sitebuilder](#)
© MMIX | [Privacy](#)
[Accessibility](#)

ESLJ Volume 7 Number 1 Special Issue - Articles

[Contents](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[The HRA and the](#)[Mainstream](#)[Human Rights, Ethics](#)[and Reality](#)[Television](#)[Race and Rights in](#)[CBB](#)[Conclusion](#)[Bibliography](#) [Download](#)

ISSN 1748-944X

Celebrity Big Brother, Human Rights and Popular Culture

Lieve Gies*

Lecturer, School of Law,
Keele UniversityVolume 7 Number 1
CONTENT[➔ Guest Editorial](#)

ARTICLES

[➔ Lieve Gies](#)[➔ Su Holmes](#)[➔ Sean Redmond](#)[➔ Dania Thomas](#)[➔ Eliza Varney](#)

ABSTRACT

*The British reality show
Celebrity Big Brother
caused great controversy*

in January 2007 when remarks made by a few contestants, most notably the reality TV star Jade Goody, and targeted at a fellow Indian contestant, were widely read as racist. In this paper, I analyse the race incident against the backdrop of a progressively expansive legal framework offering recognition for human dignity, equality and cultural diversity, most importantly through the Human Rights Act 1998. The Act aims to promote a comprehensive human rights 'culture' in public life, but it would be hard to ignore the extremely negative coverage of the legislation in large sections of the British press. However, the strong public reaction to the Celebrity Big Brother race incident seems to suggest that while public opinion on existing human rights legislation is divided, the core principles on which the law is founded may enjoy much greater support. Thus, politicians and media commentators were quick to read the Celebrity Big Brother furore as an encouraging sign of how inclusive British society had become. I am inclined to take a more sceptical stance, especially in light of the way in which Jade Goody's class background was relentlessly targeted in press criticism of her appearance on Celebrity Big Brother, while sympathy for her victim, the glamorous Bollywood star Shilpa Shetty, appeared to have been motivated largely by the fact that she fitted the media template of the deserving victim.

KEYWORDS

Human Rights Act 1998 - Reality Television - Race
Equality - Class - Gender

It has been eight years since the Human Rights Act 1998. One of its main goals was to incorporate the European Convention on Human Rights into domestic law so that domestic courts would be able to enforce their Convention rights at the hands of a public authority. In order to provide legal remedies the government was concerned with what the 1997 Parliament. The ambition was not merely to provide a framework to implement a broad cultural change by creating a human rights culture. Public bodies would make decisions mindful of their obligations. The awareness of their human rights would also be boosted. The HRA 'at home' was intended to empower them and not to leave leaving aside any discussion here of a potential indirect effect of the HRA under the HRA between citizens. For a discussion of this see (see below) are that the benefits for individual citizens have been limited (see Thomas 2005) but what about the effect of the HRA on the relationship between 'universal' human rights and national law? This is the attention in academic literature (Carens 2000; Cowan, 2000). There has been less focus on the tensions between human rights and national law. The sense that human rights are nowadays 'part of the record' is not necessarily may be no more than a hegemonic effect of the power of the dominant human rights discourses.

Moreover, it is clear that the HRA has not had an unqualified success in British media. Rights are often constructed in media in a way that the liberal elite ignoring the interests of a silent majority. The HRA provides legal protection to undeserving groups (such as prisoners) and against common sense judgment of ordinary citizens (Klug 2000). It is tempting to suggest that human rights, which have historically been 'universalised' (Douzinas 2000a) and have acquired a certain popular legal imagination and may have lost the ability to challenge. Evidently, the tabloid treatment of the HRA tends to promote common prejudices, but it could also be read as a powerful statement. The words of Douzinas (2000a, p. 237) has 'positivised, tantamount to a

When a reality show featuring a group of celebrities was broadcasted, a massive public outcry in the dying days of Tony Blair's premiership. The way in which rights may indeed have been co-opted by the media of an emancipatory promise (Douzinas 2000a), manifested itself in the situated at some considerable distance from formal law. In the case of *Big Brother* (*CBB* hereafter), the celebrity version of the show, the case of Goody, a celebrity who acquired fame in a previous British version of the show, taunting Indian Bollywood actress and fellow *CBB* contestant, demonstrated how quickly the *CBB* episode became political. It was seen as a sign of a racially tolerant society but it was also appropriated by the audience swiftly decided to evict the racist celebrity from the show. The conclusive evidence that Britain had indeed become a more tolerant society. When a subsequent inquiry by the media regulator (Ofcom) publicly apologise over the way in which it had handled the episode, the position seemed further vindicated and endorsed. What does this tell us about the wish for in ascertaining that human rights thinking has been reduced to an imagination?

In this essay, I want to argue that this spontaneous outbreak of racism should be treated with great caution. The rhetoric of equality and human rights events came across as particularly shallow given the obvious outpouring of some unadulterated class prejudice, religious intolerance, her limited education and her (alleged) lack of intelligence. In embracing racial equality in the *CBB* context, it clearly indicates a position in which the dignity of the show's participants was being

reporting. Moreover, it is important to bear in mind that the show that thrives to a large extent on provoking conflict should not be too quick to blame the media and their audience for inequality and equality. At a more general political level, it perhaps 'the gap between the triumph of human rights ideology and the problem which continues to beset human rights as a practical ambition, it often remains partial and haphazard in its execution'. The *CBB* race incident offers a good illustration of the unevenness of the culture.

THE HRA AND THE MAINSTREAM

A survey commissioned by the Disability Rights Commission (<http://83.137.212.42/sitearchive/DRC>) made sobering reading. It could not name any of their human rights. This points to the fact that the HRA at its most basic level entails, yet the same survey found that 70% of those questioned from adopting the belief that the HRA was a good thing. The knowledge of a law, such being able to name the Convention, is a sign of the legitimacy and acceptance accorded by a lay public to the HRA and human rights legislation. However, there is a world of difference between knowing 'a good thing' in principle and asking whether human rights apply to everyone regardless of status.

If some commentators in the British press are to be believed, the HRA is protecting 'undeserving' groups but notoriously inept. This was demonstrated in the infamous KFC siege incident which was extensively reported in the *Express* 2006; Delingpole 2006; Savill 2006; Smith 2006. The HRA is also criticised for the selective and negative reporting of government ministers (Falconer 2007; Klug 2007). The news that a suspect in a rooftop siege by police anxious to ensure 'his wellbeing' was not the HRA was no more than a 'criminals' charter'. The HRA's tactics to bring the siege to a peaceful end which had been widely reported gave the distinct impression that the HRA was not a good thing. The human rights specialist Francesca Klug (2007) writes:

Once the inevitable reality dawned that the HRA, rather than the "bringing rights home" narrative suggested by the tabloids, was inventing stories based on cases that never happened, the HRA, with no government rebuttal unit, until recently, [footnote omitted]. The tabloids have effectively shaped the public mind which reads: human rights for FTPs: law abiding citizens need not apply.

The notion that the HRA is essentially a rogue's charter for the public. (Note: The following question submitted by a Minister for Human Rights, in a Number 10 webchat, was given more rights than honest hard working people when someone breaks the law, they should (*sic*) forgo going to look after the innocent honest people first, why? See <http://www.number10.gov.uk/Page11712> (accessed 2008, p. 29) report suggests that while there is strong protection for human rights, 43% of people surveyed believe that the HRA is abused by too many people including 'asylum seekers and "that more than 35,000 readers taking part in a recent survey should be repealed, arguing that 'the crazy legislation should be freed to re-offend. Others have used the barmy laws of the HRA (Delingpole 2006). A 2007 YouGov poll commissioned by the press found that 70% of those surveyed believed that the UK should withhold powers to fight terrorism (<http://www.migrationwatchuk.org/dt=01-July-2007#157>). Obviously, it is clear that much

detailed map of public attitudes towards the HRA (and civil 2007)). (It is worth noting, for example, that the Equ launched an inquiry that aims to produce a comprehensive <http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/projects/human> (accessed 18 August 2008).)

So far as media discourse is concerned, when pondering universal and available to all, it is clearly not just the undeserving. Protecting the human rights of the general public also travellers, transsexuals and school pupils wishing to travel - is already proving quite a stretch in itself for the media. For example, in a recent article in the *Daily Mail* (Phillips 2004), the *Daily Mail's* most prolific columnist, the mean prisoners can hitch a ride on the grotesque case of a prisoner who was granted legal aid to sue the Home Secretary for 'helping of rhubarb crumble in a jail canteen'. The emphasis is on the familiar media trope that prisons are a soft option for inmates are cosseted rather than punished (Mason 2005). As to who are the worst culprits in causing these human rights abuses, the finger is pointed at judges, stating that they 'have simply got no reasons is human rights law' (Phillips 2006). The gist of the article emboldened judges to act as legislators: 'we are living in a d'etat, driven by a profound contempt for the law, the answerable' (Phillips 2006). Human rights lawyers are not the main beneficiaries of the HRA, allowing them to 'line up to fight human rights cases in the courts. (Note: This was an extent shared even by a paper such as *The Guardian* sympathetic to human rights. Thus, for example, in a recent article prominent human rights lawyers such as Michael Mansfield and for other successful radical lawyers who have reacted to the HRA and a social conscience have been perfectly compatible beyond').

However, it would appear that it is not so much the press in the British press but rather those groups who are seen as undeserving claimants seeking to obtain compensation. Human rights lawyers eager to increase their already over-inflated fees prevents me from exploring this point in depth, but it is more supportive of international human rights. Thus, in a recent article with palpable outrage on an American holiday resort where holidaymakers can buy 'souvenirs' carrying images of the 'shop in the world' (Levin 2008). The contrast between the UK and home (especially in relation to the 'undeserving') and the US seems to echo Klug's (2000b, p. 5) observation: 'Ask the press probably say that human rights are something that is not known for the press to draw attention to the failures of the state. One striking example is the case of the octogenarian spinster sisters who challenged UK inheritance law to claim that it was unfair that they as cohabiting sister property they jointly own when one of them dies (for which they received sympathetic coverage in the press. Their plight under the Civil Partnership Act 2004 enjoy the same benefits as a tax provided they have entered into a civil partnership. However, they could neither marry nor become civil partners their rights under the Act (article 1 of Protocol 1) and their right not to be discriminated against being violated by the UK government. 'If the *Daily Mail* wrote the *Daily Mail* in a portrait of the sisters which called them a victim of human rights abuse (Hardman 2006).

We also learn in the same piece that the sisters 'could have never been a burden on anyone, least of all the tenacious and exceptionally brave in taking on the successive Prime Ministers from Harold Wilson to Tony Blair'. A simple letter to the European Court of Human Rights, finally willing to hear their case. We are told that while legal rich footballers, the Burden sisters had to self-fund the ordinary people like the Burdens' (Hardman 2006). Through the war effort of their family, the sisters' self community and home', their refusal to accept any assistance, in short their impeccable English white middle-class Joyce Burden was quoted as saying in the *Daily Mail* and *Sunday Times* (Knight 2006): 'This government is always who have done nothing to deserve them. If we were in a better world. But we are sisters and it seems we have no right to be here'. Grand Chamber on 29 April 2008 (*Burden v. the United Kingdom*).

The essence of this particular narrative, which appears in the press, is that rights should be treated as something that should be accorded indiscriminately to all human beings. Rights in this narrative are conditional and for the proviso that sexuality or nationality may also be a condition. A classic rights tenet that every human being has rights: inalienable rights protection. It may be tempting to discuss tabloid speak prone to unleash its prejudices on any kind of some indication that parts of the public believe that rights for some groups, there is currently not enough research available to show that the population at large overwhelmingly feels that the way in which the HRA represents a serious problem (although the Ministry of Justice has thought the HRA has caused more problems than it has solved for celebration either). In other words, we should be aware of popular belief.

However, questions about the universality of rights are not answered alone. In legal-academic circles too there is great doubt about whether rights ought to be universal. Thus, Dembour (2006, p. 3) argues that to exist *irrespective* of social recognition (affecting *all* human beings and space) does not make sense'. Reflecting on 'marriage' since 1789, Douzinas (2000b, p. 99) concludes, just as other scholars have always been shorthand for something far more narrow and specific than its entirety. This is not to suggest that such critiques are a critique of the discourse intent on highlighting what it perceives to be a flaw in the system. However, it does reveal that media scepticism about the universal grounding of human rights. We should therefore have an unquestionable common sense appeal and a minimum standard of rights protection to be accorded to all.

HUMAN RIGHTS, ETHICS AND REALITY TELEVISION

In its recent report, the Ministry of Justice (2008) points to the tension between basic human rights values, on the one hand, and a more pragmatic approach to human rights, on the other. While respondents in the survey were highly in the way in which they themselves wished to be treated by the National Healthcare Service, they did not necessarily support the other words, may support underlying human rights principles prior to legislation or human rights vocabularies. That may help to explain why it automatically mean a rejection of key principles which they do not support that implicitly there may be much greater public acceptance of these discourses and opinion polls specifically targeting the public. A pessimistic reading is that while people may object to government actions they regard as undeserving, they are selfishly prepared to support them.

benefit.

It is also important to emphasise that the 'culturing' of the idea of race equality: since the mid-1960s it has been the material conditions of immigrants who were already through race equality laws (McLaren and Johnson 2006) the level of self-reported racial prejudice has steadily remained relatively low today, although it has recently been found to could be attributed, for example, to strong anti-immigration politics (Creegan and Robinson 2008). It also needs to be noted that human rights law and traditional civil liberties remain relatively recently started to show a greater willingness to accept and Gearty 2007). Nevertheless, we may speculate (as we might) that the public would warm more to the HRA if people could see essential values of dignity, equality and respect that are protected by law and public policy. (Note: Obviously we have to allow that these and related values may differ quite significantly from those that operate at a legal level. Feldman (1999; 2000) points to a legal concept that is open to different legal interpretations. There is no direct right to dignity but rather rights that derive from empirical data on how lay individuals interpret 'dignity' and social care see, for example, Ministry of Justice (2008, p.

If, as my cursory overview above has established, there is a concern that the media are much more enthusiastic about embedding values that want to overstate the significance of what may have been relevant to note that the first UK series of *Big Brother*, was screened in the summer of 2000, just a few months before the time that legislation was becoming operational to embed these values, we witnessed the launch of a TV show which was notorious for compromising of contestants' dignity and privacy. In the context of reality television may create situations that could give rise to questions worth asking how compatible some reality shows are with the values of our culture, especially considering that some broadcasters have a sense of section 6 (1) of the HRA (Leigh (1999); *R (on the application of) AC 185*).

In itself it is not remarkable for TV to be provocative: it is a (largely factual and fictional) feature and even appear to command the attention of audiences endorse the breaking of any moral boundaries. It is arguably different: one of *Big Brother's* main assets is, of course, the provision of 'shared but privileged access to the lives of contestants' - or at least they are led to believe that they have - and that unscripted events unfold because they have the power to vote them off the show. This means that the voters bear a responsibility for how contestants behave. Moreover, it is not merely incidental to reality TV formats. Stanley (quoted in) 'humiliation is the unifying principle behind a successful reality show' - a generalisation, but it would be fair to say that many reality shows the dignity of participants is easily compromised. *Big Brother* there is some concern that its standards in the UK have been becoming more exploitative and more confrontational. In the context of the reality game involves pressurising contestants into participating (*of Here*), enticing them to have free cosmetic surgery, drinking alcohol to encourage transgressive behaviour (e.g. *Big Brother* (e.g. *How Clean is Your House?*) or deliberately misleadingly presenting value (*Big Brother* again!), there is considerable scope for abuse in these genres. Sokol and Wilson (2007) question whether participants consent in circumstances which, were they proposed a committee would almost definitely reject. Mendible (2008)

A closer analysis of the concept of humiliation is central to a central mechanism within modern social hierarchies about those post-human rights societies where women - is given the most lip service.

Such comments hint at there being a fundamental tension in rights character with a thriving reality television repertoire that reality TV throws up some very complex ethical, and does not over-simplify. Feldman's (1999, p. 701) insightful analysis involving a ban on dwarf-throwing competitions provides a state to prevent someone (in this case a dwarf), in the spectacle which is only possible because of a particular restriction, as Feldman asks, to privilege the dignity of a dwarf that of the human species at large over the dignity of a dwarf to live his or her life? Similarly, some reality shows show osteoporotic contestants (such as their weight problems, their premature aging, inarticulateness - as in Jade Goody's case - and even death) as a spectacle and entertainment, creating ethical dilemmas in the dwarf-throwing competitions case.

Ethical questions are constantly present in the public domain. Couldry points out:

Although some people might argue that ethics is not the central fact of ethics is at the heart of reality programming. The treatment of ordinary people by programme makers is based on people's private experiences and dilemmas. Right and wrong, good and bad moral conduct, and taste and decency are dilemmas that arise.

Couldry (2008, p. 9) argues that:

We should not be afraid to ask whether reality TV's generic claim to represent a slice of everyday life raises ethical questions. Suppose it becomes true that we in Britain have inter-religious differences caught up in the inter-religious television. Would this represent an important opportunity to question religion's role in societies such as Britain?

Viewed from this perspective, reality TV would appear to be a rights-conscious public opinion, if only because of the way in which because of their ordinariness or everydayness are very ordinary and very tangible quality when they are played out in the public sphere. In the debate about the ethical treatment of participants, of respect, reality television raises human rights questions that are beyond worded rights vocabulary or jargon. The moral indignation (and the somewhat guilty pleasure of deliberately seeking to watch reality TV) may, in other words, be a way of questioning those that are quite similar to those underpinning human rights.

There have been several examples of programme makers that have outraged public opinion and stirred up controversy. For example, the company behind the *Big Brother* franchise, created the show in which three renal patients in need of a kidney transplant were put on a waiting list. The show attracted international condemnation against it. A middle way appeared temporarily unavailable. A paper *De Volkskrant* (2007), while *The Guardian* asked:

2007). Desperately ill compete on a reality show beyond all ethical boundaries. It was only at the last moment to announce her chosen recipient that programme makers highlighted the shortage of kidney donors in the Netherlands as a legitimate way of highlighting the issue, while overlooking the charge that the show was distasteful, its broadcasts for kidney transplants were even more reprehensible (van

Apart from shocking our moral compass into action (show makers of reality television lay claim to another form of democratisation of fame. Biessi and Nunn (2004) argue that part of the same 'cultural moment' as New Labour's reality performers and sports figures, some overcoming considerable disadvantage and success. This new form of meritocracy was arguably enabling 'ordinary' people to become celebrities. To say that on TV such celebrity status can now be earned without appearing likable to a television audience has become a truism. Goody is for many the epitome of this new culture of celebrity from a disadvantaged background (a drug addict mother and a long prison sentence was to last far longer than Warhol's proverbial fifteen minutes). That in New Labour's Britain anyone who was disadvantaged could succeed without talent or hard work. The traditional 'success myth' has been replaced out: to become a reality TV celebrity apparently requires no talent, only to be selected by programme makers who privilege ordinary people. This is a new form of freedom' (Turner 2004, p. 79). It is not television that is the engine driving this new liberty.

There are good reasons to be sceptical of any intention to democratise the potential of reality television: the number of household names and other similar shows to enjoy long-lasting fame and success is small. It is to turn their fame into a durable asset that brings sufficient financial benefit to deprived backgrounds indefinitely. Because their fame is short-lived, celebrities manufactured by the reality TV industry usually disappear from their short time in the public limelight. Turner (2004)

What motivates the media's mining of the ordinary is the desire for the performance of endless and unmotivated divas. It is to remember that celebrity remains an hierarchical system, no matter how much it proliferates. It is in the interest of the media in the contemporary context, however, to disavow the value of watching in the demotic turn is the celebrity industry that has been convincingly through the media.

It has become an almost trivial observation to say that the rise of celebrity culture in which personality matters more than talent (Turner 130). What usually attracts less attention is that in the past celebrities have become public figures whose conduct is now previously reserved for public office holders. This may be true in politics, but it also raises ethical issues of its own, namely the question of a contestant emerging from a reality TV show (in the case of RuPaul outside world during his or her time on the show) to face a world where most spin-savvy politicians would struggle to cope with the *CBB* racism storm, her struggle to maintain herself as a public figure (and treated as being of equal significance by various newspapers) for her or his political survival. Her celebrity status was not the result of the accountability of a role model who is expected to be a role model for inclusivity and multiculturalism. The same inarticulate and uneducated previously feted by media commentators were now the

The scale of the race incident triggered by the 2007 s when viewed against the backdrop of reality television generally involves more than just an isolated television self-sustaining cycle of media publicity in which it acts magazines, Internet websites, other television program interpretation of events in the *Big Brother* house. Holn [of] the semiotic base of the programme', while Could media commentary as 'the interpretative vortex provc multi-layered text in which edited footage from the sho appropriated and 'raided' (Holmes 2004, p. 125) by a the definitive version of what 'really' went on inside th points out, continuous speculation that what viewers happened or did not reveal contestants' true perso television's claim that it displays reality in its purest a media interest in the show and often brings financial b exiting the *Big Brother* house to give their 'exclusive' media.

The net effect of all this is that even people who dic incident on *CBB* were still able to express an opinion deconstructions found in countless other media accoun subsequently posted on videosharing websites such as to the show that was scandalising British public opi exclusively in the UK managed to trigger mass stree incident coinciding with the official visit of Gordon Brow (Gibson, Dodd and Ramesh 2007). In Britain meanwhile on receiving a record number of complaints from the p investigations into allegations of racism on *CBB*, MP (Gibson 2007) and senior politicians from the Prime Mi watch the programme, but we are all entitled to an comment of the then Environment Secretary David Mi media reporting and commentary, further augment unleashed by the programme. The result was that the ever greater record, Jade was forced to go into hiding commercial sponsorship of the show was cancelled, and inches.

There is no denying that Shilpa Shetty, the victim of th bullying tactics. The name-calling by Jade and her gang highly unedifying: they famously called Shetty ' Shilpa F Shilpa's food hygiene standards and command of Engl how is this different from the humiliation that is routi about food hygiene had been addressed by one (white have been considered a pretty regular display of reali the English jibe had not been targeted at an Indian con been attached to it. That it is acceptable to humiliate became clear when at some point in the *CBB* saga boyfriend Jack Tweed (who was also appearing on the he had used the C-word instead, as if that was far less £2m-a-year celebrity sewer-mouth' (Muir 2007) to appe of performance to expect. It is hard to fathom that the would not have known of Jade's reputation for crudene original claim to fame.

If that of itself did not amount to complicity, the same n for their treatment of Shetty retaliated by bullying the | (not exactly the usual tabloid suspect) described Jade's was being called to account by programme makers in th

Jade defended herself by taking her foot and pla

me to be racial about anybody," she explained to apologise" ... the word you want, Jade, is not re-estimated £8m you have earned on a remedial liposuction.

When pillorying Jade for her treatment of Shilpa, including English, media commentators resorted to making a language abilities. The same opinion makers who were 'a dog', sought inspiration in similarly unflattering canines loved every minute of it, with her gang attacking the general on heat' (*Daily Mail* 2007).

When Jade was evicted by the voting public, this was taken for tolerant and multicultural Britain. In an interview with a recently established Commission for Equality and Human Rights 'I'm thrilled. It says that whatever else the people of this place where someone can be bullied or harassed just for could ask: what was so inclusive about a public and background so ferociously in retaliation for her own re- eye-for-an-eye morality in which, as Hari (2007) suggests another one, really the best we can hope for by way of that even in this rare moment of a supposedly surging (at least one commentator managed to find a way of blaming has rights now, whether or not she can spell them, before she forgoes a single one' (Jacobson 2007).

It seems decidedly premature to posit an eviction result that racism has been defeated. The tokenistic character even have done more harm than good in the struggle. *The Observer* that 'it soothes people into believing that racism'. The constant foregrounding of Jade's socially censored of *CBB* appeared to suggest that racism could be dismissed commentary in *The Guardian* neatly sums it up:

The fact that Jade is hardly blessed with great intelligence littered with profanities, that her behaviour rarely kind of subtlety, and that her status as former winner be where she is, makes it easy for the middle class crude, ill-educated, white working-class woman, goes without saying, never behave in that way. Censored practise it in a genteel middle-class kind of way (J

What was on display in the media maelstrom triggered more than an outbreak of 'self-congratulatory political white Britons' (Gopal 2007). By blaming Jade, commercial namely the association of racial violence with 'social racism' (van Dijk 1993, p. 250).

Significantly, the Jade-Shilpa affair was not just an interweaving of gender and nationality. Central to representation' (Yuval-Davis 1997, p. 45); the expected identity, values and traditions of their community and nation that she saw herself as an ambassador for her country constructing her as the perfect emblem of modern nonthreatening way. She was, as Hedge (2007, p. 454)

In the context of the security state and the nonthreatening postcolonial subject who has just not the migrant, the local Other who can disrupt of it. She sets off the debate but is the princess

back to India and continue to eat with her fingers most likely on silver plates!

As for Jade, she clearly was seen as an aberration disruptive and intolerant Britain, causing political embarrassment. Shilpa's elegance, poise and gentleness, in short every the national disgrace to be exorcised from modern, right her 'sink estate' upbringing, she was the 'white trash' 'human waste' that needed to be disposed of in the Jeffries (2007) described the *CBB* house as 'divided imperturbably dignified Indian woman'. It was Jade, of about Jade's physical appearance have always been perceived: even during her time on the *Big Brother* series where about her body proved irresistible to the tabloid press: critics in the years since her first *Big Brother* appearance mouthed personality had made her a national treasure was seen as largely harmless in a distinctly underclass and

Ever since she first walked into the Big Brother house with glee at her supposed stupidity that has a hungry, wanted to be told that the "underclass" were uncivilized from a foreign country called East Angles.

Jade's performance in *CBB*, however, turned her into a longer her sweet 'pig ignorant' (Jacobson 2007) self brain cells to utter racist thoughts. Jade was outed as (2007, p. 461), her perfume hastily withdrawn out of fear to pollute retailers' corporate image and make them into a commodity was literally turned into waste that consumers rediscovered Jade's all too obvious waste-matter identity. Her nominations for eviction being one of the key features that sent whom to the "refuse tip". In other words, contestants forced out themselves. They are both waste and waster.

CONCLUSION

The HRA has endured some very negative press coverage and ridiculed in sections of the media as the symbol of the political and judicial establishment. Undeserving claim: the most futile of causes while 'decent' white, middle-class Burden sisters are denied justice under the HRA. How negative public image, there is some evidence of a concern to have been found to value human rights principles without as a framework that is the HRA. Merry (2006) argues that 'vernacular': abstract and universal legal human rights culture into which they are being inserted. Thus, she says symbols, narratives, and religious or secular language that (2006, p. 220). While she predominantly applies this to communities and minorities, such processes of vernacular are relevant in dominantly positioned cultures.

When the newly-elected Labour government in 1997 was promoted its message through one central metaphor: the evocative imagery of the home that was striking (with and belonging), but the suggested action of *bringing* in semiotic terms - most importantly associated with the and is that of a simple folk tale involving a hero who goes to redress an imbalance, gap or serious injustice. The 'bringing' new Prime Minister, Tony Blair, and his ministers in their mission (affirmed by a landslide majority in the 1997

journey, going to Parliament to secure groundbreaking precious gift to the British public: access to conventional sent on his quest so that British citizens, aggrieved by longer be forced to embark on the long and arduous job 'bringing rights home' narrative to promote the incorporation suggested that the government realised that it had to convey the need for legislation. Ten years on, the same to capture the public and find the right imagery to safe having some serious and well-publicised misgivings about especially in the context of anti-terrorism measures. outrage involved *A v Secretary of State for the Home Dept* of Lords declared that s. 23 of the Anti-Terrorism, Crime and Security Act 2001 was incompatible with Article 8 of the HRA.

Opportunities for such image building may present themselves as an unpredictable vernacular moment which united multicultural Britain. A galvanised public opinion, expressing its disapproval of Ofcom, appeared to be sending an unequivocal signal to multicultural Britain. Senior political figures expressed concern. But a closer look at the *CBB* race incident reveals a less different from the usual suspect - the asylum-seeker, berated by sections of the media for exploiting the 'sympathy' of the perfect victim, a sanitised Other who was not clear even resisted accusing her tormentors of racism (see Tillyard 2008). neither the race nor rights card, attracting praise for her worth fighting for.

Jade Goody, on the other hand, represented a menacing waste of which multicultural Britain wished to cleanse commentators were outbidding each other to express concern. To be as an infringement of basic rights, and this even to the extent she was forced into hiding at the height of the *CBB* storm showed little inclination to express concern at her plight. In struggling to take hold, it is not because its core problem is because of significant difficulties in imagining the social bearers of rights. As the *CBB* saga shows, it is not just the molester, the terrorist - the 'wasted lives', in Bauman's respect. If even a previously popular reality television star of just how narrowly the deserving victim of human rights

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arnot, C (2007) 'Doyen of diversity', *Guardian* 31 January <http://www.guardian.co.uk> (accessed 30 June 2008).

Ashtana, A (2007) 'Why I had a change of heart about bully Jade', *Guardian* 24 January <http://www.guardian.co.uk> (accessed 30 June 2008).

Bauman, Z (2004) *Wasted Lives: Modernity and its Outcasts* (Cambridge: Polity).

Bauman, Z (2006) *Liquid Fear* (Cambridge: Polity).

Benhabib, S (2002) *The Claims of Culture: Equality and Diversity in the Global Era* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).

Biressi, A and Nunn, H (2004) 'The Especially Remarkable: Celebrity and Social Mobility in Reality TV'

Bose, N (2007) 'Big Brother's Frankenstein: The Media Construction of Jade Goody as an "Abject-other"' 7 *Feminist Media Studies* 459.

Carens, J (2000) *Culture, Citizenship and Community: A Contextual Exploration of Justice as Evenhandedness* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Clements, L (2005) 'Winners and Losers' 32 *Journal of Law and Society* 34.

Coles, J (2006) 'Finger nickin' good farce', *Daily Mail* 7 June <http://www.dailymail.co.uk> (accessed 19 August 2008).

Costigan, R and Thomas, P (2005) 'The Human Rights Act: A View from Below' 32 *Journal of Law and Society* 51.

Couldry, N (2002) 'Playing For Celebrity: Big Brother As Ritual Event' 3 *Television and New Media* 283.

Couldry, N (2008) 'Media Rituals: From Durkheim on Religion to Jade Goody on Religious Toleration', in Deacy C and Arweck E (eds) *Exploring Religion and the Sacred in a Media Age* (Aldeshot: Ashgate) (forthcoming).

Cowan, J, Dembour, M and Wilson, R (eds) (2001) *Culture and Rights: Anthropological Perspectives* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Creegan, C and Robinson, C (2008) 'Prejudice and The Workplace' in Park, A. et al. (eds.) *British Social Attitudes, 23rd Report* (London: Sage).

Daily Express (2006) 'Human Rights Farce' *Daily Express* 7 June <http://www.express.co.uk> (accessed 19 August 2008).

Daily Mail (2007) 'The Party's Over for this Cinderella' *Daily Mail* 18 January <http://www.dailymail.co.uk> (accessed 30 June 2008).

Dembour, M (2006) *Who Believes in Human Rights?: Reflections on the European Convention* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Delingpole, J (2006) 'KFC, Fags and Pepsi...it's Human Rights, Innit?' *Times* 11 June <http://www.timesonline.co.uk> (accessed 18 August 2008).

De Volkskrant (2007) 'Donorshow BNN is Een Stunt', *De Volkskrant* 13 June <http://www.volkskrant.nl> (accessed 30 June 2008).

Douzinas, C (2000a) 'Human Rights and Postmodern Utopia' 11 *Law and Critique* 219.

Douzinas, C (2000b) *The End of Human Rights: Critical Legal Thought At The Turn of The Century*

(Oxford: Hart).

Dyer, C (2008) 'The Great Defender?', Guardian 8 April <http://www.guardian.co.uk> (accessed 30 June 2008).

Feldman, D (1999) 'Human Dignity as a Legal Value: Part 1' Public Law 682.

Feldman, D (2000) 'Human Dignity as a Legal Value: Part 2' Public Law 61.

Falconer, Lord (2007) 'Human Rights Are Majority Rights', Lord Morris of Borth-y-Gest Memorial Lecture 23 March <http://www.justice.gov.uk> (accessed 19 August 2008).

Gibson, O (2007) 'Big Brother "Racism" is raised in Commons' Guardian 17 January <http://www.guardian.co.uk> (accessed 1 April 2008).

Gibson, O, Dodd, V and Ramesh, R (2007) 'Racism, Ratings and Reality TV: now Big Brother Creates a Diplomatic Incident' Guardian 18 January <http://www.guardian.co.uk> (accessed 1 April 2008).

Gies, L (2007) Law and The Media: The Future of An Uneasy Relationship (London: Routledge-Cavendish).

Gopal, P (2007) 'Anti-racism has to go Beyond a Facile Representation Game', Guardian 25 January <http://www.guardian.co.uk> (accessed 30 June 2008).

Greimas, A (1971) 'Narrative Grammar: Units and Levels' 86 Modern Language Notes 793.

Hardman, R (2006) 'What about Our Rights, ask Sisters Fighting to Keep Their Home?', Daily Mail 15 September <http://www.dailymail.co.uk> accessed 30 June 2008.

Hari, J (2007) 'Jaded Contempt for the Working Class', Independent 22 January <http://www.independent.co.uk> (accessed 30 June 2008).

Harvey, O and Lea, M (2006) '35,000 Back Sun on Rights', Sun 13 May 2006 <http://www.sun.co.uk/sol/homepgae> (accessed 30 June 2008).

Hedge, R (2007) 'Of Race, Classy Victims and National Mythologies: Distracting Reality on Celebrity Big Brother' 7 Feminist Media Studies 453.

Hill, A (2004) Reality TV: Audiences and Popular Factual Television (London: Routledge).

Holmes, S (2004) "'All You've Got to Worry About Is the Task, Having a Cup of Tea, and Doing a Bit of Sunbathing": Approaching Celebrity in Big Brother', in Holmes, S and Jermyn, D (eds.) Understanding Reality Television (London: Routledge).

Jacobson, H (2007) "'Big Brother" Encourages us to

Embrace a Condition far more Worrying than Racism',
Independent 20 January
<http://www.independent.co.uk> (accessed 30 June
2008).

Jacques, M (2007) 'British Society is Dripping in
Racism, but No-one is Prepared to Admit it', Guardian
20 January <http://www.guardian.co.uk> (accessed 30
June 2008).

Jeffries, S (2007) 'Beauty and the Beastliness: a Tale
of Declining British values', Guardian 19 January
<http://www.guardian.co.uk> (accessed 30 June 2008).

Johnson, M and Gearty, C (2007) 'Civil Liberties and
the Challenge of Terrorism', in Park, A et al. (eds.)
British Social Attitudes: Perspectives on A Changing
Society, 23rd Report (London: Sage).

Klug, F (2000a) 'Target of the Tabloids', Guardian 14
July <http://www.guardian.co.uk> (accessed 30 June
2008).

Klug, F (2000b) Values For a Godless Age: The Story
of the United Kingdom's New Bill of Rights (London:
Penguin).

Akech, M., "The Maurice Odumbe Investigation and
Judicial Review of the Power of International Sports
Organizations", [Entertainment and Sports Law
Journal](#), ISSN 1748-944X, January 2008,
<<http://go.warwick.ac.uk/eslj/issues/volume6/number2/>

Klug, F (2007) 'Human Bill of Rights: Do We Need One
Or Do We Already Have One?' Public Law 701.

Knight, I (2006) 'Two Ladies and a Blinding Injustice',
Sunday Times 17 December
<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news> (accessed 30
June 2008).

Lawson, D (2007) 'Jade is Crude and Abusive, but her
Freedom of Speech Extends to the Right to be Rude',
Independent 19 January
<http://www.independent.co.uk> (accessed 30 June
2008).

Leigh, I (1999) 'Horizontal Rights, the Human Rights
Act and Privacy: Lessons from The Commonwealth?'
48 International and Comparative Law Quarterly 57.

Levin, A (2008) 'Greetings from Guantanamo Bay...and
the Sickest Souvenir Shop in the World' Daily Mail 4
May <http://www.dailymail.co.uk> (accessed 8 August
2008).

Mason, P (2005) (ed.) Captured by the Media
(Cullompton: Willan).

McLaren, L and Johnson, M (2004) 'Understanding the
Rising Tide of Anti-immigrant Sentiment' in Park, A et
al. (eds.) British Social Attitudes, 21st Report
(London: Sage).

Mendible, M (2004) 'Humiliation, Subjectivity, and Reality TV' 4 Feminist Media Studies 335.

Merry, S (2006) Human Rights and Gender Violence: Translating International Law into Justice (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Ministry of Justice (2008) Human Rights Insight Project, Ministry of Justice Research Series 1/08 <http://www.justice.gov.uk/publications/research100108> (accessed 30 June 2008).

Mooney, A (2002) 'Human Rights, Linguistics and the Law: The UK and Beyond' 15 International Journal for the Semiotics of Law 389.

Morgan, J (2002) 'Questioning the "True Effect" of the Human Rights Act' 22 Legal Studies 259.

Muir, H (2007) 'Diary', Guardian 1 March <http://www.guardian.co.uk> (accessed 30 June 2008).

Phillips, M (2004) 'Jailhouse Madness', Daily Mail 28 April <http://www.dailymail.co.uk> accessed 30 June 2008.

Phillips, M (2006) 'What Planet ARE Judges Living On?', Daily Mail 31 May <http://www.dailymail.co.uk> (accessed 30 June 2008).

Propp, V (1968) Morphology of the Folktale. Revised by Wagner, L (Austin: University of Texas Press) (2nd Edn).

Raeside, J (2007) 'How Low can Dutch TV Go?', Guardian 30 May <http://www.guardian.co.uk> (accessed 30 June 2008).

Riddell, M (2007) 'Racism Lite Masks Reality on the Streets', Observer 27 May <http://www.guardian.co.uk> (accessed 30 June 2008).

Rothon, C and Heath, A (2003) 'Trends in Racial Prejudice', in Park, A et al. (eds.) British Social Attitudes: Continuity and Change Over Two Decades, 20th Report (London: Sage).

Savill, R (2008) 'KFC meal "Ensures Siege Man's Rights"' Daily Telegraph 8 June <http://www.telegraph.co.uk> (accessed 8 August 2008).

Slack, J, Salkeld, L and McDermott, N (2006) 'Euro-court Denies Sisters the Same Tax Breaks as Gay Couples', Daily Mail 12 December <http://www.dailymail.co.uk> (accessed 30 June 2008).

Smith, R (2006) 'Finger Nickin' Good' Mirror 7 June <http://www.mirror.co.uk> (accessed 19 August 2008).

Sokol, D and Wilson, J (2007) 'Ethics of Reality TV', BBC News Website <http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/1/hi/magazine/6702315.stm> (accessed 4 May 2008).

Turner, G (2004) *Understanding Celebrity* (London: Sage).

Van Bommel (2007) 'In de maling genomen voor een goed doel', *Volkskrant* 2 June
<http://www.volkskrant.nl> (accessed 30 June 2008).

Van Dijk, T (1993) *Elite Discourse and Racism* (London: Sage).

Yuval-Davis, N (1997) *Gender and Nation* (London: Sage).

* I presented an earlier version of this paper at the 'Law and Popular Culture' workshop hosted by the International Institute for the Sociology of Law in Onati (Spain) on 8-9 May 2008. I would like to thank its participants for their feedback. I am also grateful to Eliza Varney and the anonymous referee for their comments on an earlier draft. Any remaining errors are mine.

Gies, L., "Celebrity Big Brother, Human Rights and Popular Culture", [Entertainment and Sports Law Journal](#), ISSN 1748-944X, April 2009,
<<http://go.warwick.ac.uk/eslj/issues/volume7/number1/>