

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

ELECTRONIC LAW JOURNALS

Not signed in  
[Sign in](#)Powered by [Sitebuilder](#)  
© MMIX | [Privacy](#)  
[Accessibility](#)

## ESLJ Volume 7 Number 1 Special Issue - Articles

[Contents](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[The 'race row' in the  
CBB House](#)[Brief Narrative of  
Events](#)[The Regulatory  
Response to the '  
race row'](#)[Assessing the  
Commonsense](#)[Racism Lite](#)[The Choice of](#)[Disavowing Racism](#)[Racism Outside the](#)[CBB House: Race](#)[Legislation and  
Immigration Policy](#)[Essentialism](#)[Race Legislation and](#)[Immigration Policy](#)[The 'race row' and](#)[Media Power](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Links to External](#)[Sources](#) [Download](#)

ISSN 1748-944X

### Race and the refusal to name racism: consumption, identity and choice in the *Celebrity Big Brother House*

Dania Thomas<sup>1</sup>  
Lecturer, School of Law,  
Keele University

#### ABSTRACT

The centrality of consumption in the resolution of the 'race row' in the Celebrity Big Brother(CBB) House 2007 characterizes 'the consumption politics of race' engendered in response to 'racism lite' (adopting Mary Riddell's term) - forms of racial harm articulated in normative frames specific

to the entertainment industry. The regulatory response to racism lite was premised on a radical and post-modern framing of race and racial harm. When compared with the responses to racism outside the CBB House, this framing reveals a cautionary tale. The recognition of racism lite is confined to a market defined framework that attributes responsibility with a view to furthering economic agendas of dominant market actors. The danger is that this dominance can (as was the case with the 'race row' in the CBB House) henceforth define the terms on which racism is debated in contemporary society.

#### KEYWORDS

Race Law – Power- Media – Regulation - Racism

#### INTRODUCTION

Volume 7 Number 1  
CONTENT[➔ Guest Editorial](#)

#### ARTICLES

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

In some respects, the Celebrity Big Brother (CBB) 'race row' Graeme Turner specifies as 'conditions of celebrity' 'race row' 'celebrity' according to Turner '... highly visible through their ability to attract greater public interest than their professional life... (Turner, 2004, p.4). Thus consumption is the mass production of celebrity and CBB like any other reality show made celebrities mass-consumed products. Was the 'race row' and constructed (and thus insignificant)?

Or did the 'race row' reflect something significant about the forms and forms of racial harm? In a possible response, Turner appeals to specify another level of significance for 'the producers and the network, the celebrity they manufacture not their primary objective: *their goal is to develop a viable product for advertisers...*' (emphasis mine)(Turner, 2004, p. 54) The continuously engendering (and satiating) consumption is instrumental: it increases profits, wealth and status of the producers, the programmers, celebrities and sponsors) associated with the 'race row' inauthentic and constructed is the significance of the 'race row' instrumentality?

In his piece for the *Financial Times* at the time, Gautam Malkani notes the regulatory feature of the 'race row' not captured by its instrumentality. Malkani notes that broadcasting codes of offensive material must be justified by "context"..." (i.e. the viewing public ...face a key question: does the 'race row' represent viewer discomfort as a key regulatory concern not racial harm. But he goes on to stress that CBB was 'reality television' representing realities that might otherwise go unnoticed. Malkani's argument is premised on the delineation between two possible responses to consumer discomfort and the other that re-examines why the 'race row' was confined to the form of the 'race row'. Was this a reflection of the power of the media to produce viewer discomfort instead of racial harm? How does this inform the persistent reality of racism outside the CBB House?

The starting point for any discussion on the 'race row' is on a disavowal of racism by the alleged victim (the celebrity). The issue of the media framing of the issue as 'race row' leads to questions about regulatory responses to the victim. Was the victim 'harmed' by racism or was she 'offensive or bullying behaviour'- behaviour that discouraged her? The alleged victim reportedly (repeatedly) denied that racism, is this disavowal sufficient to make CBB a case since this was the view taken by the broadcaster (the programme), and the sponsors to justify their refusal to instrumentally increase viewing figures (and advertising revenue) assume that decisions were made with an eye to increasing the victim's wealth. The victim herself used the incident to increase her wealth. Was the 'race row' 'inauthentic and constructed' anyway and of no more questions than answers as follows.

Should the law (race legislation, for instance) be invoked against the alleged victim) individual victims disavow racism with a disavowal of racism, in the absence of the possibility of making the broadcaster a victim for racism, can we dismiss this particular instance of racism as the case that the 'race row' successfully tested the law? Or do we need to congratulate ourselves on its efficacy? 5

regulatory template that supplements or maybe even formal legal remedies under race legislation? Especial apportions a 'market-defined' responsibility through a s choices a victim makes and similarly sanctions 'offensive contrast to a legal framework that inter alia requires th Black, Asian or Eastern European) to name the harm compared with a standard, hegemonic, notion of 'white-

Does sensitivity to consumer choice, consumer discour audience obviate the need for attribution of responsibility the media regulator for instance, received the highest any television episode ever (45,000). The regulatory, clear that the broadcaster, the producers and the regu the victim for the incident through a series of econom also punishing the perpetrators by denying them econ both cases they were responding to audience conc target audience with the following choices – punish the the show and vote them out or vote to reward the victir

Was the disavowal of racism by the alleged victim as programmers and the regulator pivotal as on acco responsibility made way for a distinct market defined the large number of complaints received by Ofcom a which issues of this kind should be decided? Is it suffi the consumer is kept adequately informed of the incid care of by the market (the broadcaster, the prograr consumers be made responsible for the consequence without interference from the state?

But the flip side of affirmative answers to any of these ( the danger that the articulation of racial harm as a fa makes racism itself 'inauthentic and constructed'? Will ; named as the neutral 'offensive and bullying behaviour framework that valorises choice and the comfort of a t that the dominance of consumer choice as a standar makes racism in contemporary Britain mere fluff, a spectacle produced for consumption?

In the same vein, if viewed in its own terms why is the the disavowal reflect a discomfort with the persistent House and the failure of the law to deal with it? Is sanitizing programming decisions to increase viewing f the hegemony of certain values 'essentially tolerant an Or does the regulatory response to the 'race row' th constructions of identity actually engendering a hege racism and identity? Do victims of racism in the commonsense?

Historically, race legislation and immigration policy have regulatory responses to race, the former tolerant and f discriminatory. (Anwar et als, 2000). In contrast to the the CBB House had, the victims of racism outside the must negotiate the contradictory impulses of the two r 'non-white-non-English' (Black, Asian or Eastern Eur consumption choices they make. Does consumption as the market-defined framework of responsibility obviate does the acceptance of the victims disavowal of racism hegemonic media constructions of 'white- Englishness' have no choice but to negotiate? Thus depending advertising revenue, the 'race row' indicates that the valorise and which to punish.

The following section narrates the events as they unfolded and indicates the nature of responsibility in a market context. Section three discusses the regulatory response to the 'race row' through the framework of commonsense. Section four reassesses the events as engendered. Section five specifies the nature of responsibility, namely race legislation and immigration policy. Section six discusses 'race row' as an issue of responsibility in a market defined by the media power. This is followed by a summary and conclusions.

## THE 'RACE ROW' IN THE CBB HOUSE

### *Brief narrative of events*

Celebrity Big Brother is a reality television show broadcast by a Dutch company Endemol. At the time, the show was broadcast from the Warehouse, (who withdrew their sponsorship of the show since stepped in to sponsor the programme). In the show, contestants live together in a house fitted with cameras. The audience votes for the contestant who is voted out of the house. The last one left in the house is the winner. The audience vote is a response to content transmitted after the show is aired for maximum impact – increase viewing figures (<http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/1/hi/entertainment/62822/01/2007>).

The first CBB episode that caused the 'race row' furor was broadcast on 22 January 2007 and then dominated the news until Saturday 27 January. A detailed analysis following even after a year of the initial broadcast was provided by Greer (2007). The contestants who were subjected to racist, offensive and bullying behaviour were Shilpa Shetty, a Bollywood film actress of Indian descent, who was a 'victim' in media reports. There were three perpetrators: Goody was singled out as the main one and the other two were O'Meara (the perpetrators). The transcripts of the 'race row' are almost boring, in any event not anything that Shetty (Greer, 2007) Not surprisingly, the Saturday and Sunday editions of the show had 3.4 million viewers respectively.

In the week following the broadcast, 30,000 people complained to the regulator set up to uphold the Broadcasting Code violations in the media. The complaints referred to the broadcasts as racist and demanded that the programme be taken off air. They were mainly about the 'jibes about Indians and skin-lightening' (Greer, 2007). (<http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/1/hi/entertainment/62822/01/2007>). This quickly became the largest number of complaints ever. In addition to the complaints, unofficial audience figures for the Friday late night edition of CBB averaged 7.8 million and the end of the programme (id.). Eventually, the audience vote declared the winner of the programme and the perpetrators were 'evicted' from the house and publicly named.

In the lead up to the eventual episode, to begin with, the show was seen for business as viewing figures for that week shot up and revenue increased. But curiously and contrary to public complaints, the harm caused in the CBB House as racism. Parliament was called to the House of Commons (id.). Shetty was even mentioned at the House of Commons by David Cameron, the leader of the opposition Conservative Party, who expressed his views on the matter (id.).

At the time, Gordon Brown, (the then Chancellor of the Exchequer) visited India where the broadsheets there were very concerned about the 'race row' (Blitz et als, 2007) He understood that 'in the UK, the government does not want to be seen as a country of fairness and to this end, I condemn.' (Story from BBC NEWS)

[/1/hi/entertainment/6282883.stm published on 20/01/2007](#)  
his hosts, Brown voiced his belief in Britain's culture of  
in the end prevail to punish the perpetrators for their  
the target audience of CBB to vote accordingly and de  
who won the show.

Curiously, through all this Shetty consistently denied th  
fully fledged sense of the word.' (Oh brother Reality TV  
*Global Agenda*,1. Retrieved April 16, 2009, from ABI/IN  
ID: 1210094391).Her statement was subsequently  
producers of the programme, to dampen the race ro  
Henceforth, as far as Shetty, the perpetrators of f  
[http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-1/hi/entertainment\\_63](http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-1/hi/entertainment_63)  
the regulator, the producers, the broadcaster and the  
'race row' in the CBB House was not racism. The comm  
bullying behaviour witnessed in the CBB House wou  
essentially a fair and tolerant society.

This commonsense extended to showing Shetty ' tra  
tolerance after winning the show. She was for instance  
minister's questions. She was feted by ministers, MPs  
Tony Blair ( Urry, 2008). Finally, Shetty was awarded '  
'contributing to  
agenda'( <http://www.hindustantimes.com/StoryPage/FullStory.aspx?ID=16/04/2009>)The event was hosted by the Next St  
established by two MP's including Keith Vaz to encoura  
private sectors (id.).

By now, the issue was not confined to a local domes  
ramifications as the ' race row' involving a Bollywc  
Bollywood in the UK. This sector one of the main items c  
India. During his visit, for instance Mr. Brown specifically  
Mumbai to encourage UK/Indian co-production and pr  
post-production work. It was important to please this  
Indian cinema is said to contribute about £200 million  
distribution and location shooting. The figure has bee  
(Leahy and Wilson, 2007). Thus, the economic impac  
what happened to Shetty was not confined to the loc  
global ramifications.

The commonsense that there was no racism in the CBB  
affirmed that Britain was a fair and tolerant society  
programme, The Carphone Warehouse, from withdr  
sponsorship of the programme. Their chief executive  
concern has rapidly mounted about the broadcast beh:  
Brother house. We are totally against all forms of ra  
behaviour is entirely at odds with the brand values c  
result, we feel that as long as this continues, we are t  
the programme."(Story from BBC news:  
[/1/hi/entertainment/6285883.stm published on 2007/01/20](#)  
disavowed in the CBB House, nationally and in  
disassociated from the issue of racial harm and was bei  
aims and economic agendas of Shetty and other marke  
The following section examines the regulatory response

### THE REGULATORY RESPONSE TO THE ' RACE ROW'

As mentioned above Ofcom received 45,000 complai  
required by the Broadcasting Code. The regulator rulec  
editorial misjudgements" in its handling of the incident  
Shetty.(Story from BBC news

[/2/hi/entertainment/6687091.stm](#) published 2007/05, contrary, the regulator ruled that the events in the instances of 'offensive and bullying behaviour'. The Ofcom commonsense that had by now become entrenched.

The starting point of Ofcom's inquiry was not whether offensive or harmful had been transmitted but whether it was appropriately handled by it' (id.). Ofcom singled out Channel 4 as having failed. One was where Jade Goody referred to the second was Lloyd telling Shetty in foul language that centred on an argument over Shetty cooking a chicken seen making offensive comments about Indian cooking. Ofcom ordered the Channel to broadcast a summary of its programmes, the first show of the new Big Brother the following morning and the first eviction show.

With this ruling, an economic sanction was imposed on the material broadcast - it lost sponsorship revenue for the the regulator. Second, this ruling was prompted by consumers to protect consumer choice. Henceforth with the broadcast could make informed decisions about whether they should broadcast by the Channel.

It is important to note that the economic cost was not Channel failing to handle material relating to instances described as 'offensive and bullying behaviour'. The decision material vetted beforehand to maximise viewing numbers expected. Similarly, the complaints made by viewers inconsequential. This inconsistent with its remit as a regulator. Malkani above- the discomfort of the target audience perpetrated against the victim) in the CBB House was not ignoring complaints to the contrary, the regulator commonsense: there was no racism in the CBB House investigation into allegations of racism was dropped. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/2/hi/entertainment/630> reaffirmed the commonsense but consistently found Channel 4 responsible for airing 'offensive and bullying behaviour' defined framework. A framework that rewards and punishes, namely celebrities, programmers, broadcasters and represents a distinct notion of responsibility when compared to a framework of legal liability such as race legislation or immigration.

In the absence of a finding of racism, the legal liability was kept in abeyance. At the time, Mary Riddell, a columnist 'the Ofcom report... hints at what one TV executive called [that] soothes people into believing that no right-thinking racism. The 44,500 viewers who objected to Channel 4 such a horror will never be repeated.' (Riddell, 2007).

The response of the political establishment and the industry reinforced 'regulation by public relations' a balance between protecting consumption choices and remedies blurred. The commonsense was clearly entrenched as welcomed Ofcom's decision. The Chairman of Channel 4 was " proportionate given Ofcom's ruling that the broadcast the Channel did not act recklessly" (Story from BBC news /1/hi/entertainment/6285935.stm published on 2007/05 Board expressed "profound regret" for any offence that the ' Board believed that the CBB events had triggered. We are also committed to ensuring that the Channel covers important social issues." (id).



It is important to note that the Channel was noted to have been on racism but by this time the issue of racism was not in its statements. This was noted at the time by Trevor Phillips of the Equality and Human Rights Commission, who expressed his disappointment that it did not acknowledge any error, "What I had hoped was that the Channel would acknowledge that what we witnessed was racial bullying, even further as with the legal liability framework that was then in place, it was erased as an 'unfortunate excrescence' (Gilroy, 1987, p. 100) in a fair society. Ofcom's finding of 'offensive and bullying' behaviour by the Channel to inform its target audience and pay a price for it. This responsibility is defined by the market. Thus, the Channel informed its target audience (and lost advertising revenue) and have been 'dealt with once and for all leaving the basic structure of the economy and society essentially unchanged.' (id.). The regulatory commonsense on racism that the 'race row' engendered

### ASSESSING THE COMMONSENSE

An additional (and unexamined) aspect of the debate about racism was that the scope of democratic accountability was defined by the consumption decisions of a target audience. Like the Channel and celebrities, the regulator and the political establishment were accountable for the consumption choices of a sufficiently large number of people, nationally and internationally. In other words, to satisfy populist sentiment, the political establishment was accountable to

This was clear in the year following CBB, when the Channel was not receiving public funding. Ofcom's public service broadcasting review played in broadcasting the events that set off the 'race row' and the resulting viewing figures was deemed irrelevant to any decision about public funding. Putnam, the deputy chairman of the Channel, was reported to have said of Big Brother but *it accounts for 15 percent of the total audience* (emphasis mine). (Stephenson, 2008) Ofcom then ruled in favour of increased public funding. This reveals the correlation between the media, its target audience, and the regulatory commonsense that responsibility can and is entirely defined by the market.

This was also highlighted when at the time Luke Johnson was described as 'a leading light in private equity' (id.) and the Channel was urged 'to up their game considerably' (id.). The episode was an inevitable 'privatisation'. At the time, Lord Putnam commented in 2006 that Luke [Johnson] was forcing us as a Board to consider the consequences of privatisation. Shilpa Shetty and Jade Jackson came along at a moment when we needed to crystallize our views on the extent of the Channel's responsibility is entirely defined by the viewing figures. Thus far from being 'inauthentic and unrepresentative' as suggested above, the programming intervention to increase revenue were made to fulfil well defined, pressing and legitimate cases for increased public funding. These were independent of the consumption choices (Ofcom ruling) or evidence of a failure to protect the public (Brown claimed). This regulatory commonsense engendered the following paragraph.

A regulatory commonsense marked by the simultaneous operation at two levels, there is a continuous discourse disavowing any attempt to address the issue of racism on its own terms. The 'neutral' phrase 'offensive and bullying behaviour' to specify the Channel's failure to protect the public at CBB House. This section reveals that this persistent dualism reveals two distinct frameworks of responsibility. Thus, the harm defined by and dealt in a market-defined framework is not responsive to economic imperatives of the broadcast

discussed at the time: increased viewership thus in recognition and empowerment of a target audience to ju

The recognition that the Channel is responsible for h market defined framework is not confined to the reg debate that followed the 'race row', the political imperatives of this framework to the extent that it res and also accepted the terms of the debate on race as premise of which was that the centrality of consumptic responsibility (through their voting power) to decid decisions. Finally, the political establishment legitimise reading it as evidence of a British tradition of fairness a the regulatory commonsense engendered by the 'rac strategic framing of the consumer vote by the Ch. sponsors. It indicates the power of the media to confine framework where their responsibility for harm causec informing consumption choices instead of responsib framework of legal liability.

The issue of race was thus strategically introduced to disavowed to justify continued recourse to public fun harm caused by the 'race row' in the CBB House was r on the 'race row' (Nicolle, 2007) the Channel and vicariously liable for breaching the provisions of the imperative therefore that the Channel, the regulator, Shetty's disavowal of racism as part of the common: framework in abeyance. The following section draws disavowal of racism by the victim of racial harm.

#### *RACISM LITE*

The events from the initial broadcast leading up to per what is referred to in this paper as a form of 'consi patterns of a target audience (in this case CBB) are de politics. This is then manipulated to further the aims of t broadcaster, the programmer, the sponsors), the regul political establishment all the while subject to responsib as described above.

As the issue of race is used strategically to increase anc events in the CBB House illustrates the nature of the politics is characterised *inter alios* by economic, poli television industry responds to concerns raised by sanctions for bad behaviour, when for instance the sp of the programme and encourage good behaviour by en economic rewards. Depending on the number of co establishment intervenes to engender a commonsense, recognition of informed (and empowered) consumer c the recognition of a British tradition of tolerance and fai The regulatory response (disavowing racism, imposing putative investigation into breaches of race legislation)

The CBB episode reveals the existence of a self-s engenders the commonsense referred to above. A sphe racism but '*racism lite*' (adopting Mary Riddell's term)(R articulated in normative frames specific to the enter consumption patterns of an audience, the economic producers and sponsors and the domestic and global *Racism lite* in the context of the CBB episode was d behaviour', caused to a victim by perpetrators and d such in response to the voting decisions of a target disavowal of racism by the victim play?



## THE CHOICE OF DISAVOWING RACISM

As discussed above, the CBB episode was marked by the fact that the victim who was up under race legislation was in abeyance for two reasons. The victim chose not to represent the incident in the CBB House and did not initiate any formal legal proceedings. Further, in the face of the 'offensive and bullying behaviour' the investigation into the incident by the state was dropped. Thus the market defined framework of the 'race row' as *racism lite* and thus of no consequence outside the CBB House.

The market framework that defined the 'race-row' as *racism lite* is one that a victim makes. So for instance, instead of having a fixed identity on her, Shetty had the choice of deciding whether or not to assert her identity as a non-White, non-English Asian woman. If she disavowed racism, she voluntarily denied herself the right to sue that would impose legal responsibility on the CBB House to compensate her for the harm caused to her. In doing so, she accepted the ascription of an identity, as an Asian woman claiming race on the grounds of her race and nationality. She was discriminated against with a white-English person in a similar situation.

In other words, she strategically asserted her identity. In a market defined framework sensitive to her choices, she was : Shetty as an Asian, Indian citizen (non-white, non-English) was not. This entailed the dismantling of a hegemonic commonsense. This was because she could choose not to engage with the market by refusing to compare her treatment in the CBB House to the treatment of an essentially 'white-English' other. This choice and the choice of refusing to accept the ascription of a race was picked up by the political establishment as evidence of 'toleration'. To fulfil the economic interests of domestic industry, the disavowal of racism sanitized the media representation of the hegemony of 'white-Englishness' in the CBB House. This is discussed in the following section.

## RACISM OUTSIDE THE CBB HOUSE: RACE LEGISLATION AND RACIAL ESSENTIALISM

In her article (Riddell, 2007) that prompted this paper, Riddell discusses complacency about the supposed British tradition of tolerance in the face of the continuing racism outside the CBB House which she refers to as 'Norwich, seven young men walked laughing from court after receiving sentences for 'a ferocious and unprovoked' attack, in which they had beaten on two Polish workers.'(id.) During the same week, news reports discussed European migrants supposedly leeching off state health services. In migration from the new EU countries, which is vital to the UK economy at its peak, and only 8,000 Romanian and Bulgarian jobs were created this year, against predictions of a 300,000 influx in 2011. A report by the Immigration Law Practitioners' Association noted the presence of unaccompanied refugee children, many of them Afghani, who were traumatized after unthinkable journeys. Thousands of children were reassigned as adults by the immigration service, and many were placed in foster care they need.'(id.)

In her piece referred to above Riddell reflects the tension between the race legislation aimed at eliminating racial prejudice and the fact that it is marked by prejudice and bias. More to the point, the tension between race legislation and immigration policy, the cases referred to above, is an assumption to be made that identity is a fixed, incontestable fact. For example, the decision about whether or not a person is entitled to enter a country or whether or not someone was entitled to the

left to the choice of the individual or groups concerned and the immigration officer. The latter ascribe a racial concern concerning an individual or a group ('ascription?'). Imputed out to the individual concerned with how an individual would have been treated ('comparison'). Both the ascription (English) and comparison with (white-English) identity of identity as discussed in the following paragraphs.

#### *RACE LEGISLATION AND IMMIGRATION POLICY*

Historically, immigration law introduced 'complex immigration to stem mainly the tide of black and Asian immigration maintenance of social order.' (Anwar et al., 2000, p.viii) was deemed necessary to treat black and ethnic minorities. This led to the promulgation of the Race Relations Act (legislation). Race legislation performs 'three functions: first, to prohibit discrimination [the recognition that non-white English people are treated the same way as white-English people]; secondly, to provide control [the ascription and comparison of essentialised identity is thus beyond the control of the victim]; and thirdly, to protect specific social groups. [this reaffirms the efficiency of race legislation]' (id.). Given its limited remit, it takes cognisance of race, for instance it 'is confined to certain groups and ethnic minorities.' (id.) Both race legislation and immigration policy are based by an implicit assumption of essentialism.

#### *ESSENTIALISM*

Essentialism represents the view that identity can be defined in an unchanging circumstance. According to one definition, it is to impute a fundamental, basic, absolutely necessary characteristic to a category, ethnic group, religious community or nation. It implies continuity, a discreteness, or boundedness in space, an internal sameness and an external difference or contrast. According to Gerd Baumann, ethnic groups have been seen as 'quasi-biological lines...with culture and ethnic essences' (Baumann, 1997, p. 209). Thus unlike Shettlesworth's protection of race legislation and negotiate the content of policy, a victim of racism outside the CBB House has no fixed identity (non-white, non-English) and accepts the construction of a 'white-English' non-discriminated other.

Essentialism is viewed as a 'representation which distorts reality' which is used to mobilise 'a community for action'. Unlike the alleged victim in the CBB House, essentialism for a victim of racism outside the CBB House may be oppressive. It is based on identity and comparison with an essentialised 'other', to which he may seek to deny. If the identity of a group lies on the birth or the skin colour of its members, then individuals, born as Sikhs, may choose not to be defined by it. That a police officer or an immigration officer may claim a marked contrast to '*racism lite*' in the CBB House which is based on identity and the strategic assertion of identity as discussed in the preceding section.

#### *THE 'RACE ROW' AND MEDIA POWER*

Strategic assertions of identity are distinct from assumptions of race legislation and immigration policy (part of the legal framework discussed in the preceding section). These are theorised in cultural studies (Hall and Modood, 1997) and feminist anthropology in the context of post-structuralist deconstructionism. (Bhabha, 1994; Hall and Du Gay (eds), 1992). This view, has no substantive content and is dynamic because it is based on a process of endorsement, contestation and transformation.

Paul Gilroy notes that [culture]...as race is never fixed actively and continually made and re-made (Gilroy, regulatory commonsense that dominated the aftermath victim to strategically assert her identity and disavow 'I have no substantive content' (op cit Wright) and 'is accommodated' (id.), the regulatory commonsense engendered whether or not this is permissible depends on sex framework in which responsibility is imposed, the nature the political and economic imperatives of market actors establishment.

The recognition of individual choice and strategic ascription frameworks specific to the entertainment industry alternative to essentialism. In this form it avoids the legislation and immigration policy: the ascription of comparison with an essentially defined hegemonic regulatory commonsense that defines it is potentially essentialism that underpins and limits contemporary legislation. It would for instance, require the recognition racial discrimination can be dealt with, beyond contemporary incidents of discrimination.

The regulatory commonsense engendered by the 'race analysis of this radical and post-modern framing of race cautionary tale. The recognition of *racism lite* is confined that attributes responsibility with a view to furthering market actors. This dominance also defines the term contemporary society, thus the danger is that the distinction outside the CBB House and *racism lite* in Reality TV is blurred.

## CONCLUSIONS

As discussed in the preceding paragraphs, there were cultural and economic reasons for disavowing racism in the CBB business from the Indian film industry, the damage to the 'fairness' the loss of public funding for the Channel and claims under race legislation. Further, like any other victim pursue her legal remedies on her own. These overriding disavowal of racism by Shetty in a context when she non-white-non-English identity and by disavowing racism a white-English other.

The strategic disavowal of racism is possible in conditions disavow racism and avoid the necessary ascription of a the harm caused to her as racism. This benefited the and was economically beneficial for Shetty. In the context of responsibility that defines the contemporary media fulfilled a myriad of economic and political interests. The and responsiveness to consumer choice and the B 'fairness'. The disavowal of racism in the CBB House to ends of the state and the market is not evidence of it instead the 'coherent, systematic and consensual' (Wright Englishness' in its hegemonic form through the media.

This contrary to the view taken by the political establishment commonsense engendered by the 'race row' as evidence tolerance, *racism lite* reflects the market power of the legally cognizable form of racial harm and as such is irrelevant far as it furthers the overriding interests of the entertainment viewership and eventually profit, it leaves unanswered harm caused to the victim in the CBB House racism exposed to deal with persistent racism in the face of its accommodation.

hegemonic 'white- Englishness' against which non-W outside the CBB House must be defined?

## REFERENCES

Anwar, Muhammad, Patrick Roach and Rangit Sondhi (2000)(eds.) *From Legislation to Integration? Race Relations in Britain*(Palgrave Macmillan)

Baumann G.(1997) 'Dominant and Demotic Discourses of Culture: The Relevance to Multi-Cultural Alliances', in P. Werbner and T.Modood (eds.), *Debating Cultural Hybridity: Multi-Cultural Identities and the Politics of Anti-Racism*(Zed Books, London) pp 209-25

Bhabha H. (1994) *The Location of Culture*(Routledge, London)

Blitz J., C.Grande, B. Hall and E.Terazono (18 Jan 2007) ' Brown drawn into TV racism row INDIA VISIT' *Financial Times* [LONDON 1ST EDITION]

Garside J. (27 April 2008) *The Sunday Telegraph*

Garnde C. and E.Terazono. (19 January 2007). Carphone suspends its Pounds 3m sponsorship of 'Big Brother' :[LONDON 1ST EDITION]. *Financial Times*,p. 1. (Retrieved April 16, 2009, from ABI/INFORM Global database. (Document ID: 1197233911).

Greer G. (17 January 2007) 'Why does everyone hate me?' *The Guardian*

Gilroy P. (1987) *Problems with anti-racist strategy*Runnymede Trust

Gilroy P. (2000) *Against race: imagining political culture beyond the color line* Belknap Press of the Harvard University Press

Hall, S. (1996) 'Introduction: Who Needs 'Identity?'' in *Questions of Cultural Identity* Stuart Hall and Paul du Gay (eds.) (Sage Publications, London)

Leahy J. and J. Wilson 'Bollywood still keen despite 'Big Brother' (20 January 2007) *Financial Times*

Nicolle, R.(29 Jan 2007) ' OPINION: Channel 4 is on shaky legal ground in Big Brother racismrow' *The Lawyer*London: pg. 8

Riddell M. (2007) ' *Racism litemasks reality on the streets*'4 *The Observer*(May 27)

Stephenson D. (1 June 2008) 'Why Channel 4 is hot and bothered' *The Express on Sunday*

Turner G.(2004) *Understanding Celebrity*SAGE

Urry M. ' It's the Shilpa Show' (8 February 2008) *Financial Times*

Werbner P (1997) 'Essentialising Essentialism, Essentialising Silence: Ambivalence and Multiplicity in

the Constructions of Racism and Ethnicity' in P. Werbner and T. Modood (eds.), *Debating Cultural Hybridity: Multi-Cultural Identities and the Politics of Anti-Racism*(Zed Books, London) pp 226-254

#### LINKS TO EXTERNAL SOURCES

Ken Livingstone media interview Story from BBC  
NEWS: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/1/hi/entertainment/6275763.stm>published  
18/01/2007

Story from BBC news:  
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/1/hi/entertainment/6285883.stm>published on  
20/01/2007

(Story from BBC NEWS:  
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/1/hi/entertainment/6282883.stm> published on  
[20/01/2007](http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/1/hi/entertainment/6282883.stm))

Story from BBC news:  
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/1/hi/entertainment/6285935.stm>published  
22/01/2007

'Police contact Big Brother's Jade' Story from BBC  
news: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/2/hi/entertainment/6302467.stm>published  
26/01/2007

Story from BBC news:  
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/2/hi/entertainment/6687091.stm>published  
24/05/2007

'Shilpa Honored by Britain'  
<http://www.hindustantimes.com/StoryPage/Fullcoverag>  
01 July 2008

Wright, S. (1999) 'The Politicisation of Culture' at  
<http://lucy.ukc.ac.uk/rai/AnthToday/wright.html>

1I presented an earlier version of this paper at the 'Race in the Modern World- An International Conference on Race Discourses and Contemporary Identities' 1-3 April 2009 organised by Goldsmiths, University of London and the Stephen Lawrence Trust and thank the audience for their feedback. I am grateful to the anonymous referee for comments on an earlier draft. Any errors are mine.

---

Thomas, D., "Race and the refusal to name racism: consumption, identity and choice in the Celebrity Big Brother House", [Entertainment and Sports Law](#)