

## **Quarterly Report of Appeals, Complaints and Advice**

**The BBFC is the regulator of commercial and internet content delivered via the mobile networks of EE, O2, Three and Vodafone.**

**In the interest of transparency, the BBFC publishes all of its adjudications in relation to cases reported to it of purported underblocking or overblocking, along with requests for advice on whether particular content should go behind parental controls or adult filters.**

**We keep this list updated as and when new cases are reported to us and publish updates every three months.**

**In all cases, the BBFC conveys its adjudication to (i) the complainant, appellant or person or body seeking advice; (ii) the Mobile Broadband Group; and (iii) the relevant mobile network operator(s).**

**The adjudication that a website contains no material that we would classify 18 does not necessarily mean that we believe it is suitable for younger children.**

**In the following cases, the adjudications represent an assessment of the content according to the dates listed below. Any subsequent changes to content have therefore not been viewed by the BBFC, although we reserve the right to change our adjudication should altered content be brought to our attention subsequently.**

### **June 2015**

*26 June 2015*

#### Website

thecompliancealliance.co.uk  
resourcesforips.co.uk

#### Issue

The owner of the websites contacted the BBFC to complain that the sites were behind adult filters, despite in their opinion containing no material that would cause access to be restricted to adults only.

#### Adjudication

The BBFC viewed the websites on 26 June 2015.

We noted that the websites provided various insolvency compliance services to fellow professionals. We found no content that we would classify 18.

### **July 2015**

*22 July 2015*

#### Website

israellycool.com

#### Issue

A mobile network operator contacted the BBFC for advice about the suitability of images on the website for people under 18, following a complaint from a member of the public that it had been placed behind adult filters despite containing no material that in the complainant's opinion would cause access to be restricted to adults only.

#### Adjudication

The BBFC viewed the website between 17 and 22 July 2015.

We noted that the site was a pro-Israel blog containing a large number of posts, including links to video content, comment pieces, cartoons and animations, all of which served to present Israel in a positive light and counter the narrative that Palestinians are victims of Israeli aggression and unjust Israeli policies. The posts also argued against those who promote negative views of Israel and its relationship with Palestinians, and promoted support of companies who do business with Israel. Although the views expressed may be subject to debate, and some people will disagree with them, they were nonetheless expressed in the spirit of providing a legitimate side to an argument. There was some material that could be viewed as promoting aggressive attitudes and behaviour, and which may be unacceptable in other contexts; however, such material was presented on this site as negative and in order to illustrate arguments against it. We found no content on the site that we would classify 18.

### **August 2015**

*19 August 2015*

#### Website

office-breaks.com

#### Issue

The website owner contacted the BBFC to complain that the site was placed behind adult filters, despite in their opinion containing no material that would cause access to be restricted to adults only.

#### Adjudication

The BBFC viewed the website between 18 and 19 August.

We noted that the site offered information on lunch break tours and activities, day trips and seasonal events. We found no content that would lead us to classify the site 18.

*20 August 2015*

#### Website

imagebam.com

#### Issue

A mobile network operator contacted the BBFC for advice about the suitability of certain images on a provided link for people under 18, following a complaint from a member of the public that it had been placed behind adult filters despite containing no material that in the complainant's opinion would cause access to be restricted to adults only.

#### Adjudication

The BBFC viewed images via the provided link on 20 August. Three of the images featured sexualised posing and there were accompanying references such as 'find casual sex now' and 'get some now!' The BBFC would classify these images at 18.

*28 August 2015*

Website

westonemanor.net

Issue

A mobile network operator contacted the BBFC for advice about the suitability of the website for people under 18, following a complaint from the site owner that it had been placed behind adult filters, despite containing no material that in the complainant's opinion would cause access to be restricted to adults only.

Adjudication

The BBFC viewed the website on 28 August 2015.

We noted that it was a hotel site offering accommodation and dining, along with services such as wedding and memorial functions. We found no content on the site that we would classify 18.

**September 2015**

*2 September 2015*

Website

baff.org.uk

Issue

A mobile network operator contacted the BBFC for advice about the suitability of the website for people under 18.

Adjudication

The BBFC viewed the website on 2 September 2015.

We noted that it was a site run by serving and former members of the UK's Armed Forces. There were various articles and links to news stories about the Armed Forces, and while we noted that the site contained references in one article to the use of anabolic steroids, the approach of the article was a cautionary one, highlighting the dangers of using such substances. We therefore found no content on the website that we would classify 18.

*3 September 2015*

Website

2saucydating.co.uk

Issue

The website owner contacted the BBFC to complain that the site was behind adult filters, despite in their opinion containing no material that would cause access to be restricted to adults only.

Adjudication

The BBFC viewed the website on 2 and 3 September 2015.

We noted that the website offered dating services for people aged 18 and over. The site's front page contained sexualised material including a photograph of a topless woman kissing a man, and there were numerous text references to sexual activity along with photos of women from various regions of the UK 'all looking for action...looking for a hot sexy date'. As the site's primary purpose was clearly to facilitate meetings between adults, with an expectation of sex, we did not consider it suitable for people under the age of 18.

*4 September 2015*

Website

annsummers.com

Issue

The website owner contacted the BBFC to complain that the site was behind adult filters, despite selling similar items to those found on other retail websites that were not behind filters.

Adjudication

The BBFC viewed the website between 2 and 4 September.

We noted that the site sold a wide range of products, many of which were visible in drop down menus on the front page. These included lingerie, stockings, sex toys and some bondage clothing and accessories. Vibrators were offered for sale in the 'Sex Toys' section along with other items, while in the 'Bondage' section items such as ball gags and nipple clamps were sold. There were strong references to sexual activity throughout the site (including articles on sex toy trends). Much of the clothing on the site also featured women in sexualised poses, some of whom were topless.

Given the sexualised nature of material presented across the website, we did not consider it suitable for people under the age of 18.

*8 September 2015*

Website

archive.org

Issue

A mobile network operator contacted the BBFC for advice about the suitability of the website for people under 18, following a complaint from a member of the public that it had been placed behind adult filters despite containing no material that in the complainant's opinion would cause access to be restricted to adults only.

Adjudication

The BBFC looked at the website on 8 September 2015.

We noted that it was a website acting as an archive for a vast array of internet content, including web pages and video / audio files. The site had a video archive of films and video material which are out of copyright. Some of these films had been classified 18 by the BBFC. In addition, some web pages available on the archive included pornographic images. As such, we found content that we would classify 18 or R18.

*9 September 2015*

Website  
abuyehuda.com

Issue

A mobile network operator contacted the BBFC for advice about the suitability of the blog for people under 18, following a complaint from the blogger that it had been placed behind adult filters despite containing no material that in the complainant's opinion would cause access to be restricted to adults only.

Adjudication

The BBFC viewed the site between 27 August and 9 September 2015.

We noted that it was a politically minded pro-Israel blog that contained a large number of posts, some of which were academic in nature. It served to present Israel in a positive light, critique perceived anti-Israel positions, and counter the narrative that Palestinians are victims of Israeli aggression and unjust Israeli policies. Although the views expressed may be subject to debate, and some people will disagree with the position of the blog, they were nonetheless expressed in the spirit of providing a legitimate side to an argument. We found no content on the site that we would classify 18.

Website  
elderofziyon.blogspot.com

Issue

Two mobile network operators contacted the BBFC for advice about the suitability of the website for people under 18.

Adjudication

The BBFC viewed the website between 4 and 9 September 2015.

We noted that it was a politically minded pro-Israel blog that contained a large number of posts, some of which were academic in nature. It served to present Israel in a positive light, critique perceived anti-Israel positions, and counter the narrative that Palestinians are victims of Israeli aggression and unjust Israeli policies. While the views expressed may be subject to debate, and some people will disagree with the position of the blog, they were nonetheless expressed in the spirit of providing a legitimate side to an argument. We found no content on the site that we would classify 18.

*10 September 2015*

Website  
sultanknish.blogspot.com/

Issue

A mobile network operator contacted the BBFC for advice about the suitability of the website for people under 18, given its broad similarity to other sites adjudicated on by the BBFC.

Adjudication

The BBFC viewed the website between 4 and 10 September 2015.

We noted that it was a politically minded pro-Israel blog that contained a large

number of posts which served to present Israel in a positive light, critique perceived anti-Israel positions, and counter the narrative that Palestinians are victims of Israeli aggression and unjust Israeli policies. Although the views expressed may be subject to debate, and some people will disagree with the position of the blog, many of them were nonetheless expressed in the spirit of providing a legitimate side to an argument. However, the site also included comments which argued that Mohammed was a pig and made generalisations that have the potential to encourage the view that Muslim men are paedophiles and rapists. The promotion of such potentially harmful views would attract an 18 rating.

#### Websites

israeldefender.com  
israelmatzav.blogspot.com

#### Issue

A mobile network operator contacted the BBFC for advice about the suitability of the websites for people under 18, given their broad similarity to other sites adjudicated on by the BBFC.

#### Adjudication

The BBFC viewed the websites between 4 and 10 September 2015.

We noted that they were politically minded blogs that contained a large number of posts and / or articles. While the views expressed may be subject to debate, and some people will disagree with the position of the blogs or websites in question, they were nonetheless expressed in the spirit of providing a legitimate side to an argument. We found no content on the sites that we would classify 18.

*11 September 2015*

#### Website

jihadwatch.org/

#### Issue

A mobile network operator contacted the BBFC for advice about the suitability of the website for people under 18, given its broad similarity to other sites adjudicated on by the BBFC.

#### Adjudication

The BBFC viewed the website on 11 September.

We noted that it was a political blog site that aimed to, in the website's words, bring 'public attention to the role that jihad theology and ideology play in the modern world and to correcting popular misconceptions about the role of jihad and religion in modern-day conflicts.' The site contained numerous news articles covering global events, and a section titled 'Islam 101' consisting of a break down of what the author considered the fundamentals of Islam to be, largely focussed on the author's interpretation of the Quran. However, the site also included a number of comments accompanying some of these articles, which addressed Muslims in negative terms in a broad-brush style, that arguably encouraged discriminatory attitudes with little foundation. We would not consider the promotion of such potentially harmful attitudes to be suitable for people under the age of 18.

*18 September 2015*

#### Website

barenakedislam.com

#### Issue

A mobile network operator contacted the BBFC for advice about the suitability of the website for people under 18, given its broad similarity to other sites adjudicated on by the BBFC.

#### Adjudication

The BBFC viewed the website between 17 and 18 September 2015.

We noted that it was a site featuring numerous editorial posts, articles and associated comments that contained discriminatory attitudes. Some of the video content also contained real footage of executions that we could not classify at any category below 18, if at all.

We also considered whether the site contained material that might constitute incitement to racial hatred. Some comments accompanying a beheading video arguably carried the potential to constitute both religious and racial hatred. One of the comments advocated a second Crusade to finish off the job the First Crusade did not complete.

The Mobile Classification Framework states that 'It is the Content Provider's responsibility to ensure that none of the content subject to the Classification Framework contains any illegal material' (<http://www.bbfc.co.uk/what-classification/mobile-content/framework>). Therefore, we informed the mobile network operator that they might wish to take their own legal advice as to the legality of the website. However, in terms of the content viewed by the BBFC for this adjudication, we found material that we would refuse to classify.

#### Website

edgar1981.blogspot.co.uk

#### Issue

A mobile network operator contacted the BBFC for advice about the suitability of the website for people under 18, following a complaint from the site owner that it had been placed behind adult filters despite containing no material that in the complainant's opinion would cause access to be restricted to adults only.

#### Adjudication

The BBFC viewed the website on 18 September.

We noted that it was a politically minded pro-Israel blog that contained a large number of blog posts and reaction to news articles, and which served to present Israel in a positive light and critique perceived anti-Israel positions. Although the position of the site and the views expressed may be subject to debate or disagreement, such views were nonetheless expressed in the spirit of providing a legitimate side to an argument. Therefore, we found no content on the site that we would classify 18.

#### Websites

israpundit.com

pamelageller.com

#### Issue

A mobile network operator contacted the BBFC for advice about the suitability of the websites for people under 18, given their broad similarity to other sites adjudicated on by the BBFC.

#### Adjudication

The BBFC viewed the websites between 11 and 18 September.

We noted that they were primarily politically minded pro-Israel blogs containing a large number of posts which served to present Israel in a positive light, critique perceived anti-Israel positions, and counter the narrative that Palestinians are victims of Israeli aggression and unjust Israeli policies. While the views expressed may be subject to debate, and some people will disagree with the position of the sites, much of the content was nonetheless expressed in the spirit of providing one side to an argument. However, the sites also included a number of comments addressing both Islam and Muslims in negative terms in a broad-brush style, that arguably encouraged discriminatory attitudes with little foundation. We would not consider the promotion of such potentially harmful attitudes to be suitable for people under the age of 18.

*29 September 2015*

#### Website

thereligionofpeace.com

#### Issue

A mobile network operator contacted the BBFC for advice about the suitability of the website for people under 18, given its broad similarity to other sites adjudicated on by the BBFC.

#### Adjudication

The BBFC viewed the website on 29 September 2015.

We noted that it contained extended commentary about Islam, with specific focus on its political and religious teachings. The site contained images of people about to be executed, a photo of a young boy apparently holding a severed head and footage of real life beheadings. There was a section titled 'The Myths Of Muhammad', with the related articles covering topics such as torture, rape and paedophilia, and the section 'What Would Muhammad Do?' covered similar issues. The front page also contained direct links to videos and articles containing further discriminatory attitudes or examples of violence. Therefore we found content that we would classify at least 18, or may even refuse to classify.

*30 September 2015*

#### Websites

daphneanson.blogspot.co.uk  
palestinefreenow.blogspot.co.uk  
bdsmovement.net  
anneinpt.wordpress.com  
thisongoingwar.blogspot.co.uk  
richardmillet.wordpress.com

#### Issue

A mobile network operator contacted the BBFC for advice about the suitability of the websites for people under 18, given their broad similarity to other sites adjudicated on by the BBFC.

#### Adjudication

The BBFC viewed the websites between 29 and 30 September.

We noted that they were politically minded sites containing a large number of posts and / or articles. While the views expressed may be subject to debate, and some people will disagree with the position of the blogs or websites in question, they were nonetheless expressed in the spirit of providing a legitimate side to an argument. We found no content on the sites that would we would classify 18.

#### Website

facebook.com/edgarblog

#### Issue

A mobile network operator contacted the BBFC for advice about the suitability of the Facebook page for people under 18, given its broad similarity to other sites adjudicated on by the BBFC.

#### Adjudication

The BBFC viewed the page on 30 September.

We noted that the content on the above Facebook page was very similar to that of the main website - edgar1981.blogspot.co.uk (see above) – in providing multiple links to stories available on that site. Therefore, we similarly found no content that we would classify 18.

#### Website

facebook.com/pages/Death-To-America-Israel

#### Issue

A mobile network operator contacted the BBFC for advice about the suitability of the above Facebook page for people under 18, given its broad similarity to other sites adjudicated on by the BBFC.

#### Adjudication

We viewed the page on 30 September.

We noted that it was a page that proclaimed to 'Hate Illegal & War Criminal State Israel' and that 'America and Israel are the greatest threats to peace.' It included numerous, sometimes contradictory, comments that addressed Israel and Muslims in negative and aggressive terms in a broad-brush style, which could potentially encourage discriminatory attitudes. These included the assertion that Israel is responsible for genocide, and comments about wanting to rid the UK of Muslims and even threatening violence against certain people.

The promotion of such potentially harmful attitudes would mean that the BBFC would classify the page at least 18, and may even refuse to classify it.

BBFC

30 September 2015