



After the watershed: A McDonald's burger | Image: GETTY IMAGES NORTH AMERICA/AFP

Food

UK bans daytime TV ads for cereals, muffins and burgers

Dec. 5 | 06:00 am JST | 30 Comments

LONDON — The UK government is banning daytime TV adverts for sugary foods like granola and muffins in its battle against child obesity, branding such popular items as junk food.

Ads showing "less healthy" food and drinks will only be allowed to be aired after 9 p.m. from October next year.

According to the National Health Service, obesity is rising among British kids with one in 10 four-year-olds now considered to be obese. And one in five five-year-olds suffers from tooth decay from eating too much sugar.

Also included on the government's list -- which uses a scoring system based on each item's sugar, fat and salt content -- are pre-packaged popular sugary breakfast foods such as croissants, pancakes and waffles.

"Breakfast cereals including ready-to-eat cereals, granola, muesli, porridge oats and other oat-based cereals" are included, the government said.

Also on the banned list are products such as chickpea or lentil-based crisps, seaweed-based snacks and Bombay mix as well as energy drinks, hamburgers and chicken nuggets.

But the new restrictions will not apply to healthier options such as natural porridge oats and unsweetened yoghurt.

The government hopes the new measures could help prevent some 20,000 cases of childhood obesity a year.

"Obesity robs our kids of the best possible start in life, sets them up for a lifetime of health problems, and costs the NHS billions," Health Secretary Wes Streeting said.

"This government is taking action now to end the targeting of junk food ads at kids, across both TV and online."

© 2024 AFP

30 Comments



Mr Kipling Dec. 5 | 06:58 am JST

Another stupid "woke" action. If fat people are a problem just tax them. Or at least charge them in the hospitals if their body weight is directly responsible for their visit. Why should those of us who don't stuff ourselves with cake have to sponsor those who do?

-7 (+11 / -18)



BertieWooster Dec. 5 | 07:28 am JST

Rather than taxing fatties, how about taxing the cause of the problem? How about taxing on the amount of sugar/sugar substitute each item contains? If Coca Cola was £20 a can, they would think twice.

-3 (+9 / -12)



bo Dec. 5 | 07:51 am JST

Blame the parents ,they should be more responsible !

7 (+11 / -4)



Ken Dec. 5 | 07:54 am JST

Another stupid "woke" action. If fat people are a problem just tax them. Or at least charge them in the hospitals if their body weight is directly responsible for their visit. Why should those of us who don't stuff ourselves with cake have to sponsor those who do?

You people really do call everything you don't understand woke. Is there a mental illness where people explode over the smallest of changes that don't affect them? Assuming you're not a junk-food commercial connoisseur. That is honestly a new one lol yt persons that think "eating habits" are woke lmao

3 (+12 / -9)



Chico3 Dec. 5 | 09:00 am JST

I know that burger photo is the point of ad banning, but still, that looks like one of the saddest burgers I've ever seen.

| *Blame the parents ,they should be more responsible !*

Yes and no on this one. I was really fat growing up. At the same time, I was my parents' first child and they thought they were doing a good thing allowing me to drink a carton of milk a day (this was as a baby). The doctors gave my parents the scolding of their lives. This was during the 70s, when I grew up on Mexican food that was fried with lard. Fast forward to the 90s during my university years when one day, I came from a class kind of huffing and puffing during a normal walk. It was then that I decided to leave and find a gym. I worked off quite a bit of weight and even went to doctors for health checks on my weight loss progress.

Looking back on this, I kind of blamed my parents for them insisting that I eat well and finish my plate. However, I chose to do something about it and worked off the weight. My parents at the same time scaled back on their ingredients and chose a healthier way of eating (especially since my mom was diagnosed with diabetes and was afraid that I would get it, too.) Both parents are doing much better health wise and so am I.

7 (+7 / -0)



Abe234 Dec. 5 | 09:17 am JST

KiplingToday 06:58 am JST

| *Another stupid "woke" action. If fat people are a problem just tax them. Or at least charge them in the hospitals if their body weight is directly responsible for their visit. Why should those of us who don't stuff ourselves with cake have to sponsor those who do?*

no it's not woke! It's just good public health policy! We deregulated betting and advertising went through the roof and now there are betting addiction problems. We used to have cigarette advertising and we banned that. Every little helps. Just cause you don't agree with it, doesn't mean it's woke. We banned some adverts before the concept of woke ever existed.

we also banned advertising on baby formula milk to encourage women to breast feed. Not woke! Just common sense! We've deregulated in areas and tightened up on others. No woke!

And they can still advertise after the watershed. Not woke just reasonable! I believe they introduced a sugar tax too a few years ago.

5 (+9 / -4)



Chabbawanga Dec. 5 | 09:18 am JST

| *Another stupid "woke" action.*

First time I think ive ever seen someone stick up for advertisements

7 (+9 / -2)



Abe234 Dec. 5 | 09:33 am JST

KenToday 07:54 am JST

You people really do call everything you don't understand woke. Is there a mental illness where people explode over the smallest of changes that don't affect them? Assuming you're not a junk-food commercial connoisseur. That is honestly a new one lol yt persons that think "eating habits" are woke lmao

spot on.

boToday 07:51 am JST

Blame the parents ,they should be more responsible !

Partly but some parents aren't that smart. Some parents want to be friends with their kids, and some just like eating the same junk. Yes they should be more responsible but we can't download the responsibility patch. But at least the government can legislate, while those with responsibility can go about our happy lives.

BertieWoosterToday 07:28 am JST

Rather than taxing fatties, how about taxing the cause of the problem? How about taxing on the amount of sugar/sugar substitute each item contains?

We do have a sugar tax.it has reduced sugar consumption in adults and kids. But it'll take decades for todays gen to reap the benefits.

KiplingToday 06:58 am JST

Another stupid "woke" action. If fat people are a problem just tax them. Or at least charge them in the hospitals if their body weight is directly responsible for their visit.

I agree but I wonder if the business /industries would actually support this? My guess is. No! And those crying woke would then shout "nanny state", it's my right " I have the freedom to choose" It's not the health services fault or even the people's fault, it's the fault of government, schools,business and cheap junk food. If people had more money to buy better food, (which is generally more expensive) they'd make better choices. Where do we draw the line? Cyclist? Fell of his bike! Stupid guy, bill em. Had some alcohol, fell over bumped his head, bill em. Broke your leg playing footie? Bill em. We could start to find reasons to bill everyone for something they did. Had a car crash? Bill em! And the people shouting woke, would also shout out if they had to pay, "but I pay my taxes". Well they do too. I think the cheapest option is Tax the companies, at the sales point and curb advertising.

6 (+7 / -1)



bass4funk Dec. 5 | 10:28 am JST

| *You people really do call everything you don't understand woke.*

How about letting the people and parents decide?

| *Is there a mental illness where people explode over the smallest of changes that don't affect them?*

Most people hate big government, and big brother.

| *Assuming you're not a junk-food commercial connoisseur. That is honestly a new one lol yt persons that think "eating habits" are woke lmao*

Then Big government should shut up.

-9 (+5 / -14)



falseflagsteve Dec. 5 | 11:22 am JST

It's all well and good the government making this token gesture but has anyone seen the low nutrition junk kids are given for school lunches? It all seems rather hypo right to me, you see.

-1 (+7 / -8)



rosujin Dec. 5 | 12:37 pm JST

I wonder if McDonald's can run commercials that advertise their corporate identity without talking about the food. "Come to McDonald's for enjoyment and satisfaction (wink, wink)."

1 (+2 / -1)



Luis David Yanez Dec. 5 | 01:51 pm JST

So, who decides what's healthy?

Because anything, and I mean anything, can become unhealthy if in excess. The problem is excess calories, which is something that at the end of the day is either personal responsibility or responsibility of the parents.

I really do not understand this weird crusade against fast foods, it feels extremely elitist and condescending, specially for people who eat fast food because of the economics of it.

Not to mention that one of the main causes of high sugars in foods is because of the 80's and 90's hysteria against fats. Bakers used to use a lot of fats for flavor in breads, but after fats became evil in the eyes of the health police, bakers started to replace fats with sugars.

It seems like people are just starting to realize that sugars contain more calories than fats, and now that's the new evil food.

-1 (+6 / -7)



K3PO Dec. 5 | 01:59 pm JST

Let's give it a chance - but do kids even watch TV anymore?

3 (+4 / -1)



Raw Beer Dec. 5 | 03:58 pm JST

Not to mention that one of the main causes of high sugars in foods is because of the 80's and 90's hysteria against fats.

Yes!

The main harm from hamburgers comes from the bun, and the soda and fries often consumed with the hamburger. Nothing wrong with eating beef and cheese, assuming it's of decent quality.

-1 (+4 / -5)



Speed Dec. 5 | 04:38 pm JST

Make food labels much easier to read and translate all those unknown words like dextrose, maltose, high-fructose corn syrup etc. into plain old understandable English "sugar." There are dozens of other confusing terms like these for many other nutrients.

Restrict and warn the public about the dangers of low-fibrous foods, high starch, carbohydrates, and sugar. They really do need a more honest and updated dietary guide for people. They're dying of obesity and related comorbidities.

2 (+3 / -1)



Zaphod Dec. 5 | 05:48 pm JST

branding such popular items as junk food.

"Branding"? They are junk food.

-2 (+2 / -4)



virusrex Dec. 5 | 05:50 pm JST

| *So, who decides what's healthy?*

People that study the effect on the health of populations.

| *Because anything, and I mean anything, can become unhealthy if in excess.*

Which has no relevance to consider something healthy, if that were the case nothing could be called this way since the most innocuous or positive things (clean water, exercise, etc.) could be damaging when in excess.

| *I really do not understand this weird crusade against fast foods, it feels extremely elitist and condescending, specially for people who eat fast food because of the economics of it.*

If something can be demonstrated as damaging for the health when is consumed as most people would do there is nothing elitist or condescending with recognizing this fact, what would be condescending would be to hide that something should be avoided because you feel bad that people consume it because of economics.

| *Bakers used to use a lot of fats for flavor in breads, but after fats became evil in the eyes of the health police, bakers started to replace fats with sugars.*

This makes no sense, even if people wanted to replace *animal* fats the obvious replacement are plant derived fats, not sugars. This would not offer significant advantages but neither higher risks. The problem is simply people getting used to sweeter things, for cereals for example the trend to loading them with sugar is the same even if they were never loaded with fats in the first place.

| *Nothing wrong with eating beef and cheese, assuming it's of decent quality.*

Quality is not a guaranteed of lack of health damage from any food, and conversely every food can be consumed as long as in a healthy quantity. People can enjoy long and healthy lives eating bread, fries and even soda, just not as a main source of nutrition, which also applies to cheese and meat.

-1 (+4 / -5)



albaleo Dec. 5 | 05:56 pm JST

| *I wonder if McDonald's can run commercials that advertise their corporate identity without talking about the food.*

It seems they can.

<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/c5ydwnyvvxjo>

1 (+1 / -0)



Mr Kipling Dec. 5 | 06:07 pm JST

Rather than taxing fatties, how about taxing the cause of the problem? How about taxing on the amount of sugar/sugar substitute each item contains? If Coca Cola was £20 a can, they would think twice.

Because that would also be taxing the healthy. There is no such thing as an unhealthy food. There is such thing as an unhealthy diet. I have 6% body fat and run a 3hr 20 marathon. Eating half a packet of chocolate cookies is absolutely fine for me. Not so for a fatty.

-6 (+1 / -7)



Raw Beer Dec. 5 | 06:39 pm JST

I wonder if McDonald's can run commercials that advertise their corporate identity without talking about the food.

Oh, like Jaguar did recently, without talking about or showing their product..

Bakers used to use a lot of fats for flavor in breads, but after fats became evil in the eyes of the health police, bakers started to replace fats with sugars.

Yes, they discovered how corrupt scientists made up results and conclusions to vilify fats to protect their sugar industry. And later, animal fats were similarly vilified to promote seed oils and margarine.

People are increasingly realizing that meat and animal fats are healthy, and many of the products that have for decades been promoted as "healthy" alternatives are anything but healthy..

-3 (+4 / -7)



Peter Neil Dec. 5 | 09:19 pm JST

will children be required to avert their eyes when passing a burger shop and in grocery stores before 9pm?

“close your eyes children, we’re driving past a blecker burger.”

”mum, why are there curtains covering the cereal aisle?”

0 (+3 / -3)



Wick's pencil Dec. 6 | 05:46 am JST

According to the National Health Service, obesity is rising among British kids with one in 10 four-year-olds now considered to be obese. And one in five five-year-olds suffers from tooth decay from eating too much sugar.

If there are so many obese 4 and 5 year olds, the problem is with their parents. Preventing daytime adverts won't do much.

1 (+4 / -3)



virusrex Dec. 6 | 09:27 am JST

Yes, they discovered how corrupt scientists made up results and conclusions to vilify fats to protect their sugar industry. And later, animal fats were similarly vilified to promote seed oils and margarine.

There is no such thing happening with breads, the same as with every other food product where the content of sugar increased this is something directly promoted by the food industry without any kind of hidden conspiracy, people are easily convinced to consume more sugar, more fat, more salt, this is why is so difficult to keep a healthy diet on population level, the part that requires effort is to avoid them.

People are increasingly realizing that meat and animal fats are healthy, and many of the products that have for decades been promoted as "healthy" alternatives are anything but healthy..

Reducing animal products is still the healthiest choice, gifters still try to mislead people to ignore the dangers of cholesterol and high meat diets but the consensus of science is clear and much more balanced diets are better for the health of the people.

-2 (+3 / -5)



Chabbawanga Dec. 6 | 10:43 am JST

Not to mention that one of the main causes of high sugars in foods is because of the 80's and 90's hysteria against fats. Bakers used to use a lot of fats for flavor in breads, but after fats became evil in the eyes of the health police, bakers started to replace fats with sugars.

A useful narrative, but the real reason is sugars are far cheaper and have longer shelf life than butter products. Its on the manufacturers not the customers.

-1 (+1 / -2)



FizzBit Dec. 6 | 10:45 am JST

Nanny state. What would Orwell think?

0 (+3 / -3)



Raw Beer Dec. 6 | 11:09 am JST

| ... without any kind of hidden conspiracy..

The evidence clearly proves otherwise:

A short history of saturated fat: the making and unmaking of a scientific consensus

<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36477384/>

“The idea that saturated fats cause heart disease, called the diet-heart hypothesis, was introduced in the 1950s, based on weak, associational evidence. Subsequent clinical trials attempting to substantiate this hypothesis could never establish a causal link. However, these clinical-trial data were largely ignored for decades, until journalists brought them to light about a decade ago. Subsequent reexaminations of this evidence by nutrition experts have now been published in 20 review papers, which have largely concluded that saturated fats have no effect on cardiovascular disease, cardiovascular mortality or total mortality.”

Sugar Industry and Coronary Heart Disease Research - A Historical Analysis of Internal Industry Documents

<https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamainternalmedicine/article-abstract/2548255>

“Together with other recent analyses of sugar industry documents, our findings suggest the industry sponsored a research program in the 1960s and 1970s that successfully cast doubt about the hazards of sucrose while promoting fat as the dietary culprit in CHD.”

-2 (+2 / -4)



Zaphod Dec. 6 | 02:07 pm JST

virusrex

| *Reducing animal products is still the healthiest choice, grifters still try to mislead people to ignore the dangers of cholesterol and high meat diets but the consensus of science is clear and much more balanced diets are better for the health of the people.*

Oh my. If that is what your notorious "world-wide experts and respected institutions" are saying, you must be stuck in a time-warp. That old narrative is challenged on all fronts and there certainly is no "consensus" on the health of these low-fat, but sugar rich concoctions that used to be promoted as healthy any more.

-3 (+3 / -6)



virusrex Dec. 6 | 10:07 pm JST

The evidence clearly proves otherwise:

No it does not, bread has an increased content of sugars not because of a hidden conspiracy to replace its content of fat as claimed, but instead as the whole purpose in the first place, the same as other examples (as cereals) sugars were not ever used to replace anything, they were put there to satiate an unhealthy desire of precisely sugars, something well known to be a negative influence for the health of the people.

Your source does not sustain the conspiracy you claim either, it mentions a problem with rushed conclusions that were corrected precisely by the same scientific community that according to you is hiding the truth, if anything this proves that the consensus is actually correct and will reach the best available conclusion even if this hurts the interests of the food industry.

Oh my. If that is what your notorious "world-wide experts and respected institutions" are saying, you must be stuck in a time-warp. That old narrative is challenged on all fronts and there certainly is no "consensus" on the health of these low-fat, but sugar rich concoctions that used to be promoted as healthy any more.

For this to be the case you would have no difficulty in finding any recognized institution of science that defends the claim that healthy diets have high content of animal products like meat and fat, you have never been able to bring any in the past, which would clearly indicate the consensus you are trying to dismiss is very clear and explicit. Which by the way do not defend anything low-fat high sugar as you tried to misrepresent.

-1 (+1 / -2)



Wick's pencil Dec. 7 | 09:48 am JST

Your source does not sustain the conspiracy you claim either, it mentions a problem with rushed conclusions that were corrected precisely by the same scientific community

No, his source clearly proves that "rushed conclusions" were made by people with obvious conflicts of interest, and that all the research since then disproving those conclusions continue to be ignored.

-1 (+0 / -1)



virusrex Dec. 7 | 04:50 pm JST

No, his source clearly proves that "rushed conclusions" were made by people with obvious conflicts of interest, and that all the research since then disproving those conclusions continue to be ignored.

The scientists and experts disproved those conclusions, which completely contradict the claim of the supposed conspiracy, the interests of the food industry did not change, so according to the claim the understanding should still be according to them and it would be impossible that the experts improved the understanding in clear opposition of those interests, the reference (that is recognized as valid, else it would not have been brought) disproves completely the claim made.

-1 (+0 / -1)