



## **CASE REPORT**

- |                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 94/04  |
| 2. Advertiser                 | Ross Mollison Productions (Puppetry of the Penis)  |
| 3. Product                    | Entertainment  |
| 4. Type of advertisement      | TV   |
| 5. Nature of complaint        | Discrimination or vilification Religion – section 2.1<br>Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3 |
| 6. Date of determination      | Tuesday, 11 May 2004   |
| 7. DETERMINATION              | Dismissed  |

## **DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT**

The advertisement was to promote the Melbourne Comedy Festival show “Puppetry of the Penis – The Director’s Cut” and involved use of the word penis to describe the name of the show. It also depicted male comedians naked on the stage but with their genital areas covered.

## **THE COMPLAINT**

Comments which the complainant/s made regarding this advertisement included the following:

*“The ad is vile, but if it must be shown at all, shouldn’t it be reserved for late night television?”*

*“I also object to blasphemy in advertising during the day. This ad makes a mockery of reproductive organs which is not only embarrassing and disgusting for this 25 year old student.”*

*“The advertisement was unsuitable to be shown at any time particularly when children may see it. I was deeply offended by it.”*

## **THE ADVERTISER’S RESPONSE**

The advertiser provided a copy of the TVC and script in response to the complaint/s regarding this advertisement, however, did not include any specific response/comments other than to provide their contact details for further information if required.

## **THE DETERMINATION**

The Advertising Standards Board (“Board”) considered whether this advertisement breaches section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics (the “Code”).

The Board noted that in the context of prevailing community standards, the majority of people would not find this advertisement offensive.

The Board found that the depiction did not contravene the provisions of the Code relating to the portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity or discrimination (religion) /vilification.

Further finding that the advertisement did not breach the Code on any other grounds, the Board dismissed the complaint.