



Case Report

1	Case Number	0030/12
2	Advertiser	Chrysler Australia Pty Ltd
3	Product	Vehicles
4	Type of Advertisement / media	TV
5	Date of Determination	08/02/2012
6	DETERMINATION	Dismissed

ISSUES RAISED

2.4 - Sex/sexuality/nudity S/S/N - general

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

A dog is jealous of its owners' new partner so when she goes for a run the dog dresses in her lingerie then climbs in to bed with the boyfriend. When the woman returns she sees her boyfriend in bed with her lingerie-clad dog and in the next scene the man is nowhere to be seen as the woman and dog take a drive through some woods.

THE COMPLAINT

A sample of comments which the complainant/s made regarding this advertisement included the following:

The bedroom scene implies that the man has had a sexual encounter with the dog. This is really gutter advertising.

My husband and I are not pruders; some people might think this ad is funny but it is really in bad taste. There is no need for such advertising.

The advertisement depicted bestiality ie; the boyfriend in bed with the dog dressed in lingerie. This is highly inappropriate and incredibly offensive.

I'm offended by the fact that they are joking about bestiality - they are suggesting that the woman rejects the man because she caught him in the bed with the dog dressed up in sexy underwear. I don't think bestiality is something to be joked about the same way child abuse etc should be joked about.

I am disturbed that this appears to be a reference to bestiality in prime time TV hours. I find this totally tasteless and inappropriate. If there is some other way of interpreting this scene I'd love to hear it. Nothing actually takes place between the dog and the boyfriend but having

to explain to a young person why the dog is dressed in her red corset and why she then gets rid of the boyfriend is something which should not happen as a result of watching a show as harmless as Antiques Roadshow.

Show this ad after 9.30 (or not at all) not during dinner time!

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

Comments which the advertiser made in response to the complainant/s regarding this advertisement include the following:

No response received from advertiser.

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 the complainants' concerns that the advertisement suggests a man has had a sexual encounter with a dog.

The Board viewed the advertisement and noted the absence of a response from the advertiser.

The Board considered whether the advertisement was in breach of Section 2.4 of the Code. Section 2.4 of the Code states: "Advertising or Marketing Communications shall treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience".

The Board noted that the advertisement features a woman's dog, jealous of her new partner, dressing itself in lingerie and climbing in to bed with the man.

The Board noted the complainants' concerns that the advertisement is suggestive of bestiality and considered that whilst the woman in the advertisement just sees her lingerie-clad dog in bed with her partner, the viewers have seen the dog dress itself and are aware that the situation has been contrived by the dog without the man's knowledge.

The Board considered that the woman's interpretation of why the dog is dressed in lingerie and in bed with her partner is not clear cut and that whilst one interpretation, shared by the complainants, is of sexual activity, another interpretation could be that she is annoyed that the man has dressed the dog in her lingerie.

The Board noted that in the final scene we see the dog and the woman in the car and that the man is not visible and again the Board considered that there are numerous interpretations to this scene: the man could be at home, or in the back seat.

The Board acknowledged that some people could find the advertisement to be in poor taste however the Board noted that this is not an issue which falls under the provisions of the Code and considered that the mild implication of something inappropriate between the dog and the man is overridden by the humour of the advertisement and the fact that viewers are aware of what the dog has done.

The Board determined that the advertisement did treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience and that it did not breach Section 2.4 of the Code.

Finding that the advertisement did not breach the Code on other grounds, the Board dismissed the complaint.