



## Case Report

<b>1</b>	<b>Case Number</b>	<b>0080/12</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Advertiser</b>	<b>Red Bull Aust Pty Ltd</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Product</b>	<b>Food and Beverages</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Type of Advertisement / media</b>	<b>Pay TV</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Date of Determination</b>	<b>14/03/2012</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>DETERMINATION</b>	<b>Dismissed</b>

### ISSUES RAISED

- 2.5 - Language inappropriate language
- 2.1 - Discrimination or Vilification Religion

### DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The advertisement depicts three cartoon characters fishing on a lake. One of the characters, named Jesus, states he's bored and decides to leave the boat and appears to walk on water as he departs. The other two characters in the boat voice their surprise and suggest that this feat may be a miracle or a result of drinking Red Bull (which has given Jesus wings) but Jesus replies that it's nothing to do with either, it's because he knows where the stepping stones are.

### THE COMPLAINT

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

*I am offended that my family had to see this ad making a mockery of all we stand for as a Christian family.*

*I have a sense of humour and I can laugh at my own faith....and yet I am offended by this advertisement due to it taking a cheap shot at Christianity and using swearing in the mouth of Jesus. They wouldn't DARE do an ad with Mohammed in it!! Because they would be afraid of offending people....But somehow it's ok to badly ridicule a figure that is revered and worshipped by millions and make an ad that isn't even witty. And try to sell something with it!! I am offended by this. It isn't even very clever!. Thanks for reading my complaint. I'm sure it's not the only one.*

*This is a highly offensive advert to anyone who is a Christian for the following reasons:*

- 1. Suggesting Jesus was a slacker and making a mockery of what Christians believe*
- 2. Suggesting Jesus was a falsifier and did not perform miracles - mocking the Christian bible*
- 3. Having Jesus take his own name in vain. In the Christian beliefs one of the Ten Commandments is not to take the lords name in vain. Swearing can be forgiven blasphemy is not. Having to watch a cartoon of the son of god taking his own name in vain is absolutely disgusting and shocking.*

*I have never seen any other religion mocked in such a fashion in an advertisement. If this advert is allowed to stay airing it is a mockery to the Christian faith. The story line and imagery seems to be oblivious to the feelings of Christians. The advertisement makes direct reference to a particular religious group and it makes a mockery of the section of our community with those beliefs.*

*The add ends with the character of Jesus appearing to slip on a rock and blaspheming by way of cursing using his own name. As a Christian I find the portrayal of Jesus blaspheming deeply offensive and enormously disrespectful. This act is not in keeping with the character of Jesus and therefore is a gross misrepresentation of his very nature.*

## **THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE**

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

*Red Bull Energy Drink television and online advertisements demonstrate the energising effects of Red Bull on body and mind in a fresh and cheeky way via light-hearted cartoons that are not designed to be taken literally.*

*As with most cartoons, the drawings and storylines have been developed over many years with the purpose of communicating a humorous, satirical story or message and not a true life scenario. For example, The Simpsons is an animated cartoon whereby the characters are created for their humour and yet not taken so literally.*

*The Red Bull brand image is hallmarked by individuality, innovation and non-conformism. These brand values are reflected in the brand communication, characterised by self-confidence, a witty approach and unique identity, as well as self-irony, which is appreciated by the millions of fans worldwide who purchase our products, attend or participate in our events and consume our media content through various media channels.*

*However, we respect the views and opinions of the complainants as advised by the ASB, and as the Red Bull television commercials are not intended to offend, we have chosen to remove the relevant advertisement from all television and online mediums as of this Sunday 4 March 2012.*

*Red Bull Australia is committed to complying with the AANA Advertiser Code of Ethics and all applicable laws related to advertising.*

*Given our action, we trust that the matter does not require the consideration of the Advertising Standards Board.*

## **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 complainant’s concerns that the advertisement is inappropriate, offensive and blasphemous.

The Board viewed the advertisement and noted the advertiser’s response.

The Board considered whether the advertisement was in breach of Section 2.1 of the Code. Section 2.1 of the Code states: “Advertising or Marketing Communications shall not portray people or depict material in a way which discriminates against or vilifies a person or section of the community on account of race, ethnicity, nationality, sex, age, sexual preference, religion, disability or political belief.”

The Board noted that the advertisement features animated, cartoon style characters intended to depict Jesus and two of his followers or disciples. The three men are on a small boat on the water and they discuss the miracle of Jesus walking on water and whether or not this is because he has consumed Red Bull. Jesus confirms that he is walking on stepping stones not performing a miracle. At the end of the advertisement Jesus slips on a rock and says “Jesus”.

The Board considered that the use of a depiction of Jesus and references to specifics that are well known within the Christian faith is a serious and sensitive issue and could be considered offensive and inappropriate by members of the community.

The minority of the Board agreed that some members of the community would consider that the advertisement mocked and trivialised Christian beliefs, in particular by suggesting that Jesus walking on water was not a miracle. The minority of the Board considered that the advertisement is demeaning of Christian beliefs and that it does vilify people of Christian belief and values.

The majority of the Board also agreed that advertisements which use humour in connection with religious concepts would be considered offensive by many members of the community. However the Board noted that the Christian faith is well established and accepted in Australian society and that many well known elements are now used as general references, for example, ‘walking on water’ to describe the achievements and success of particular people.

The majority of the Board considered that the advertisement was not attacking of a vulnerable minority group and that it does not discredit any specific elements of Christianity. In fact the Board considered that the advertisement clearly acknowledges that walking on water is ‘another one’ of the miracles that Jesus performed and is supportive of the Christian belief that Jesus did perform miracles. The majority of the Board considered that the imagery depicted in the advertisement does not denigrate Christianity or Christians and would be seen

by most people as a humorous play on a well known biblical story with no reflection on the beliefs underpinning the scene.

The Board determined that the material depicted did not discriminate against or vilify any person or section of the community on account of religion and did not breach Section 2.1 of the Code.

The Board then considered whether the advertisement was in breach of Section 2.5 of the Code. Section 2.5 of the Code states: “Advertising or Marketing Communications shall only use language which is appropriate in the circumstances and strong or obscene language shall be avoided.”

The Board noted that blasphemy in itself is no longer an offence and that, although the word ‘Jesus’ in this context could be considered offensive by some members of the community, in the Board’s view there is no strong or obscene language explicitly stated in the advertisement.

The Board considered that the depiction of Jesus using the term “Jesus” could be interpreted as Jesus admonishing himself.

The Board considered that the word is not strong or obscene and that it did not breach Section 2.5 of the Code.

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