



**Ad Standards** Community Panel  
PO Box 5110, Braddon ACT 2612  
P (02) 6173 1500 | F (02) 6262 9833

**AdStandards.com.au**

Advertising Standards Bureau Limited  
ACN 084 452 666

# Case Report

1	<b>Case Number</b>	<b>0127/18</b>
2	<b>Advertiser</b>	<b>Universal Pictures</b>
3	<b>Product</b>	<b>Entertainment</b>
4	<b>Type of Advertisement / media</b>	<b>Internet-Social-FB</b>
5	<b>Date of Determination</b>	<b>21/03/2018</b>
6	<b>DETERMINATION</b>	<b>Dismissed</b>

## ISSUES RAISED

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

## DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This Facebook advertisement features upcoming scenes from the movie 'Blockers' including a man mistaking his daughters underwear for his wife's and putting it in his mouth, a group of teenage girls messaging about a sex pact, a teenage girl talking about having sex that night with a boy and a man participating in an alcohol enema.

## THE COMPLAINT

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

*The depiction of a father placing his daughter's underwear into his mouth in a sexually suggestive manner, albeit inadvertently, is utterly appalling and repugnant. While this scene may well be in the film itself, I don't see any need for the general public to be unwillingly exposed to this level of smut.*

## THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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





*The advertiser did not provide a response to this complaint.*

## **THE DETERMINATION**

The Ad Standards Community Panel (the “Panel”) considered whether this advertisement breaches Section 2 of the AANA Code of Ethics (the “Code”).

The Panel noted the complainant’s concern that the advertisement was too sexualised.

The Panel viewed the advertisement and noted the advertiser’s did not respond.

The Panel 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 Panel noted this Facebook advertisement includes a variety of scenes for the upcoming movie Blockers including a man mistaking his daughters underwear for his wife's and putting the underwear in his mouth, a group of teenage girls messaging about a sex pact, a teenage girl talking about having sex that night with a boy and a man appearing to participate in an alcohol enema.

The Panel noted the complainant’s concern that the advertisement was appalling and repugnant and not appropriate for the general public.

The Panel considered that this advertisement was a sponsored post on social media and considered it was not know what demographic this advertisement was targeting, but that it was reasonable to assume that the audience should not be under 13 years.

The Panel considered that while some members of the community would not be comfortable with the depiction of a man placing his daughter’s underwear in his mouth however noted that he did so unknowingly and appeared disgusted when he was informed that they were his daughter’s.

The Panel considered that while this depiction may be in bad taste, bad taste is not a provision under the Code. The Panel considered that the man’s actions did not contain a level of sex, sexuality and nudity that would be inappropriate for the relevant audience.

The Panel noted that there were other scenes in the advertisement that referenced sex and discussions about sex, however noted that there was no suggestion of strong sexual activity or nudity in the advertisement. The Panel considered that it was reasonable for an advertiser to include movie scenes in the advertisement for the



movie, and that any sexual references in these scenes were relevant to the product being advertised.

The Panel considered that the advertisement was not inappropriately sexualised and that the advertisement did treat the issue of sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant online audience and did not breach Section 2.4 of the Code.

The Panel considered Section 2.6 of the Code. Section 2.6 of the Code states: “Advertising or Marketing Communications shall not depict material contrary to Prevailing Community Standards on health and safety”.

In particular, the Panel considered a scene in the advertisement where a man appears to be participating in an alcohol enema, and that this is an activity that could potentially be unsafe.

The Panel noted that the suggestion in the advertisement is that a man is using a ‘beer bong’ to consume alcohol through his anus in competition with someone else.

The Panel considered that this is behaviour which could be considered dangerous and potentially lead to alcohol poisoning.

The Panel noted that the only depiction of alcohol in the advertisement was when it was moving up through the hose and splashes another man in the face.

The Panel considered that the suggestion of this scene is that the alcohol enema is not a positive activity and considered that the advertisement does not appear to encourage or condone the behaviour but shows distasteful results of such behaviour.

The Panel considered that the content of the movie trailer did not depict material contrary to Prevailing Community Standards on health and safety and did not breach Section 2.6 of the Code.

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

