



Case Report

1	Case Number	0168/13
2	Advertiser	Roadshow Film Distributors Pty Ltd
3	Product	Entertainment
4	Type of Advertisement / media	TV
5	Date of Determination	12/06/2013
6	DETERMINATION	Dismissed

ISSUES RAISED

2.3 - Violence Cruelty to animals

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The advertisement is advertising the movie The Hangover - Part III. There are various scenes from the movie including one where a man is driving down a busy road pulling a giraffe in a trailer behind him. We see that they are heading for a bridge and the scene cuts away before we see what happens to the giraffe.

THE COMPLAINT

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

Part of the trailer featured a giraffe traveling on the back of a trailer, whereby we see an approaching low bridge, we can therefore assume that the giraffe is about to be decapitated, killed or maimed. This is disgusting and it glorifies cruelty to animals. The rest of the trailer is about men being idiots, which is fine, but showing the part with the giraffe is taking it too far and is not necessary. Please remove this section of the trailer swiftly as it is debased and horrible to even imagine, just the thought of it made me nauseous.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

Our TV campaign for the film ends on the 1st June and after this date there will be no more TV advertising for the film. There is only currently 1 spot on air that contains the Giraffe be-heading scene and this will come off air on 1st June.

The spots that contained the so called Giraffe be-heading received a J and T CAD rating from CAD and the spots aired within their allowed time-slots as dictated by FREE TV and the TV networks. The spots do-not actually show a be-heading it is only implied as part of the comedic script within the movie.

The complaint seems to be in relation to a spot seen between 9-9.30 and the spots containing this specific scene received a J (30 and 15 sec version) and a T (60 sec version) - so was allowed to run on air much earlier than 9pm. All spots were approved by CA and appeared on air within their allowed time-slots as dictated by FREE TV and the TV networks.

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 glorifies cruelty to animals and is inappropriate for viewing on television.

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

The Board considered whether the advertisement was in breach of Section 2.3 of the Code. Section 2.3 of the Code states: “Advertising or Marketing Communications shall not present or portray violence unless it is justifiable in the context of the product or service advertised”.

The Board noted that the advertisement features several scenes from the movie Hangover 3. One of the scenes includes one of the characters driving along the freeway in a convertible with a giraffe in a box trailer behind him. The car approaches a low bridge and we then see a series of accidents and mishaps happen until the driver turns to see the trail of disaster behind him.

The Board noted that the scenes in the advertisement are actual scenes from the movie which is a well-known humorous movie that is based on exaggerated instances that a group of

friends recall after a night of drinking excessively.

The Board noted that there is a clear connection between the scenes in the advertisement and the movie. The Board noted that the particular scene of concern shows a giraffe in a box trailer and a man towing the trailer yelling to a boy in a car next to him while driving. The Board noted that the entire scene is clearly unrealistic.

The Board also noted a brief image of a man holding a pillow and looking toward a chicken. The Board considered that this could be seen as a suggestion that the chicken was about to be harmed or smothered and that this behaviour is not condoned. The Board noted however, that the viewers do not see what happens to the chicken and in the context of the movie being advertised this type of implied violence is justifiable in the context of the product being advertised.

The Board noted that the suggestion that the giraffe will meet its fate as they approach a low bridge is suggested but never seen. The Board agreed that the path of destruction left behind adds to the idea that something did happen to the giraffe but the viewers do not see what happened.

The Board considered that there is no overt cruelty or violence and that most reasonable members of the community would understand the humour and recognise that the advertisement is not condoning or encouraging this type of behaviour toward animals.

In the Board's view the advertisement does not present violence and the footage of cruelty is mild and justifiable in the context of the service being advertised.

The Board determined that the advertisement did not breach Section 2.3 of the Code.

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

dismissed the complaint.