



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	Case Number	0346/18
2	Advertiser	Honey Birdette
3	Product	Lingerie
4	Type of Advertisement / media	Poster
5	Date of Determination	08/08/2018
6	DETERMINATION	Upheld - Not Modified or Discontinued

ISSUES RAISED

- 2.2 - Objectification Degrading - women
- 2.2 - Objectification Exploitative - women
- 2.4 - Sex/sexuality/nudity S/S/N - general
- 2.4 - Sex/sexuality/nudity S/S/N - nudity

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This poster advertisement features lingerie titled "Zoe". It features a woman applying lipstick in the mirror, and wearing a black lace bra in through which her nipples are visible. The tops of her lace underpants are visible.

THE COMPLAINT

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

Sexual content and nudity clearly visible to children

I am not opposed to companies advertising lingerie however this particular poster clearly showed the woman's nipple. It was a blown up poster which then emphasised this. This was unavoidable and I do not wish for this content to be visible in a shopping



centre for my toddler. Surely this particular poster breaches the code by not treating nudity sensitive to the relevant audience. There are a lot of kids at Fountain gate. Those posters should only face inside the shop for those customers who choose to enter.

This Honey Birdette store is located on the corner just around from the main food court, which is frequented by mums and their small children, not to mention many school kids hang around that area as there are many teen stores, and also children's clothing and toy stores nearby. The images are porn, and are intended to be sexual. There certainly is a difference between a naked body, and sexualized image of a naked body, and these images are pornographic in nature and are, from concept to execution, intended to be sexual and lusty. By allowing these images, we as a society are responsible for introducing children to porn. Revealing pornographic material, such as the Honey Birdette posters, to children at such a young age will no doubt lead them to a life of crippling porn addiction.

Furthermore, young men, full of hormones, seeing these images will be enticed to search out more images like them on the internet, which we know from many internal injury reports made by Australian doctors, can result in these young men insisting on their young girlfriends emulating with them the things that they see in porn.

When young women see these images it teaches them that they need to be over sexualized themselves in order to be attractive, and when we as a society gives the okay to have these overtly sexual images displayed so publicly it teaches young women and girls that the ultimate value of a woman lies in the way she looks and how sexually desirable she is.

Then there are the dads, husbands and men in general who go out in the world with good intentions of being faithful to their partners, yet are confronted by these shocking pornographic images. Porn is devastating for many people's lives, and dulls people's human interactions with each other. Point blank, porn harms our society, and the images the Honey Birdette stores blast out to the community are porn. Honey Birdette is harming our society.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

Advertiser did not provide a response.

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 complainants’ concern that the advertisement featured a sexualised image of a woman that was inappropriate for a broad audience which would include children.

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

The Panel considered whether the advertisement was in breach of Section 2.2 of the Code. Section 2.2 of the Code states: “Advertising or marketing communications should not employ sexual appeal in a manner which is exploitative or degrading of any individual or group of people.”

The Panel noted the AANA Practice Note which provides guidance on the meaning of the terms exploitative and degrading:

Exploitative - (a) taking advantage of the sexual appeal of a person, or group of people, by depicting them as objects or commodities; or (b) focussing on their body parts where this bears no direct relevance to the product or service being advertised. Degrading – lowering in character or quality a person or group of people.

The Panel noted the complainants’ concern that the advertisement objectifies women.

The Panel first considered whether the advertisement used sexual appeal.

The Panel noted the poster advertisement featured lingerie titled “Zoe”. It featured a woman applying lipstick in the mirror, and wearing a black lace bra with the top of her lace underpants visible. The Panel considered that the style of the lingerie in combination with the woman’s pose did constitute sexual appeal.

The Panel then considered whether the advertisement used sexual appeal in a manner that was exploitative of an individual or group of people.

The Panel considered that there was a particular focus on the woman’s breasts in the advertisement, however considered that this focus was relevant to the lingerie being sold.

The Panel considered that the advertisement did not suggest the woman was an object, or was for sale, rather the advertisement featured the woman wearing the underwear that was for sale.



The Panel considered that the advertisement did not use sexual appeal in a manner that was exploitative of an individual or group of people.

The Panel then considered whether the advertisement used sexual appeal in a degrading manner.

The Panel considered that the advertisement depicted the woman as confident and empowered, and considered that the advertisement did not depict the woman in a way which lowered her in character or quality.

The Panel considered that the advertisement did not use sexual appeal in a degrading manner.

The Panel determined that the advertisement did not employ sexual appeal in a manner which is exploitative or degrading of any individual or group of people, and did not breach Section 2.2 of the Code.

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 that this poster advertisement was in the window of a store and was visible to people walking past the store, and considered that the relevant audience for this poster would be broad and would include children.

The Panel considered the complainants' concerns that the model's nipples were revealed which was contrary to community standards.

The Panel noted that the bra the woman was wearing was sheer and considered that there was a strong suggestion that her nipple was visible.

The Panel noted that the design and cut of the lingerie featured in the advertisement left a large portion of her breasts visible and that this imagery did contain a high level of nudity.

The Panel considered that the level of nudity was at the higher end of the scale and as such the image included on a poster that is visible to members of the community standing outside the business was not appropriate for the relevant broad audience which would likely include children.

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

Finding that the advertisement breached Section 2.4 of the Code, the Panel upheld



the complaints.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE TO DETERMINATION

We do not agree with the Ad Standards decision to uphold these complaints. How is it that men's nipples do not warrant complaint, however a highly faded female nipple that is covered by a lace bra can now lead to sexual assault. How offensive?!

Ad Standards are fully aware that we are a target. No child is looking at an image of a woman in lingerie and saying 'I'm offended'. It's a frightening development for the modern woman and Ad Standards decision is one we do not agree with. We are here to empower women and we are going to continue to do that.