



Case Report

1	Case Number	0374/13
2	Advertiser	Xotica
3	Product	Sex Industry
4	Type of Advertisement / media	Poster
5	Date of Determination	13/11/2013
6	DETERMINATION	Dismissed

ISSUES RAISED

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

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

Vinyl self adhesive "poster" affixed to three panel false window on front of trading premises. The centre panel has photographic images of three feature performers attired in lingerie.

THE COMPLAINT

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

I was in town with my family (including my three young children) out for lunch and we had to walk past the large poster.

The images on the poster present women as mere sexual objects to be used by men. I felt demeaned and degraded. One of the women on the poster below had her nipple exposed. I should not have to have a conversation with my small children as to why these women are not dressed, or why they are showing their private parts. I should not have to explain to my older child who can read (age 7) why there is a competition for Miss Nude or what lap dancing, striptease or any of these other things are.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

The complainant has taken issue with the bikini attired women in the poster as being in "sexualised Poses".

To the contrary, they are posed no more provocatively than images present in advertising found everywhere in all forms of media from buses to print and shop windows.

She perceives our poster as "presenting women as mere sexual objects to be used by men". I would disagree and question her objectivity in this regard.

As per the attached images, there is NO exposed nipple, a vandal has burnt the area in question with a cigarette which would be blatantly obvious to "Blind Freddy".

The attachments display the images from various angles and zoom to ensure you have the full content to compare to what the complainant has provided.

We haven't undertaken repair or replacement as the panel in question as it is being renewed in November to promote and advertise one of our resident performers who has just been crowned Penthouse Magazine, Pet Of The Year together with five others who have graced the pages of Penthouse this year.

As this will use images from the front covers of Penthouse, the same images on open display in magazine racks in retailers such as Newsagents, Petrol Stations and the like, I hope the ASB will respond to their next complaint without referring the matter to us.

With regard to his/her closing paragraph and her taking issue with why she should have to explain to her children why these things exist, she is a parent and that is what one does!

I must question the true intentions of your complainant.

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 depicts women as sexual objects, shows a woman's nipple and is not appropriate for display outdoors where children can see it.

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

The Board 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 and degrading of any individual or group of people."

The Board noted that the advertisement features six women wearing bikinis or lingerie and text which advertises the premises and includes the descriptors, "Topless Barmaids" and "Female Strippers".

The Board noted the complainant's concerns that the advertisement is demeaning and degrading to women and considered that whilst some members of the community would prefer for adult venues to not be advertised, in this instance the women's private areas are covered and in the context of an advertisement for an adult venue the images of the women are not exploitative and degrading.

The Board determined that the advertisement did not breach Section 2.2 of the Code.

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 signage is on a building which is located in an area which contains a high proportion of adult venues. The Board noted that the advertisement does not show any private parts of the woman and whilst the women’s poses are sexualised the overall advertisement is not inappropriate for a broad audience which may include children.

Based on the location of the building and the nature of the image the Board considered that the advertisement does treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience.

The Board determined that the advertisement 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.