



**ADVERTISING
STANDARDS
BUREAU**

Level 2, 97 Northbourne Avenue, Turner ACT 2612
Ph: (02) 6262 9822 | Fax: (02) 6262 9833
www.adstandards.com.au

Case Report

1	Case Number	0493/11
2	Advertiser	Bonds Industries Ltd
3	Product	Clothing
4	Type of Advertisement / media	Poster
5	Date of Determination	18/01/2012
6	DETERMINATION	Dismissed

ISSUES RAISED

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

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The Poster included an image that directly correlated to the Bonds 12days of Christmas TVC. The scene was from day 8- '8 maids a milking' in which 8 men slide (like Risky Business) across the floor in their undies and socks whilst holding a carton of milk. The gentleman in the poster is wearing the new Lo Rise Guyfront trunk undies.

THE COMPLAINT

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

The underwear, whether intentional or unintentional, sat below the man's pubic hair line meaning that some of the hair was showing. Considering that the point of the advertisement is the underwear your attention is drawn to it.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

The complaint is that the undies sat below our talent's pubic hair line. This is not the case. The undies are sitting where they are meant to sit above the pubic hair area. The shape of the underwear shown are a low cut - and sit low as they are designed to be worn but they cover any pubic region. Our products are of a modest nature - they are not sexual in any way and this new product is not portrayed in this manner at all.

The hair that can be seen is the natural hair that continues to the belly button for most men. We did not deem this offensive in any way - as it's the natural state of his body. We're inclined to not over retouch any of our artwork as we are a genuine and authentic brand. We are also very serious about being an inclusive and family brand - so we do not take these comments lightly. We need to put people in our products and show them wearing our products as they are intended in our advertising - unfortunately some people do not like to see the human form in commercials but we do try to avoid offense where possible. This communication was intended as a fun, family friendly campaign interpreting the 12 days of Christmas with an Aussie twist.

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 shows a man’s pubic hair.

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

The Board considered whether the advertisement complied with Section 2.4 of the Code. Section 2.4 states: ‘...shall treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience.’

The Board noted that the advertisement features a man wearing Bonds lo rise guyfront underpants and socks and that he appears to be in the act of sliding across the floor. The Board noted the advertiser’s response that this is a still image taken from the 12 days of Christmas TV advertisement.

The Board noted that the relevant audience was very broad and could include children. The Board noted that the man is only wearing underpants and socks and considered that his pose was not sexualised and was not sexually suggestive.

The Board noted that the man does have some hair on his lower stomach and considered that this is normal for a lot of men and that in this instance the visibility of the hair is not inappropriate or sexual. The Board considered that the image was mild and unlikely to be considered inappropriate by most members of the community.

The Board considered that most members of the community would not find the advertisement as a whole offensive and that the advertisement did treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience and that it 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.