



**ADVERTISING
STANDARDS
BOARD**

Level 2, 97 Northbourne Avenue, Turner ACT 2612
Ph: (02) 6173 1500 | Fax: (02) 6262 9833
www.adstandards.com.au

ACN 084 452 666

Case Report

1	Case Number	0512/17
2	Advertiser	Grosvenor Hotel
3	Product	Food / Beverages
4	Type of Advertisement / media	Billboard
5	Date of Determination	22/11/2017
6	DETERMINATION	Upheld - Modified or Discontinued

ISSUES RAISED

2.2 - Objectification Exploitative and degrading - women

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The image features 2 x pizza's with caption "Pizzas or Jugs", with a tag line of "Grab both for just \$25" at the Grosvenor Hotel which is a Topless Bar and Strip club.

THE COMPLAINT

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

It condones and suggests sexual harassment of women by suggesting that people can grab "jugs" at the bar, which is a topless bar in Brisbane.

Objectifies and demeans women

Sexist reference to women's bodies

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

Grosvenor Hotel is advertising a promotional \$25 "Pizza & Jug" deal.

I went to lengths to make sure that this ad was appropriate & even removed part of our Logo that says "Topless Bar & Strip Club".

I'm not sure where these complainants get that it is "sexist" or "demeaning" in any way.

I really do not wish to waste my time on the matter as it is ridiculous, especially when you haven't even seen the advertisement.

THE DETERMINATION

The Advertising Standards Board (the "Board") considered whether this advertisement breaches Section 2 of the AANA Code of Ethics (the "Code").

The Board noted the complainant's concerns that the advertisement is objectifying and demeaning to women.

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: (a) where images of Minors, or people who appear to be Minors, are used; or (b) in a manner which is exploitative and degrading of any individual or group of people."

The Board noted that in order to breach this Section of the Code the advertisement would need to be using sexual appeal in a manner that is considered both exploitative and degrading.

The Board noted this Billboard advertisement is for the Grosvenor Hotel which is a topless bar and strip club. The advertisement features two pizzas side by side with pepperoni in circles on the pizzas and the words Pizzas or Jugs? at the top of the image. Below the pizzas reads "grab both for just \$25. The details of the venue appear on the bottom right of the image.

The Board noted that the product or venue is a topless bar and that some members of the community would prefer that these types of adult venues were not allowed to operate and should not be advertised at all.

The Board first considered whether the advertisement used sexual appeal and noted that the only image was two pizzas.

In the current case, the image is a picture of pizzas with strategically placed pepperoni for the purpose of creating the impression of breasts with pronounced nipples. The Board noted the placement of the pizzas side by side was an element also adding to the suggestion that the pizzas were a depiction of breasts.

The Board considered the use of the term Pizzas or Jugs and noted that the colloquial definition for Jugs can include breasts. The Board noted that the image juxtaposed with the text did amount to an overall impression that was intended to make the pizzas appear as breasts.

The Board considered that by including an image of breasts, albeit presented as pizzas did introduce a level of sexual appeal as women's breasts are often considered an object of sexual desire.

The Board then considered whether the ad used sexual appeal in a manner that was exploitative and degrading.

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

“Exploitative - means clearly appearing to purposefully debase or abuse a person, or group of persons, for the enjoyment of others, and lacking moral, artistic or other values.

Degrading – lowering in character or quality a person or group of people.”

The Board noted it had dismissed complaints about an advertisement for Frucor where lemons were presented in a manner that made them appear as breasts.

“The Board noted that the image is clearly intended to look like a pair of breasts. The Board considered that the positioning of the lemons together and the placement of the lemon ends toward the front was a depiction that was undeniably designed to suggest breasts. The Board noted that overall impression in connection with the words “not as guilty as it looks,” strengthened the innuendo.”

“In the Board's view, the fruit is presented in a manner that makes them suggestive of breasts however at the same time the fruit is clearly identifiable as fruit. In this case lemons. The Board noted that the use of fruit in this way did not humiliate or ridicule women and did not treat women unfairly.

In contrast to the case mentioned above for Frucor (0251/17) the Board noted that the representation of women's breasts as pizzas did reduce women to an object which was exploitative by way of purposefully debasing women. In addition the promotion of being able to grab the deal at a bargain price was degrading by lowering in character and quality women in general.

In the Board's view the overall impression was that the image and words did amount to a depiction that was clearly appearing to purposefully debase a group of persons, for the enjoyment of others, and lowering in character or quality a person or group of people and did breach section 2.2 of the Code.

Finding that the advertisement did breach section 2.2 of the Code, the Board upheld the complaints.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE TO DETERMINATION

The Billboard in question in Central Station has been removed due to its scheduled removal on the 27th November 2017 as the period paid for was only up until then & was scheduled to be removed on this date when it was erected.