



CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number	148/98
2. Advertiser	Goodman Fielder (Quality Bakers)
3. Product	Food
4. Type of advertisement	TV
5. Nature of complaint	Discrimination or vilification Other – section 2.1 Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3 Health and safety – section 2.6
6. Date of determination	Tuesday, 13 October 1998
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The Board viewed two versions of this advertisement. Complaints were received about both versions.

1. The advertisement shows a buffet table/smorgasbord. A man is sampling and apparently enjoying sliced bread. The advertisement shows a vast selection of toppings that he could choose to put on his bread. The man, however, appears to be enjoying the bread, plain. As the man moves off, a voiceover says, 'Quality Bakers, it tastes good, with nothing on.' The advertisement then shows the man from behind. We see that he is totally naked and there is a rear-shot of his naked buttocks. After close-up shot of sliced bread, there is a further shot of the rear of the man and this time he wiggles his exposed buttocks.

2. The second advertisement is the same as the first except that in the second advertisement, the man's buttocks are obscured by pixel type squares.

THE COMPLAINT

Comments the complainants made about the advertisement included:

'...objection to the nudity in the advertisement...'

'I am not offended by the nudity in this advertisement but, it obviously degrades men. If that had been a nude woman I wonder if it would have been censored immediately. Why has such an obviously degrading commercial been given the all clear?'

'My concern is 1 it is in children's time on T.V. and 2 it is sly adult innuendo, even a double entendre.'

'My 2 ½ year old son still knows the man is wearing nothing and says he should get dressed. How do we teach our kids privacy and morals.'

'I don't mind nudity in other parts of the house – it is just not hygienic near food!'

THE DETERMINATION

The Advertising Standards Board ('the Board') considered whether these advertisements breach Section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics ('the Code').

The Board was of the opinion that the advertisements' portrayal of the character concerned did not constitute discrimination or vilification. In addition, the Board was of the view that the

advertisements' treatment of nudity did not amount to a breach of the Code and nor did they depict material contrary to prevailing community standards on health and safety. The Board felt that neither of the advertisements would offend prevailing community views and standards and dismissed the complaint.