



CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number	223/05
2. Advertiser	Bonds Industries Ltd (intimates)
3. Product	Clothing
4. Type of advertisement	TV
5. Nature of complaint	Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3
6. Date of determination	Tuesday, 9 August 2005
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This advertisement consists of a series of mid-range and close-up black and white shots of a woman wearing lingerie. At different points in the advertisement the cameras focuses on either the bra or the briefs. In the closing scene of the advertisement we see that Sarah O’Hare is the model. She turns to the camera and says: *“Bet you didn’t think it was Bonds.”*

THE COMPLAINT

Comments which the complainant/s made regarding this advertisement included the following:

“The ad displays the woman’s body... in an unnecessary sexual manner. One, the time of day is inappropriate, two, it is school holidays...”

“I believe this ad is pornographic in the style used to show the scantily clad women on TV...”

“... It is pretty much soft porn. I take offence and believe that it should not be shown at that hour.”

“... the ad is very arousing and is border-line pornographic. It is clear that the ad is set up to arouse sexual feelings and is not appropriate for viewing by anybody.”

“The products were displayed and shot in a lascivious manner with much more portrayal of cleavage and other personal female areas than I was comfortable with...”

“... It is fair to acknowledge that the advertiser will most likely need to use a female figure to show off their product but it is another thing when they portray this in a highly sexual, inappropriate and disconcerting way...”

“... The focus of this ad is not, however, on the product but on the body of the woman as shown by full screen shots of cleavage and the sensual movements of the body. These overly sensual movements draw attention to the body not the product or the details of the product.”

THE ADVERTISER’S RESPONSE

Comments which the advertiser made in response to the complaint/s regarding this advertisement included the following:

“The Bonds Intimates TVC was created as a spoof of advertising by Calvin Klein...”

“The intention of our commercial was to make the consumer believe this commercial was for another brand... and surprise them that this new range was from Bonds.”

“There is no nudity, or sex in the TVC...”

“This TVC is certainly more sensuous than previous ads from Bonds – but is not sexual or offensive in its intent...”

“... We are planning to run this commercial again in November – in response to a few of the complaints you have received we will instruct them to place these spots only after 8.30 pm.”

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 that the depictions in the advertisement did not portray any nudity and that the images were not overly graphic in that they did not expose the breasts or genitals in any way.

The Board was of the opinion that the images used in the advertisement were relevant to the product being advertised.

The Board found that the depiction did not contravene the provisions of the Code relating to the portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity.

Further finding that the advertisement did not breach the Code on any other grounds, the Board dismissed the complaint.