

CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number	305/04
2. Advertiser	Bonds Industries Ltd (Hipster Lovelies)
3. Product	Clothing
4. Type of advertisement	TV
5. Nature of complaint	Discrimination or vilification Gender - section 2.1 Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3 Language – use of language – section 2.5
6. Date of determination	Tuesday, 9 November 2004
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The advertisement features well known model Sarah O'Hare wearing Bonds underwear around her home. She drinks milk from the carton and it dribbles out of her mouth down onto her chest. Sarah O'Hare says "Bugger". The tagline is "Bonds new Hipster Lovelies. Fancy undies. For us Bonds' girls."

THE COMPLAINT

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

"My concern is with the word 'bugger' which I find offensive."

"I object to a woman wearing next to nothing prancing around the screen, then in a provocative manner removing her top to reveal her bra. She then drinks some milk, dribbles it down her chin and swears."

"I feel the ad is made to be sexually stimulating and could be classified as pornographic, and would be something one would find in a pornographic magazine. It promotes the idea that women are sexual objects, and uses their bodies to sell a product."

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

"Our 'Hipster Lovelies' commercial was developed to emulate the theme of Toyotas very successful 'bugger' campaign – an ad that most Australians know and love. The creative concept is based upon applying an iconic Australian advertising idea (the Toyota bugger ad) to a category which is generally about softness and femininity."

"Bonds reputation and standing in the Australian marketplace is such that we would never run an ad that suggests or explicitly states offensive language as expressed in the complainant's letter."

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 in the context of prevailing community standards, the majority of people would not find this advertisement offensive.

The Board found that the depiction did not contravene the provisions of the Code relating to the portrayal of people (sex) and/or 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.