



CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number	321/04
2. Advertiser	Unilever Australasia (Streets Paddle Pop)
3. Product	Food
4. Type of advertisement	TV
5. Nature of complaint	Discrimination or vilification Other – section 2.1
6. Date of determination	Tuesday, 7 December 2004
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The advertisement features Streets animated animal characters on top of an icy mountain. One of them experiences flatulence which cracks the ice surface and the hero character uses the Streets esky lid to slide down the mountain and win a race.

THE COMPLAINT

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

“This, in my opinion, is encouraging children to believe breaking wind in public is not only acceptable but humorous. With etiquette and manners at an all time low why do the advertisers need to encourage this behaviour.”

“... I find it offensive that this dog or whatever it is does that. I don't see what it has to do with the ad. I have two children who thought it was a disgusting ad. My 8 year old asked me why the dog was in the ad and what did farting have to do with icecreams. I don't see the connection either.”

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

“The TVC aims to create humour via dramatizing a real life situation.”

“The humour in this commercial taps into the observation that sometimes in real life, people struggle to hold in the urge to break wind. This can sometimes be a little embarrassing, and is often shirked off by the offender with an embarrassed giggle, similar to how Happy laughs in the TVC. Streets felt that this was a situation that kids could relate to.”

“The intent of the commercial was to communicate that Streets Paddle Pop is a fun kids' brand. We did not intend to offend anyone, and sincerely apologise for any offence caused.”

THE DETERMINATION

The Advertising Standards Board (“Board”) considered whether this advertisement breached section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics (the “Code”).

The Board was of the view that in the context of prevailing community standards, the majority of people would find this advertisement humorous rather than offensive.

The Board found that the depiction did not contravene the provisions of the Code relating to the

portrayal of people (other).

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