



CASE REPORT

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 342/05 |
| 2. Advertiser | Holeproof (Antz Pantz) |
| 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, 13 December 2005 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The opening scene in this television advertisement is set in the penthouse suite of a luxury hotel where models Nicky Hilton and Kimberley Stewart, both in their underwear, look at hundreds of ants swarming over the disheveled remains of an after-party mess, glasses, crockery and even their legs. They order room service and a waiter arrives with a serving dish. When he lifts the lid, Rex the anteater is revealed. One of the girls with ants crawling over her legs says: “*Sic ‘em Rex*”. As party music starts and the girls start giggling, the waiter leaves the room and we see a “Do Not Disturb” sign hanging on the door knob.

THE COMPLAINT

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

“... the anteater proceeds to eat the ants off the women’s legs and the way the ladies scream in delight as the anteater moves upwards gives the innuendo of acts of bestiality. I find it offensive and disturbing”.

THE ADVERTISER’S RESPONSE

“(this) campaign has been running for nearly 20 years and is a light-hearted attempt to link the brand of underwear with beautiful shots of women wearing it.”

“The women in the commercial are not squealing with delight related to any acts of bestiality, but in fact are responding to the tickling of the ants and the echidna as they crawl over their legs”.

THE DETERMINATION

The Advertising Standards Board (‘the Board’) considered whether this advertisement breaches Section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics (the Code).

The Board noted that the advertisement did not contain any overly graphic or explicit images, nor did it in fact depict any acts of bestiality. The Board was of the opinion that the majority of people would not be offended by this advertisement.

The Board found that the advertisement did not contravene the provisions of the Code relating to the portrayal of sex or sexuality.

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