



## **CASE REPORT**

1. Complaint reference number	425/06
2. Advertiser	Diageo Australia Ltd (Guinness)
3. Product	Alcohol
4. Type of advertisement	Outdoor
5. Nature of complaint	Discrimination or vilification Gender - section 2.1
6. Date of determination	Tuesday, 14 November 2006
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

## **DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT**

There are two outdoor advertisements in this series which feature a glass of Guinness and the question on one execution reads “Scarlett Johanssen or Angelina Jolie?” and the other reads “Silicone: Work of genius or just a brilliant idea?”

## **THE COMPLAINT**

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

*This advertisement is encouraging men to treat women as objects and at the same time encouraging women to think they have to objectify themselves for men.*

*Sure, silicone has many uses, but in the context of the ads in this series posing questions about sexual preferences, one can only assume they mean breast implants. So, there is no nudity or overt sexual imagery PICTURED... but the implication of this particular ad is quite clear that unless women have surgically enhanced breasts that look like two halves of a basketball peeping out of their neckline, they're just not really worth anything.*

## **THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE**

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

*Firstly I would like to take this opportunity to assure you that there was never any intention to cause offence – in fact, the campaign is intended to be humorous whilst being compliant with your code.*

*We have reviewed the clauses that you have referred to and our purpose is not to be judgmental about these issues and we do so by asking mostly topical questions. The whole campaign is intended to be humorous and witty. Consumer research carried out prior to the campaign launch showed that the topics were relevant to the audience and in the right tone and manner. Currently we are not planning to run these executions again.*

*I can only apologise if any offence has been unintentionally caused by this campaign.*

## **THE DETERMINATION**

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

The Board viewed the advertisement and considered the complainant’s comments that the advertisement encourages men to think of women as sex objects.

The Board considered whether the advertisement breaches Section 2.1 of the Code dealing with discrimination and vilification of gender.

The Board considered the advertisement's approach to silicone and agreed that the reference to silicone in the context of the advertisement would most likely allude to silicone breast implants in the eyes of most of the community. The Board agreed that the phrase in question effectively promotes silicone implants and was in poor taste inasmuch as it assumed that silicone implants were desirable. However the Board agreed that such a phrase does not, of itself, vilify or discriminate against women. Hence the Board agreed that the advertisement did not breach section 2.1 of the code.

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