



CASE REPORT

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 71/03 |
| 2. Advertiser | Unilever Australasia (Streets Magnum Sixties Nine) |
| 3. Product | food |
| 4. Type of advertisement | TV |
| 5. Nature of complaint | Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3 |
| 6. Date of determination | Tuesday, 8 April 2003 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This television advertisement opens on a bedding shop scene, with a young couple walking past rows of mattresses. They are later shown trying one of the beds, with other shoppers surprised to see them having discarded their clothing and getting passionate. A female shop assistant looks set to stop them but disrobes and joins them. A superimposed caption reads: ‘Take Another Bite At The Sixties.’

THE COMPLAINT

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

“The advert depicted a couple having sex in a public place, which is still an illegal offence... The advert then depicted the couple being joined for a threesome by the salesgirl, which is a moral offence.”

“Suffice to say I’ve had sex with more men than you’ve had baked dinners... I feel so embarrassed when these ads come on if my grown son is watching TV with me, I have to leave the room.”

“This is offensive to the moral values of our family.”

“This is even more sickening as it is in a department store bedding section.”

“If someone wants to pollute their lives with such immorality that’s their choice, however the innocent and non-suspecting viewer should not have to be subject to such rudeness thrown in their face unawares.”

“I find this ad to be quite offensive and not in the best interests of families, and in particular teenagers.”

“...completely against morality...degrading the sacredness of sex...”

“I feel that it is gratuitous to show 3 people, 2 females and 1 male, romping around in bed.”

“If this sort of thing was shown in a movie, the cover would contain warnings such as sexual references if not sex scenes.”

“This is just promoting this role playing as entertaining and clever action to take part in with no regard or respect for passer byers (sic) or themselves as they are prepared to ‘whatever’ with complete strangers just on impulse.”

“We are trying to teach our children about moral decency in a fairly immoral world, and then ads like this send them signals like ‘a threesome is okay.’”

“...shocked and subsequently disturbed...”

“...suggestive...highly unacceptable.”

“...overtones of a sexual orgy...”

“...extremely offensive...”

“...I am offended ...”

“...distasteful...”

“...disgusting...”

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 advice from the advertiser that ‘Whilst the TVCs do contain sexual & drug references, we have tried to dramatise the idea humorously and with the intent to entertain rather than offend.’

The Board considered that, within the context of prevailing community standards, the depiction could be regarded as humorous rather than offensive.

It determined that the advertisement did not contravene the provisions of the Code relating to the portrayal of sex, sexuality and/or nudity and further finding that the material did not breach the Code on any other grounds, the Board dismissed the complai