



## **CASE REPORT**

- |                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 75/06   |
| 2. Advertiser                 | Emap Australia (Zoo Weekly)   |
| 3. Product                    | Media   |
| 4. Type of advertisement      | TV  |
| 5. Nature of complaint        | Violence Other – section 2.2<br>Health and safety – section 2.6<br>Other - Causes alarm and distress<br>Other - Social values |
| 6. Date of determination      | Tuesday, 14 March 2006  |
| 7. DETERMINATION              | Dismissed   |

## **DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT**

This television advertisement depicts a sweet old lady giving her husband a dinner of sausages and mashed potato and peas. As he eats the sausage he bites something solid and we see him take a gold ring from his mouth, and ponder how it became part of his sausage. The scenario cuts to a meat processing factory where a male employee is walking across a gantry, so absorbed in reading Zoo Weekly that not watching where he is going, he falls head first into an industrial mincing machine. A male voiceover warns “Mondays aren’t safe anymore” with various images of articles in Zoo Weekly.

## **THE COMPLAINT**

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

*The use of black and yellow safety markings...makes a mockery of health and safety as the machine is clearly unguarded.*

*This advert caused me to be extremely upset, to lose sleep, have nightmares and become very emotional.*

*I became rather nauseous and cannot look at sausages the same way again.*

*I find the idea of suggesting cannibalism rather offensive.*

*The idea that in processed food there could be human meat without the person being aware, is nauseating to me.*

*The ad implies cannibalism and not to mention it takes the mickey out of work place safety...The suggestion that a person is being eaten is repulsive.*

*While you do not see any blood, the end result is essentially cannibalism.*

*It is violent and could make children and adults alike seriously ill.*

*...my daughter actually vomited after seeing the ad.*

## **THE ADVERTISER’S RESPONSE**

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

*The “Sausage” advertisement for Zoo Weekly is intended to be a humorous and unrealistic depiction of the consequence of reading a magazine that is so engaging to the target consumer so that he is no longer aware of his surroundings.*

*This (scenario) is intended, along with the insinuation that the elderly man is eating sausages which contain the remains of the factory worker, to be a humorous and clearly unreal reflection of the engaging content within the magazine.*

*With regards to “cannibalism” the elderly man is obviously not aware that he is potentially eating sausages containing the remains of the factory worker; indeed, at no point after the factory worker falls into the machine, is the elderly man even seen to eat the sausage.*

## **THE DETERMINATION**

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

The Board considered that this advertisement was in quite bad taste and could understand why some people would find it distasteful.

The Board noted that the portrayal of a workplace accident was cartoonish and in the realm of fantasy and that the advertisement did not depict any realistic or graphic detail of the accident. The only violence in the advertisement is implied.

The Board did not consider that the advertisement portrayed workplace practices that contravened community standards on health and safety. In fact the advertisement suggested a consequence of not taking appropriate care and notice of workplace safety.

Overall the Board considered that the advertisement, considering the audience to which the product is targeted, did not contravene any of the provisions of the Code.

Finding that the advertisement did not breach the Code on any grounds, the Board dismissed the complaint.