



CASE REPORT

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 40/05 |
| 2. Advertiser | Just Porn (iVibe Rabbit) |
| 3. Product | Other |
| 4. Type of advertisement | Print |
| 5. Nature of complaint | Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3 |
| 6. Date of determination | Tuesday, 8 March 2005 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The advertisement is a print advertisement which features a picture of an “iVibe Rabbit” vibrator which is described as ‘the world’s smartest vibrator’ and as a product which ‘rotates and swirls.. . Vibrates and pulsates.. . The contoured jelly head swivels.’

THE COMPLAINT

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

“The page this appears on is supposedly the page for national news, the one my fourteen year old son was reading to research Australian politics for his studies. The upset and offensive embarrassment it has caused him is extremely unpleasant. I am disgusted and extremely insulted by this sexually explicit representation that intentionally denigrates, relegates and objectifies women in such a disparaging manner, and other equally disgusting representations associated with individual sexual preferences. ”

THE ADVERTISER’S RESPONSE

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

“[The advertisement] is nothing to do with us here at Just Porn. It is [the newspapers] choice and they can publish what they like so please take any complaints/problems to them. We were not impressed with the conversation today. You should use the right channel to discuss such complaints in the future. I wish to have nothing to do with you and your so called organization. The News will publish what they feel is correct as we have been doing the same ads for the past 2 years.”

THE DETERMINATION

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

The Board disagreed with the advertiser’s comment that Just Porn was not responsible for the advertisement. It was an advertisement for a Just Porn product and not the newspaper it was placed in.

In any event, the Board was of the view that the photographic image of the vibrator was a legitimate advertisement for the product. The Board noted that the advertiser had not made use of explicit or sexualized images to advertise the product.

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

portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity.

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