

<b>COMPLAINT NUMBER</b>	18/066
<b>COMPLAINANT</b>	L. Butler & J Eastwood
<b>ADVERTISER</b>	Guardian Storage
<b>ADVERTISEMENT</b>	Guardian Storage, Digital Marketing
<b>DATE OF MEETING</b>	5 March 2018
<b>OUTCOME</b>	No Grounds to Proceed

**Advertisement:** The website advertisement for Guardian Storage, [www.guardianstorage.co.nz](http://www.guardianstorage.co.nz), shows a doll with red hair in a 1970's style outfit with the wording "Some things are better stored away."

**The Chair ruled there were no grounds for the complaint to proceed.**

**Complainant, L. Butler, said:** I think the message is prejudice against red heads. Had the doll been a black gollywog doll, it would be deemed racist. I've seen redheads been discriminated in advertising in the past, where parents were disappointed at the arrival of a ginger baby.

Alongside this it's found socially acceptable to publicly announce 'kick a ginger day' which was later changed to 'hug a ginga day' due to multiple assaults. It's also common slang to name redheads 'ranga' which is the derivative of orangutan, comparing peoples appearance to a primate which I find derogatory. Although the guardian ad doesn't express the other views I have discussed it is aligned very well with them, and supports what I would call one of the last acceptable forms of public prejudice.

**Complainant, J Eastwood, said:** I was reading an article online this morning (via a Google NZ search) and was shocked by a distasteful ad while reading.

It was for Guardian Self Storage and had a picture of a red headed doll with the text "Some things are best stored away".

I find this thoughtless and mean, as though being a red head is something to be ashamed of. Making fun of people with red hair has become a socially accepted form of bullying but that doesn't make it right.

I imagine anyone who collected dolls might be offended too?!

**The relevant provisions were Code of Ethics - Basic Principle 4, Rule 4, Rule 5.**

**The Chair** noted the Complainants' concerns the advertisement encouraged discrimination and bullying against those with red hair.

The Chair said the satire and intended humour in the advertisement meant it was ambiguous enough to not meet the threshold to be said to denigrate people with similar hair colouring.

The Chair said there were alternative interpretations which could be taken from the advertisement such as the doll represented the often maligned 1970's fashion style and embarrassing mullet hairstyle which were "better forgotten".

The Chair said the advertisement, although offensive to some, did not meet the threshold to cause serious or widespread offence in the light of generally prevailing community standards, and there was no apparent breach of the Advertising Codes.

Accordingly, the Chair ruled there were no grounds for the complaint to proceed.

**Chair's Ruling:** Complaint **No Grounds to Proceed.**

#### **APPEAL INFORMATION**

According to the procedures of the Advertising Standards Complaints Board, all decisions are able to be appealed by any party to the complaint. Information on our Appeal process is on our website [www.asa.co.nz](http://www.asa.co.nz). Appeals must be made in writing via email or letter within 14 days of receipt of this decision.