



CASE REPORT

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 26/04 |
| 2. Advertiser | Gillette Australia Pty Ltd (Dufour) |
| 3. Product | Toiletries |
| 4. Type of advertisement | Outdoor |
| 5. Nature of complaint | Discrimination or vilification Gender - section 2.1 Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3 |
| 6. Date of determination | Tuesday, 17 February 2004 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The advertisement is an outdoor advertisement which depicts two identical images of an attractive female, one on a computer screen and stating “Before” underneath it with the second one in a personally owned frame stating “Dufour” under it. The tagline reads “Deodorant Cologne for men, what’ll it dufour you?”

THE COMPLAINT

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

“[The advertisement] shows women in demeaning and offensive postures ...the ads are inappropriate to be publicly displayed in bus shelters...frequented by children.”

“... demeans and demoralizes the position of women.”

“It is a known fact that children are learning about Sex and promiscuity far too early for their development.”

“I find the advertisement particularly distasteful and exploitative of the status of younger women.”

“It suggests that this kind of sexual attitude is both acceptable and promoted which is deluding and confusing to the younger generation.”

THE ADVERTISER’S RESPONSE

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

“... the established advertising conventions in the male body-spray category play to tongue-in-cheek, obviously exaggerated claims of the product’s effectiveness”.

“The photographs are in no way “pornographic””

“The advertisement in question features a photograph of a bikini-clad woman and is well within accepted community standards.”

THE DETERMINATION

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

The Board noted that in the context of prevailing community standards the images used were not sexually explicit and that the majority of people would not find the advertisement offensive.

The Board found that the depiction did not contravene the provisions of the Code relating to the portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity or discrimination (sex)/vilification.

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