



Case Report

1	Case Number	0269/11
2	Advertiser	PZ Cussons Australia
3	Product	Toiletries
4	Type of Advertisement / media	TV
5	Date of Determination	27/07/2011
6	DETERMINATION	Dismissed

ISSUES RAISED

2.3 - Sex/sexuality/nudity Treat with sensitivity to relevant audience

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

A family bathing with Imperial Leather Foamburst in their A380 airbus bathroom. The parents are behind screens so we only see their shoulders and upper chest, and the children are in a pool at their feet.

THE COMPLAINT

A sample of comments which the complainant/s made regarding this advertisement included the following:

Indecent exposure and very noticeable not suitable for children to watch and offensive.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

Comments which the advertiser made in response to the complainant/s regarding this advertisement include the following:

Thank you for your comments in regards to the Imperial Leather Foamburst TV advertisement.

We understand that our campaign is somewhat different to what is often seen on TV screens. We are very pleased with the result as we had such a task ahead of us given we immortalised

the original TV advertisement 'Simon Tahiti' from the 1980's which was a very famous advertising campaign for Imperial Leather, this TV advertisement in 1980 was like our new TV advertisement very engaging and conveys the dramatisation of luxury.

The execution is intended to depict the feeling of pure luxury that you will experience when bathing with Imperial Leather Foamburst. This product creates a rich creamy lather like no other soap on the market.

Our dramatisation of the world of opulence that this family live in is intended to be an exaggeration of what may be possible if you lived in a world of pure luxury.

The setting is over the top our family is bathing in an enormous shower in their own private A380 airbus plane, given they are bathing they appear to be naked. But we have taken enormous care in the presentations of nudity to be sensitive to the audiences that are watching our TV advertisement and ensure that the pictures seen are very restrained - our family is covered in all the appropriate areas, we have ensured there are items, be it the TV screens and the phone etc. covering these sensitive areas. We believe by doing this we have ensured that our TV advertisement is mild in impact.

Further to this in order for this TV advertisement to appear on television it gained approval and a PG classification from Commercial Advice the Australian company that governs what is seen on television screens. Our media placements of this TV advertisement have strictly followed the set rules of this PG code and in turn did not appear in children's programs.

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 the complainant's concerns that the advertisement features indecent exposure and is inappropriate for children to watch.

The Board reviewed the advertisements and noted the advertiser's response.

The Board considered whether the advertisement was in breach of Section 2.3 of the Code. Section 2.3 of the Code states: "Advertising or Marketing Communications shall treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience and, where appropriate, the relevant programme time zone".

The Board noted that this advertisement depicts a family bathing in their luxury bathroom aboard a plane and that most of the parents' bodies are shielded by screens whilst the child is submerged in water. The Board noted the advertisement has been granted a PG rating by CAD.

The Board noted that the private parts of the parents, and of the children, are not visible and considered that the depiction of the family bathing was relevant to the product being advertised. The Board considered that most members of the community would consider the level of nudity within the advertisement to be very mild and not offensive.

Based on the above the Board determined that the advertisement did treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience and that it did not breach Section 2.3 of the Code.

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