



CASE REPORT

- 1. Complaint reference number 107/03
- 2. Advertiser Lever Rexona (Lynx)
- 3. Product Toiletries
- 4. Type of advertisement TV
- 5. Nature of complaint Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3
- 6. Date of determination Tuesday, 13 May 2003
- 7. DETERMINATION Dismissed

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This television advertisement opens on a close-up of what becomes revealed as a man’s armpit, with the camera view turning and widening to show the man’s face, part of his upper body and left arm before the scene changes to a view of the advertised product as a caption-supported voiceover states: “The Lynx Effect. Now available in roll-on.”

THE COMPLAINT

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

“In this advertisement, the first image on the screen appears to be the lower half of a naked woman’s torso.”

“The ad starts out with a close-up of what appears to be a naked woman’s torso, crutch area and upper legs...I simply found the initial part of the ad, which was suggestive of a naked woman, to be crude and not in any way linked with a man’s body spray, except for the suggestion that ‘if you use our spray you will be more attractive to women and you may have a greater chance of having a sexual encounter with them.’”

“Advertising like this is demoralising. I find it offensive and unnecessary for selling deodorant.”

“A female’s body parts have nothing to do with a male’s armpit or what type of deodorant he chooses to use...inappropriate, sexist and offensive.”

“This is offensive and unnecessary, and obviously designed, like smutty joke, to shock.”

“There were 15 of us watching an Iraq news update. We were all appalled and found the ad offensive to the extreme...”

.....2

107/03 2

“I don’t consider myself a prude, but using what is obviously meant to look like a naked female body, although on turning, become a male’s armpit is a pretty sad way to sell a product...and the advertisers shouldn’t be able to get away with this disgusting illusion.”

“I consider it offensive in a pornographic sense...looking like a shaved pubic area...I believe this ad has crossed the line of decency.”

“Just because it is pretend nudity does not make it acceptable...It is deplorable.”

THE DETERMINATION

The Advertising Standards Board ('the Board') considered whether this advertisement breaches Section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics ('the Code').

The Board noted that while this advertisement caused offence to some people, the advertiser had pointed out that there is, in fact, no sexual content, and that "it is only the viewer's assumption or imagination that suggests otherwise."

The Board determined that, within the context of prevailing community standards, the content of this advertisement did not contravene the provisions of the Code relating to the portrayal of sex, sexuality and/or nudity.

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