



CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number	123/05
2. Advertiser	Ford Motor Co (Aust) Pty Ltd (Falcon Ute)
3. Product	Vehicles
4. Type of advertisement	Print
5. Nature of complaint	Discrimination or vilification Race – section 2.1
6. Date of determination	Tuesday, 14 June 2005
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This print advertisement features a studio photograph of a silver Ford Falcon Ute against a bright yellow background. Above the photograph appear the following words in large, bold text: “*More value than beating the Poms*”.

THE COMPLAINT

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

“An advertisement for the new Special Edition Falcon ute uses a derogatory, offensive racial nickname. In the context of the advertisement there is absolutely no reason to use such terminology.”

THE ADVERTISER’S RESPONSE

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

“Our creative strategy includes, but is not limited to, the adoption of sporting based headlines with synergies to the vehicle’s value proposition. In keeping with the ‘larrikin’ nature of both our target customer and our product’s brand positioning, we sought to inject an element of humour in our advertisement. Given the depth of coverage international cricket receives in these papers (especially in recent times with much discussion being had on the forthcoming “Ashes” tour), we chose to adopt the headline “More value than beating the Poms” to promote our special edition Falcon Tradesman Ute. In cricket circles, the Australian team has a long standing rivalry with the English team (often referred to as the “Poms”). We would argue most strongly that the term “Poms”, in this context, is neither derogatory nor racially offensive and, is used in a friendly, good natured manner to emphasise the long standing rivalry between two great cricketing adversaries.”

THE DETERMINATION

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

The Board took into consideration that the term “Pom” has had longstanding use in Australia . It considered that the term is used to refer to an almost affectionate, yet fiercely competitive sporting rivalry.

The Board considered that readers would understand the term in this context given the coverage of international cricket in the press. The Board was of the opinion that the term was neither derogatory nor racially offensive.

The Board found that the depiction did not contravene the provisions of the Code relating to Portrayal of People (race).

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