



CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number	139/98
2. Advertiser	The Smith's Snackfood Co. Ltd (Smith's Crisps)
3. Product	Food
4. Type of advertisement	TV
5. Nature of complaint	Discrimination or vilification Other – section 2.1 Violence Other – section 2.2 Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3
6. Date of determination	Tuesday, 8 September 1998
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENTS

This latest series of advertisements titled “Chicken poulet” and “The Full Monty” uses, as its central concept, a family of animated stick figures (the ‘Smith’ family). Complaints were received about both advertisements in the series. Both advertisements show members of the Smith family engaging in various activities and discussing the two different variety of Smith’s chips. In the advertisement entitled “The Full Monty”, Les (the Smith family father) in dialogue with Maureen (his wife) calls her ‘woman’ and also performs a striptease.

THE COMPLAINT

Complaints were received from members public about portrayal of sex, sexuality and nudity in the advertisements, discrimination/vilification and about the portrayal of violence. Comments that some of the complainants made included the following:

‘...the male stick figures seem to include a very unnecessary penis type shape included in their trousers...’

‘...the attention is drawn to both male’s trousers that appeared to display an outline that is very suggestive of the male sex organ. I realise that the commercial is based on the movie titled the The Full Monty but I question the reason fro using this presentation to advertise a product that is more often than not directed to children.’

‘I am referring to the section where the man refers to his wife as “woman”. This statement is derogatory (sic) towards women and sets a bad example to the young men and women of Australia .’

‘This commercial displays violence and is sexist...The amateur drawings are also sexist in the way they portray the male characters.’

THE DETERMINATION

The Advertising Standards Board (‘the Board’) considered whether these advertisements breach Section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics (‘the Code’).

The Board determined that the portrayal of sex, sexuality and/or nudity in this advertisement would not offend prevailing community standards. The Board was of the opinion that the portrayals of the characters in this advertisement did not constitute discrimination or vilification and did not breach the Code. The Board dismissed the complaint.