



CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number	143/05
2. Advertiser	Nutricia Australasia Pty Ltd
3. Product	Food
4. Type of advertisement	TV
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 television advertisement for a toddler's drink formulation features images of young toddlers playing with their toys. A young girl is shown to play with a toy stethoscope and doll as the word "doctor" appears on the right-hand side of the screen. The next scene shows a young Asian boy sitting on a toy car. The word "chauffeur" appears on the right of the screen. The following scenes depict a child playing with a toy guitar ("rockstar"), a child hitting a garden tap with a toy hammer ("plumber") a child sitting at a dinner table with a plate of food ("food editor"). All the talent used in the advertisement other than the Asian-Australian boy shown on the toy car are caucasian.

THE COMPLAINT

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

"... all the anglo-saxon children were linked to important jobs in society when they grew up, like doctors, plumbers, food-critic etc, but the one Asian child depicted in the advertisement was linked to being a chauffeur. I find this advertisement to be racist and demeaning towards the many Asian-Australian citizens ..."

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

"... we strongly deny that the advertisement portrays or depicts material in a way which discriminates or vilifies a person or section of the community on account of race or ethnicity ..."

"... at no point was any particular 'potential job' depicted as being either superior or inferior to another."

"... it cannot be reasonably argued that one potential job is presented as being objectively better or worse than any other, or has any particular ascertainable comparative social standing."

"... it is our submission that it is neither the intention nor effect of the advertisement to present the chauffeur job as being inferior to the other jobs, and/or to deliberately cast an Asian child as some form of value judgment on our part ..."

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 the potential job assigned to the Asian boy was not necessarily below par of

other jobs mentioned in the advertisement. The Board considered that the depiction of a caucasian boy as a plumber was at least on par with the depiction of the Asian boy as a chauffeur. Further, the Board considered that the job of a chauffeur was not necessarily one that lacked respect from the general public.

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

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