



## **CASE REPORT**

1. Complaint reference number	152/02
2. Advertiser	Windsor Smith Pty Ltd
3. Product	Clothing
4. Type of advertisement	Outdoor
5. Nature of complaint	Discrimination or vilification Other – section 2.1 Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3
6. Date of determination	Tuesday, 9 July 2002
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

## **DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT**

This outdoor advertisement features a photograph of a man apparently putting on his shoes while sitting on the end of a large bed where two women are shown behind him. Alongside the photograph there is a picture of three ‘Wicked’ branded shoes. The headline ‘WINDSOR SMITH.COM’ appears over the two photographs.

## **THE COMPLAINT**

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

*“I found this ad objectionable (sic) on two counts. Firstly, one of the women with the smeared mascara is reminiscent of a representation of the style ‘heroin chic’...The second objectionable thing was that this was obviously a bedroom scenario, the suggestion that this man is, or has had sex with the girls. Anyone with any sex education would understand that that is the suggestion of the advertisement, although when I contacted Windsor Smith they insinuated that it was just in my head.”*

*“These billboards depict ... a man dressing after sex with two women...I find these to be very graphic sexual images to be displayed in such a medium as a billboard. They move well beyond crass sexual innuendo to not far off pornographic.”*

*“...sexist and downgrading to women...”*

## **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 determined that, under prevailing community standards, this advertisement did not contravene the provisions of the Code relating to the portrayal of sex, sexuality and/or nudity, and did not otherwise contravene the Code in relation to the portrayal of people.

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