



CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number	168/98
2. Advertiser	Sancell Pty Ltd (Libra Skins)
3. Product	Toiletries
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 Other - Miscellaneous
6. Date of determination	Tuesday, 13 October 1998
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The advertisement depicts a man and woman involved in intimate embracing and kissing. They are sitting/reclining on a tiger skin. The advertisement shows various shots of the man and woman embracing. A close up of the woman's hands reveal that she has very long white nails/talons, with which in one scene she vigorously claws/scratches the man's back. In response, he appears to flinch and lies back on the tiger skin. The advertisement ends with the words, (female voiceover) 'Libra Fleur, Skins, brings out the animal in you.'

THE COMPLAINT

Comments the complainants made about the advertisement included:

'(The advertisement) ...was too graphic sexually suggestive for the timeslot in which it appeared...believe this advertisement to totally inappropriate for any timeslot earlier than 8.30 pm.'

'...The wrapper design has no bearing on the performance of the tampon, the above action is irrelevant, and can only be seen as gratuitous anti-male violence, with a desire to impart a sense of superiority to the female viewers... why is it acceptable to create a male victim of violence?... The double standard...sends a message that violence is ok, violence is sexy, violence is cool etc as long as the victim is male.'

'...the idea of associating menstruation and tampons with glamour and sex in the jungle is ludicrous to me. Menstruation is definitely far from sexy.'

'...a sadistic message to people, especially the young.'

'Not only is the tiger perhaps the world's most magnificent species, it is also critically endangered...In the meantime, a tasteless advertisement is allowed to air which shows total disrespect to the tiger and shows the same callous "who cares?" attitude of the days before some of us became more compassionate.'

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 was of the opinion that the advertisement's portrayal of sex, sexuality and nudity did not offend the Code nor did its characterisation constitute discrimination or vilification. The Board was

satisfied that the advertisement did not breach the Code and dismissed the complaint.