

Level 2, 97 Northbourne Avenue, Turner ACT 2612 Ph: (02) 6262 9822 | Fax: (02) 6262 9833

www.adstandards.com.au

CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number 195/00

2. Advertiser Primus Telecommunications (Aust) Pty Ltd (Internet)

3. Product Telecommunications

4. Type of advertisement TV

5. Nature of complaint Discrimination or vilification Other – section 2.1

Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity - section 2.3

6. Date of determination Tuesday, 11 July 2000

7. DETERMINATION Dismissed

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The television advertisement portrays a boy operating a computer. The doorbell rings, is answered by a woman and a man with a tray of food marked 'Doh-Net' says, 'Hello, I have a delivery for a James.' The bell rings again and the woman opens the door to a moving wooden crate emanating fierce noises and labelled 'Danger – Live Animal'. She retreats inside. The boy is again seen at his computer, leaning back, arms behind his head and with a broad smile. The doorbell rings, the woman answers and a young woman wearing a bikini and sash marked 'Venezuela' says, 'Hi, I after James', and enters the house. A voiceover says, 'We give you high speed internet access so you can access the world faster. For \$24-95 a month unlimited hours with iprimus, you'll get the speed you need.' The woman is shown operating a computer, the doorbell rings, the boy answers and is confronted by a muscle-flexing young man wearing animal skin briefs and arm band. The boy calls, 'Mum', and the woman pops her head around the door and smiles. The advertisement concludes with text and a voiceover: 'Primus Telecom. Put a smile on your dial. Phone 1300 85 85.'

THE COMPLAINT

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

'My main objection is the advertisement's portrayal of a boy apparently in early adolescence accessing sexist and semi-pornographic material over the internet. The advertisement also degrades men as well as women as the real "mother" accesses a young "Tarzan" by the Internet. This sex-crazed advertisement is not a healthy model for this society and is not fit to be seen by anyone.'

THE DETERMINATION

The Advertising Standards Board ('the Board') considered whether this advertisement breached Section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics ('the Code').

The Board determined that the material within the advertisement did not contravene prevailing community standards in its portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity and that the advertisement did not breach the Code on this or any other ground. The Board, accordingly, dismissed the complaint.