

## CASE REPORT

- |                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 202/04   |
| 2. Advertiser                 | Austereo Group Ltd - Triple M (Chelsea Clinton)    |
| 3. Product                    | Media  |
| 4. Type of advertisement      | TV   |
| 5. Nature of complaint        | Discrimination or vilification Other – section 2.1 |
| 6. Date of determination      | Tuesday, 14 September 2004                         |
| 7. DETERMINATION              | Dismissed  |

## DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The advertisement features footage of Chelsea Clinton getting off a plane and greeting various people. The footage is accompanied by Triple M radio DJs' commentary. The Triple M DJs make comments about Chelsea Clinton indicating that they think she is 'hideously ugly looking' and has 'gone under the knife' to transfer her hideously ugly looks. The tagline is "Nothing's Sacred".

## THE COMPLAINT

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

*"In a social climate where there is much concern about bullying and cruelty amongst children, I find it shameful that this feeble attempt at humour is allowed air time, and the message it projects – i.e. that such behaviour is acceptable because it is 'witty' and 'funny' (!!!???)"*

*"That an entity should belittle a person like this for their own gain seriously disturbs me."*

## THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

*"We advise that this advertisement had been discontinued in both Melbourne and Sydney."*

*"The comments were part of a comedy piece and were clearly intended to be seen as such and were not part of a serious comment on the subject."*

## THE DETERMINATION

The Advertising Standards Board ("Board") considered whether this advertisement breaches section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics (the "Code").

The Board found that although the Triple M DJ's comments were of bad taste and were unkind, the depiction did not contravene any of the provisions of the Code relating to discrimination (other)/vilification.

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