



CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number	275/01
2. Advertiser	Look Melbourne Pty Ltd (Riki Nathan Australia)
3. Product	Retail
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, 13 November 2001
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENTS

One of two associated outdoor advertisements features a photograph of a reclining woman wearing only shoes and a wristwatch, accompanied by text reading: “HAVEN’T GOT A THING TO WEAR? For a Great Fashion Story. Riki Nathan Australia. www.loogroup.com.au Available at Look, New Attitude and Leading Fashion Retailers.” The second advertisement uses the same text in conjunction with another photograph of the same woman standing, this time wearing a hat and briefs as well as the wristwatch and shoes, with a large question mark partly obscuring her breasts.

THE COMPLAINT

Comments which the complainants made regarding these advertisements included the following:

“It completely degrades women and portrays them as an object of ridicule. Images of this size and nature on the side of a building I believe is (sic) offensive.”

“I believe the advertisements are far too explicit for public display and particularly degrading to women.”

THE DETERMINATION

The Advertising Standards Board (‘the Board’) considered whether these advertisements breach Section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics (‘the Code’).

The Board appreciated the sentiments expressed by the complainants but, after vigorous debate, was of the view that, while some people might find the advertisements confronting and offensive, they did not go so far as to breach the Code on any ground.

Accordingly, the complaint was dismissed.