



## **CASE REPORT**

1. Complaint reference number	301/01
2. Advertiser	Unilever Australasia (Streets Ice Cream - Strawberry Blonde Magnum Cone)
3. Product	Food
4. Type of advertisement	Outdoor
5. Nature of complaint	Discrimination or vilification Other – section 2.1 Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3 Health and safety – section 2.6
6. Date of determination	Saturday, 1 December 2001
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

## **DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT**

The outdoor advertisement features a photograph of a tanned, naked woman reclining on a leather couch, looking at an item she holds which is depicted pixel-style. The advertisement contains the words, ‘The Adults Only Cone’, together with a graphic of the product, text stating ‘New Magnum Cone’ and a Streets logo.

## **THE COMPLAINT**

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

*‘It insinuates that the cone is a phallic symbol and is totally derogatory towards women.’*

*‘This is very offensive in that it violates basic decency. In addition, it tends to rob children of their innocence and childhood by exposing them to adult images of a very sexual nature. It is very distracting to drivers and could easily cause accidents.’*

*‘..... on one level I object to using sex to advertise an ice cream, but my main objection is the reference to drugs. Kids smoke cannabis in cones ..... the idea of Streets using drug references to sell ice creams is appalling.’*

*‘This form of advertising is the most intrusive and offensive and it should be more stringently censored than others. I can turn off the television and the radio but I cannot prevent my children from witnessing this attack on the family.’*

*‘Why should a whole community have such degrading and sexist images displayed whether they like it or not. Frankly I’m sick of it.’*

## **THE DETERMINATION**

The Advertising Standards Board (‘the Board’) considered whether this advertisement breaches Section 2 of the AANA Advertiser Code of Ethics (‘the Code’).

The Board came to a view that the featured photograph was sensual rather than sexual, and that the advertisement was exotic rather than erotic.

It determined that the material did not contravene the Code’s provisions relating to the portrayal of sex, sexuality and/or nudity, and that it did not constitute discrimination and/or vilification.

The Board further determined that the advertisement did not breach the Code’s provisions relating to

health and safety.’

Finding that the material did not contravene any other provision of the Code, the Board dismissed the complaint.