



CASE REPORT

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 335/00 |
| 2. Advertiser | Seagram Pacific (Chivas Regal) |
| 3. Product | Alcohol |
| 4. Type of advertisement | Outdoor |
| 5. Nature of complaint | Discrimination or vilification Gender - section 2.1
Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3
Health and safety – section 2.6 |
| 6. Date of determination | Tuesday, 12 December 2000 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The outdoor advertisement, captioned ‘Yes, God is a man’, portrays a woman entering or alighting from the driver’s seat of a motor vehicle, wearing a scoop neck top, short skirt and T-strap sandals. Her head, arms and right foot and are out of frame. The advertisement shows a bottle of the product and text, ‘When you know’, ‘Drink responsibly. (But you know that.)’ and a website.

THE COMPLAINT

A sample of comments which the complainant/s made regarding this advertisement included the following:

The saturation advertising on bus shelters and on public transport means another generation of girls can not (sic) avoid viewing themselves as a dehumanised commodity and another generation of boys is encouraged to view women as an expendable sexual object.

It uses the lowest common denominator principles of sexually gratuitous depictions of women to appeal to the urban neanderthals (sic) that constitute the target market.

The advertisement is blatantly sexist in assuming that God is a man and offensive in depicting women purely as sex symbols.

*As a Christian I find the implication that God is in some way “sleazy” highly offensive.
.....this ad is really distasteful and disrespectful of those who profess a Christian faith.*

I had to pause and remind myself what decade we’re living in when I was first confronted with this pathetic, inane and sexist piece of work. Pathetic, because it celebrates chauvinistic attitudes eschewed by the wider community years ago. Inane, because it implies God is a leering moron. Sexist, because it erases the model’s identity by not picturing her face.

..... ads such as this have been shown in research to contribute to male practices of gender stereotyping and subsequent increased potential of physical and psychological abuse of women.

The first thing that struck me was how impossibly thin this womans (sic) legs are and the further reinforcing this has to young girls and women of any age that yes you really do have to be anorexic to be slim enough to be deemed “attractive”.

THE DETERMINATION

The Advertising Standards Board (“Board”) considered whether this advertisement breaches Section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics (the “Code”).

The Board, while appreciating the points of view expressed by the complainants, felt that the portrayal of the woman within the advertisement did not contravene prevailing community standards in its depiction of sex/sexuality/nudity. The Board was of the view that the depiction of the female body as sexually attractive did not of itself constitute discrimination or vilification; neither did the advertisement's caption constitute discrimination or vilification.

The Board determined that the advertisement did not breach the Code on any ground and, accordingly, dismissed the complaint.