



## **CASE REPORT**

1. Complaint reference number	364/03
2. Advertiser	Gillette Australia Pty Ltd (Dufour Deodorant)
3. Product	Toiletries
4. Type of advertisement	Transport
5. Nature of complaint	Discrimination or vilification Gender - section 2.1 Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3
6. Date of determination	Tuesday, 11 November 2003
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

## **DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT**

The advertisement depicts four women clothed in bikinis with their arms around one another's shoulders. There is a caption across the middle of the women's bodies that reads: "Why Do One?". At the bottom of the advertisement is a message that reads "DuFour Deodorant for men".

## **THE COMPLAINT**

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

*"I found this ad to be offensive and demeaning to women ...."*

*"..... depicts women as sexual objects...is consistent with the idea of vilification ....."*

*"..... women are portrayed as interchangeable commodities ....."*

*"I find the advertisement demeaning, ... and overly sexual, objectifying of and therefore degrading to women."*

*"It discriminates against women by treating them as objects for men's desires. It portrays sexuality in an offensive way by suggesting you can have group sex if you use this product."*

*".... appears we women are just here to be done."*

*".... implies that women are willing and ready for group sex ....."*

*"This ad is demeaning to women, sexually offensive and should not be visible to young people."*

*"The concept of "doing" four women is also highly offensive as it implies that the sex is not "with" a partner but "to" a partner...it has some implications of non-consensual sex."*

*"Given the amount of sexual violence that still happens in our society, much of it still directed at young women, this ad is repulsive."*

*"I feel this advertisement skims the edge of promoting paedophilia ....."*

*"..... with a "billboard" display there is no opportunity for the public to make a choice to either "turn off", "don't go to the film" or "don't buy the book"."*

## **THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE**

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

*“Therefore, the established advertising conventions in the male body-spray category play to tongue-in-cheek, obviously exaggerated claims of the product’s effectiveness. This is exemplified by the long-running and widely accepted advertising campaign for the category dominant Lynx brand...”*

*“... the great majority of the community simply do not put a malicious interpretation on the word “do” ...”*

## **THE DETERMINATION**

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

The Board noted that the majority of the community would not take the advertisement seriously but view it as a tongue-in-cheek play on words.

The Board found that the depiction did not contravene the provisions of the Code relating to the portrayal of sex, sexuality or nudity or discrimination or vilification.

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