



## **CASE REPORT**

- |                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 70/04  |
| 2. Advertiser                 | RMK  |
| 3. Product                    | Clothing   |
| 4. Type of advertisement      | Outdoor  |
| 5. Nature of complaint        | Discrimination or vilification Gender - section 2.1<br>Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3 |
| 6. Date of determination      | Tuesday, 13 April 2004   |
| 7. DETERMINATION              | Dismissed  |

## **DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT**

The advertisement is a series of outdoor advertisements featuring a female girl posing in different positions and wearing RMK shoes.

## **THE COMPLAINT**

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

*“The advertisement portrays a young girl ... very tartyed-up to look ‘sexy’. If we are to take child abuse and pornography seriously as a society, then we should not be portraying young girls (or boys) in such a seductive manner.”*

## **THE ADVERTISER’S RESPONSE**

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

*“The model chosen is a 21 year old lady. She is not a child and the campaign we have just shot is world class in the eyes of many in the industry...”*

*“The beautiful, confident female in our advertising is portraying an image which will not be intimidated or demoralized by backward, chauvinistic views. She will not succumb to such antediluvianism. She is not vulnerable and subject to any male dominance ....”*

## **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 in the context of prevailing community standards, the majority of people would not be offended.

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

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