



CASE REPORT

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 75/07 |
| 2. Advertiser | Luscious Locs Hair Extensions |
| 3. Product | Other |
| 4. Type of advertisement | Print |
| 5. Nature of complaint | Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3 |
| 6. Date of determination | Tuesday, 13 March 2007 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This print advertisement features a young woman with long dark hair, naked from the waist up, but with a pink lei/feather boa covering her breasts.

THE COMPLAINT

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

I am disgusted that this kind of advertising is allowed in a paper that children read, exposing them to soft porn on their own doorstep. Sex is selling out everything including our children's innocence. We are breeding sex addicts and alcoholics.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

I think the lady who wrote this letter is complaining in general to advertising in her local community, and seems to have a bone to pick with any form of advertising where a person is not completely covered from head to toe. We don't live in an Islamic Community and nor are expected to dress in this way. This too would be a violation of our rights. If you turn to the back on nearly any newspaper now, you will see many escort services with much more explicit photos than the photo used to represent an innocent advertisement for 'Hair Extensions'.

The truth of the matter is that it is a free country, there was no nudity whatsoever in this advertisement and it was advertising an innocent service to people of the community. I believe her fears are possibly a reflection of a sedate inner issues, or I think she got it right in her letter.... slightly prudish? Lets hope the Caboolture News is the only local newspaper she is browsing through in her spare time, I would be concerned for her well-being if God forbid she picked up a Courier Mail.

THE DETERMINATION

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

The Board viewed the advertisement and considered whether it breached Section 2.3 of the Code dealing with sex, sexuality and nudity. The Board noted the complainants' comments that the advertisement was soft porn.

The Board considered the image of the woman in the advertisement and noted that her breasts were largely covered. The Board agreed that the image of the woman, while suggestive, was acceptable.

Finding that the advertisement did not breach the Code on other grounds, the Board dismissed the complaint.