



CASE REPORT

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 83/05 |
| 2. Advertiser | Football Australia |
| 3. Product | Leisure & Sport |
| 4. Type of advertisement | Transport |
| 5. Nature of complaint | Discrimination or vilification Other – section 2.1 |
| 6. Date of determination | Tuesday, 12 April 2005 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This print advertisement shows an office worker in an office environment with his shirt lifted over his face and head imitating the actions of a soccer player who has just scored a goal. The tagline reads: “It’s not the same anywhere else”.

THE COMPLAINT

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

“It is a clear reference to the Iraq torture practices favoured by the United States in the now infamous Abu Ghuraib torture prison. ... the ad is an unintelligent and cheap visual pun. How shameful and distasteful to use the humiliation and persecution of others as the central idea of an ad.”

THE ADVERTISER’S RESPONSE

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

“It is clear from the advertisement that the individual is located in an office environment and is celebrating in the same manner his soccer/football heroes do.”

“The same image was used by FFA to promote a soccer/football match between the Australian National team and the Indonesian National team ... this clearly establishes that the image used ... was based on the “soccer celebration after scoring a goal” ... and is not to specific historical events in Iraq .”

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 the advertiser’s comments regarding the office setting for the advertisement and agreed with the advertiser’s assertion that the ad was not linked to historical events in Iraq .

The Board found that the depiction did not contravene the provisions of the Code relating to the portrayal of people.

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