



CASE REPORT

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 370/06 |
| 2. Advertiser | Icon Clothing (Lee Jeans) |
| 3. Product | Clothing |
| 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 September 2006 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This outdoor advertisement features a young woman lying down and looking towards the camera with open mouth and holding a lollipop to her tongue. She is wearing navy shorts and a blue striped top which is unbuttoned. Text on the billboard reads “Lee. See more at leejeans.com”

THE COMPLAINT

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

No advertiser has the right to place such sexually explicit pictures in public. The ad is semi pornographic. The shorts supposedly being advertised can hardly be seen. The lollipop being sucked is obviously analogous to oral sex. The t-shirt is open and the breast half exposed. The legs are spread and the immediate focus of the eyes are on the thigh and thus the woman’s crotch (read vagina).

It teaches young girls that women are simply there for their bodies and it teaches young boys the same thing- woman (sic) are to be used and seen as sexual objects.

The clothes can hardly be seen. We all must play a role in reducing violence including sexual violence in our society. This type of ad demeans women. Portraying women as just sex objects also contributes to women being abused, objectified and treated violently.

THE ADVERTISER’S RESPONSE

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

Lee Jeans commissioned Terry Richardson, one of the world’s foremost fashion and art photographers to develop a stand out branding campaign for the Lee Spring Summer campaign. The concept was developed along the theme of people’s fascination with their own self image and what they do behind closed door.

Terry Richardson’s take on the brief pushes the campaign to a new level – it’s a tongue in cheek, kitschy, and over exaggerated portrayal of classic denim poses.

The international, professional models photographed in the campaign are adults over the age of 18.

THE DETERMINATION

The Advertising Standards Board (“Board”) considered whether this advertisement breaches section

2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics (the “Code”).

The Board first considered whether the advertisement breached section 2.3 of the Code by treating sex, sexuality or nudity without sensitivity to the relevant audience. The Board noted that the model used in the campaign is over 18.

The Board considered that the advertiser had clearly intended that the advertisement be provocative. The woman’s pose in the advertisement was a reference to a ‘Lolita’ style image of a young girl and the advertisement did have sexual overtones.

However the Board considered that the woman in the advertisement was clearly not an underage or young girl – but was a mature young woman. While there were sexual overtones in the pose struck by the model and her consumption of the lollipop, the Board considered that the representation was not inappropriate for a billboard. Specifically the Board noted that the woman is over 18, is fully clothed in attire that is fashionable amongst young women for summer, and that there is no nudity. The Board considered that a degree of sexuality in advertising is not unacceptable and that the woman’s pose was not inappropriately sexual. The Board also noted that consumption of this style of lollipop is now common amongst people over 18.

The Board also considered whether the image was likely to promote violence against women. Having already determined that the sexual allusions in the advertisement were not inappropriate, the Board considered that it was unlikely that the advertisement would be seen as encouragement or in any way as endorsement of violence against women, specifically assault of girls and young women.

The Board also considered whether the advertisement was demeaning to women. The Board considered that the image of an attractive young woman, in a confident but sexy pose was not demeaning to women.

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