LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Letters intended for publication should be a maximum of 500 words, 10 references, and one table or figure, and should be sent to the editor at the address given on the inside front cover. Those responding to articles or correspondence published in the journal should be received within six weeks of publication.

Whose standard is it, anyway?

Editor—In their recent article in Tobacco Control Bialous and Yach1 create the impression that international standards for the machine smoking of cigarettes were foisted on the smoking public unilaterally by the tobacco industry by its influence on the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) through control of CORESTA (Centré de Co-operation pour les Recherches Scientifiques au Tabac). They also allege, inter alia, that the ISO standards were developed by the tobacco industry (has, through CORESTA, changed the methodology in order to produce lower smoke yield values to get round the European “tar” ceiling directives, and (2) misled the public by developing low “tar” cigarettes to cheat the smoking machine, and then makes unjustified health claims about them. (“Standards” are documented agreements containing technical specifications or concise criteria to be used consistently as rules guidelines.)

In their article, Bialous and Yach concentrated predominantly on a few highly selective quotes from internal tobacco company documents. They appear not to have consulted much of the very large volume of scientific literature published on the subject. When this information is taken into account it becomes obvious that the very narrow and restricted literature base of Bialous and Yach’s analysis has resulted in them making factual errors, drawing wrong conclusions and writing inaccurate statements on many aspects of the subject.

A review of the published literature on the subject shows clearly that the broad facts are as follows:

(1) Techniques relevant to the machine smoking of cigarettes were developed and refined throughout the 20th century.1 The first standard was specified by the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), a US federal government agency, in 1966 and first used to test cigarettes in 1967.2 The CORESTA recommended method, similar in many respects to that of the FTC, was developed after the FTC standard and was published in 1969.3

(2) There were small differences in the details of the smoking machine procedures in the various standard methods developed by the FTC and subsequently CORESTA, ISO and authorities in the UK, Germany, Canada and elsewhere between 1969 and the late 1970s.4 These differences resulted in about a 10% difference in the “tar” yield of the same cigarette measured by authorities in Britain and Germany,5 for example. By the late 1980s it was recognised that this situation was unacceptable in view of pending European directives which specified “tar” ceilings for all cigarettes sold in member states across Europe from 1993. Consequently, the differences in methodology were harmonised in a common ISO standard method in 1991, developed following a considerable amount of inter laboratory comparisons of the developing methodology undertaken within CORESTA across 29 laboratories from 15 countries.1 This revised standard method is now used in all countries except the USA where the slightly different FTC method still continues to be used, and in Japan where some minor differences are used in their national standard. Changing to the ISO standard in the early 1990s, “tar” yields determined in the UK, for example, decreased by up to 0.5 mg while “tar” yields in Canada, for example, increased by up to 3 mg for some brands.

(3) The purpose of the smoking machine standards is to determine the “tar”, nicotine, and carbon monoxide content of cigarette smoke when the cigarette is smoked under precisely defined conditions, and hence to allow a comparison of the yields from different cigarettes. Such yields are not predictive of the yields humans obtain when smoking, nor were they ever expected to be so, since no two smokers smoke exactly the same way. The same smoker does not smoke a cigarette the same way on every occasion. This purpose has been stated consistently many times, originally by the FTC in 1967, and subsequently in the scientific literature, published by the tobacco industry and health regulatory authorities, over the last 35 years.

(4) Compensation by smokers when switching to a low “tar” cigarette has been discussed in the scientific literature for 40 years. The phenomenon was first published by the tobacco industry and tobacco industry scientists have published books and papers on the subject, e.g.6–10 The available evidence, albeit limited, indicates that compensation is partial in the short term (up to a few weeks), and that smokers switching from a higher to a lower “tar” cigarette do generally obtain a reduction in smoke delivery.11

(5) Since the 1950s numerous health scientists have advocated that lower “tar” cigarettes should be developed and marketed on the grounds that they may represent a less hazardous form of smoking, e.g.12–15 Health authorities have consistently advised smokers to quit, but for those who choose to continue to smoke that they should smoke “tar” cigarettes, e.g.16–17 The tobacco industry has responded to these health authorities by developing cigarettes with lower “tar” but has also followed public health advice by not advertising lower “tar” cigarettes as safe cigarettes.
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Research & Development Centre,
British American Tobacco,
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International Standard) will be published as an international standard with no changes other than editorial. What Bialous and Yach apparently fail to appreciate is that the ISO approval process leading up to the DIS stage involved a development period of at least four years and multiple balloting stages (opportu-
nities) for significant amendments. For example, balloting at the previous committee draft stage (ISO/TC 126 N 537, July 1995) generated nine pages of comments from 12 countries. The 1997 CORESTA minutes reflect only that at the DIS stage in the over-all ISO process, no changes had been requested by ISO members other than those of an editorial nature.

Secondly, Bialous and Yach made a compound assertion, that “CORESTA works with ISO directly or that CORESTA works through one of ISO’s member bodies”. CORESTA does have a liaison member status with ISO, but does not work with any of ISO’s member bodies.

Lastly, Bialous and Yach assert “CORESTA resists any interference with its processes, and makes efforts to keep overall control of the situation and the outcomes of ISO meetings”. Offered as support is a matter concerning updates to the ISO smoking methods. Again, an egregious misstatement has resulted. A CORESTA working group and the British Standards Institution (BSI) independently prepared editorial commentary on similar issues within the text of the ISO smoking methods. Wishing to defer to the ISO process, CORESTA postponed an update to the existing CORESTA methods, instead wishing to wait for ISO to finish their deliberations.

Contrary to propriety, Bialous and Yach offer examples that do not support their contention. Rather to the contrary, these examples serve as testament to the pro-

Author’s reply

Editor—Mr Jacob and Dr Baker’s criticisms of our paper mostly indicate an incomplete reading of it. We believe our paper reached its stated goals, and showed that tobacco industry, through CORESTA, play a major role in determining the scientific evi-
dence and suggesting the [international] standards.” Our conclusion that “ISO’s tobacco and tobacco products standards are not adequate to guide tobacco products regulatory policies, and no health claims can be made based on these standards” derives both from the evidence in the paper and evid-
ence from studies and international reviews. Such standards are useful to rank cigarette’s nicotine and tar yields according to machine measurements, they do not reflect human smoking, and measurement methods can be modified to provide different readings without the need for product modification, a point also made by Dr Baker.

Recent literature and health authorities’ recommendations regarding “lower” tax and nicotine cigarettes show that switching to lower yields is no longer perceived as an effective policy to address tobacco related morbidity and mortality. Several countries and the European Union have already banned or are moving to ban the utilisation of labels such as “mild” and “lights” based on scientific and tobacco industry document evidence that these mislead the public into thinking these cigarettes are safer. Indeed, a 1977 British America Tobacco (BAT) document stated work in this area should be directed towards providing consumer reassurance about cigarettes and the smoking habit. This can be provided in different ways, for example, by claiming low deliveries, by the perception of low deliveries, and by the perception of “mildness”. Furthermore, advertising for low delivery or traditional brands should be constructed in ways so as not to provoke anxiety about health, but to enable the smoker to feel assured about the habit and confident in maintaining it over time.

We do not suggest “impropriety in CORESTA’s involvement” since, as per the ISO definition, the tobacco industry is entitled to participate in the process. However, we question the adequacy of having tobacco interests being the sole provider of scientific evidence in the area of tobacco products smoking methods. We question CORESTA’s involvement as much as the lack of involvement from other interested parties (for example, health and consumer groups) as well as whether or not the ISO is fulfilling its aim of protecting the health and safety of consumers of tobacco products.

Mr Jacob’s assertion that the “majority of worldwide tobacco science expertise resides within the tobacco industry should come as surprise to no one” is correct. However, recent litigation has shown that this expertise has not been used to benefit the health and safety of the consumers of tobacco products. It is also no surprise that many of the tobacco industry experts “find themselves involved in CORESTA and ISO TC-126 activities”, but it is unacceptable that these experts be the only ones participat-

As for the three specific areas of criticism in Mr Jacob’s letter:

(1) From the description of the ISO standards approval process, “the majority of work is done at the Technical Committee (TC) level, and final approval of a DIS (Draft International Standard) is by the TC as well. In the case of TC 126, with a majority of members representing the tobacco industry, and CORESTA being the organisation conducting the work on the proposed stand-

arments, amendments are referred back to the TC and to CORESTA. In the example offered, ISO/DIS 11454, reference 34 in our paper” describes some of these comments and how they represent the tobacco industry’s perspective.

The assertion CORESTA works with ISO either directly or through one of ISO’s members bodies . . .” emphasises the great overlap among the people (and interests) who are members of CORESTA, TC 126 and those involved in tobacco control at member bodies such as British Standards Institution (BSI) and American National Standards Insti-
tution (ANSI). Although no official relation between CORESTA and ISO’s member bod-

ies exists, it is clear that efforts are often agreed upon. In the example provided, at a CORESTA Scientific Committee meeting a modified environmental tobacco smoke (ETS) determination was sent to ISO via ANSI. (An unquoted example, from reference 45, states that CORESTA has prepared a draft standards on ambient air to be be generated nine pages of comments from 12 countries. The 1997 CORESTA minutes reflect only that at the DIS stage in the overall ISO process, no changes had been requested by ISO members other than those of an editorial nature.

The ongoing process leading up to the DIS stage apparently fail to appreciate is that the ISO is fulfilling its aim of protecting the health and safety of consumers of tobacco products.11
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10 Recent literature and health authorities’ determinations of a measurement method). Several countries and the European Union have already banned or are moving to ban the utilisation of labels such as “mild” and “lights” based on scientific and tobacco industry document evidence that these mislead the public into thinking these cigarettes are safer. Indeed, a 1977 British America Tobacco (BAT) document stated work in this area should be directed towards providing consumer reassurance about cigarettes and the smoking habit. This can be provided in different ways, for example, by claiming low deliveries, by the perception of low deliveries, and by the perception of “mildness”. Furthermore, advertising for low delivery or traditional brands should be constructed in ways so as not to provoke anxiety about health, but to enable the smoker to feel assured about the habit and confident in maintaining it over time. We do not suggest “impropriety in CORESTA’s involvement” since, as per the ISO definition, the tobacco industry is entitled to participate in the process. However, we question the adequacy of having tobacco interests being the sole provider of scientific evidence in the area of tobacco products smoking methods. We question CORESTA’s involvement as much as the lack of involvement from other interested parties (for example, health and consumer groups) as well as whether or not the ISO is fulfilling its aim of protecting the health and safety of consumers of tobacco products.

Mr Jacob’s assertion that the “majority of worldwide tobacco science expertise resides within the tobacco industry should come as surprise to no one” is correct. However, recent litigation has shown that this expertise has not been used to benefit the health and safety of the consumers of tobacco products. It is also no surprise that many of the tobacco industry experts “find themselves involved in CORESTA and ISO TC-126 activities”, but it is unacceptable that these experts be the only ones participating in these activities.

As for the three specific areas of criticism in Mr Jacob’s letter:

(1) From the description of the ISO standards approval process, “the majority of work is done at the Technical Committee (TC) level, and final approval of a DIS (Draft International Standard) is by the TC as well. In the case of TC 126, with a majority of members representing the tobacco industry, and CORESTA being the organisation conducting the work on the proposed standards, amendments are referred back to the TC and to CORESTA. In the example offered, ISO/DIS 11454, reference 34 in our paper” describes some of these comments and how they represent the tobacco industry’s perspective.

The assertion CORESTA works with ISO either directly or through one of ISO’s members bodies . . .” emphasises the great overlap among the people (and interests) who are members of CORESTA, TC 126 and those involved in tobacco control at member bodies such as British Standards Institution
Table 1  Crude odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence intervals of desire to stop smoking among daily smokers and intermittent smokers according to sociodemographic and snuff consumption characteristics. The public health survey in Malmö 1994.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of birth</th>
<th>Daily smoker</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Intermittent smoker</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>OR (95% CI)</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>OR (95% CI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.6 (0.0 to 1.1)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>0.5 (0.2 to 1.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>1.0 (0.5 to 2.0)</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>0.9 (0.5 to 1.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>1.0 (0.5 to 2.0)</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>1.0 (0.5 to 2.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>1.0 (0.5 to 2.0)</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>1.0 (0.5 to 2.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>1.0 (0.5 to 2.0)</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>1.0 (0.5 to 2.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>1.0 (0.5 to 2.0)</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>1.0 (0.5 to 2.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>1.0 (0.5 to 2.0)</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>1.0 (0.5 to 2.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>1.0 (0.5 to 2.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>1.0 (0.5 to 2.0)</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>1.0 (0.5 to 2.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.1 (1.2 to 3.8)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.0 (1.1 to 3.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 12 years</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>1.0 (0.5 to 2.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12 years</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>1.3 (0.8 to 2.0)</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>1.0 (0.5 to 2.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 9 years</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>0.6 (0.3 to 1.2)</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>1.0 (0.5 to 2.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>0.7 (0.4 to 1.2)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.0 (1.1 to 3.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.0 (1.1 to 3.5)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.0 (1.1 to 3.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snuff user</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>1.0 (0.5 to 2.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>1.7 (0.8 to 3.7)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>0.6 (0.3 to 1.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.0 (1.1 to 3.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.0 (1.1 to 3.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
have been documented in cognitive and psychomotor performance. The smoking of intermittent smokers may be motivated by these effects.

The results further support the notion that intermittent smokers are a specific group of smokers. Smoking cessation characteristics that differ from the characteristics of daily smokers.

MARTIN LINDSTROM
Department of Community Health, University Hospital MÅS, Lund University, S 205 02 Malmö, Sweden
martin.lindstrom@smi.mas.lu.se


11 Pomerleau OF, Pomerleau CS. Neuroregulators and involved in one year training to acquire PHN, and midwifery schools. Students of midwifery schools. After excluding incompletely answered questionnaires, 3762, 530, and 303 responses were analysed, respectively. The prevalence of smoking among women was 25%, in the nursing schools, 13% in the PHN schools, and 22% in the midwifery schools. In the nursing schools, the prevalence of smoking increased as the grade advanced. In the third year, the prevalence of smoking was 31%, higher than that among the general population in their 20s (23%).

As to male students in third year, the prevalence of smoking was nearly the same as that of the general male population in their 20s (60%).

Furthermore, the nicotine dependency among female daily smokers in the nursing schools was higher than that in the PHN schools or midwifery schools. Therefore, anti-smoking education in nursing schools is urgently needed. In this survey, smoking prevalence was lower among students in the PHN and midwifery schools. The difference occurs because those who had already qualified as nurses and wished to continue studying to acquire another qualification were less likely to smoke than those who were not in the same career level. It is therefore suggested that the prevalence of smoking among less educationally motivated students is lower. Adrianne and colleagues reported that nurses who were motivated in their jobs had a tendency not to smoke, which is consistent with the results although our subjects were nursing students.
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Figure 1  Frequency of tobacco use (events per hour) in a random sample of top grossing films from 1960 through 2000. The films were watched in five minute intervals and each use of tobacco in a green interval was counted as a single event. The total number of events was then divided by the duration of the film. 4

is now increasing significantly. Based on this regression equation, on average there were 7.3 instances of tobacco use per hour in films in 1960 compared with 10.9 in 2000. The messages continue to reflect tobacco industry marketing themes of glamour, rebelliousness, and independence, rather than the realities of addiction, suffering, and death.

KAREN KACIRK
STANTON A GLANTZ
University of California, San Francisco
San Francisco, CA 94143-0130, USA
kacirkk@cvri.ucsf.edu, glantz@medicine.ucsf.edu

This work was supported by National Cancer Institute Grant CA-61021.


BOOK

Book reviews and books of interest to “Tobacco Control” should be sent to the editor at the address given on the inside front cover.

Smoke in their eyes


There have been memorable dates, both glorious and infamous, that have defined aims and charted progress and setbacks for the US tobacco control movement. The most notable of these events have had global repercussions.

On 15 December 1953, the heads of four major US tobacco firms met in New York City’s Park Plaza Hotel, where they launched the Tobacco Industry Research Council and hammered out the seminal text of a nationwide newspaper ad, “A frank statement to cigarette smokers”. On 11 January 1964, US Surgeon General Luther Terry released the Report of the Advisory Committee on Smoking and Health, concluding “it is the judgment of the Committee that cigarette smoking contributes substantially to mortality from certain specific diseases and to the overall death rate”. At the Waxman Hearings on 14 April 1994, the “seven dwarves”, chief executive officers (CEOs) of the top seven US tobacco companies, were photographed for posterity as they prepared to declare that “nicotine is not addictive”.

At least one more date marks the US tobacco control calendar, but it evokes no signal image, conjures no immortal quote. And yet, on 3 April 1997, at the Sheraton Hotel in Crystal City, Virginia, an extraordinary meeting did take place. That Thursday afternoon, Geoffrey Bible and Steve Goldstone, CEOs of Philip Morris and RJ Reynolds, respectively, met in secret with trial lawyers and state attorneys general, hoping to hammer out a settlement of litigation pending against the tobacco industry. Along with the CEOs, the lawyers, the attorneys general, and their minions, there was one more participant at that meeting: Matthew Myers, vice president and general counsel of the National Center for Tobacco-Free Kids.

In Smoke in their eyes: lessons in movement leadership from the tobacco wars, Michael Pertschuk describes the political path that led Myers to that Virginia hotel and chronicles what happened in the meeting’s wake. Pertschuk, former head of the US Federal Trade Commission, founder and co-director of the Advocacy Institute, and longtime combatant in the tobacco wars, interviews many key players and makes innovative use of email records to “set the record straight” on the role of various advocates during the tumultuous debate over the 1997 “global” settlement and the 1998 McCain bill. However, as the author repeatedly makes clear, the book is as much an impassioned defence of Myers as it is an analysis of the colossal, scarring failures of tobacco control advocates during that time.

At its core, Smoke in their eyes pits Myers against Stanton Glantz, University of California professor of medicine and lead author of The cigarette papers. For Pertschuk, the plausible, if arguable benefits of the McCain bill could have been realised if not for the schism cleaving former allies into hostile camps. According to Pertschuk, great public health gains could have been realised had Glantz and his zealous followers not framed the debate to suit their purposes.

As a behind-the-scenes look at the personalities and polemics of both advocacy groups and political agencies, the book is a rousing success. Though there are few felicitous literary passages, Pertschuk has obtained detailed accounts from former Surgeon General C Everett Koop, former head of the Food and Drug Administration David Kessler, and other principal players, with the glaring exception of Glantz. The book’s central failing, however, is Pertschuk’s unwillingness or inability to focus on Myers’s secret, unilateral decision to attend that first Virginia meeting.

Myers was like Caesar crossing the Rubicon, with just a slight difference or two. Firstly, the general neglected to tell the troops he’d crowned himself emperor. Then, he realised he didn’t know the way to the river’s edge. Those failings are paramount. Myers’ good intentions should not be doubted, but he paved the path to acrimonious, rancorous debate. The Center for Tobacco-Free Kids was not a well established entity in 1997 and many former allies felt betrayed by Myers’ “lone ranger” tactics. Once turned off, they could not easily be convinced to follow Myers anywhere, as demonstrated by the caustic, pitched battles between the rival ENACT and Save Lives, Not Tobacco coalitions.

The what-could-have-beens of the McCain bill are still being debated. The USA is again playing a negative role on the global tobacco stage, this time with respect to the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control. What is certain is that the tobacco industry knew what it wanted back in 1997 and still knows what it wants today.

Philosopher Isaiah Berlin famously borrowed the dictum of the Greek poet Archilochus, who wrote: “The fox knows many things, but the hedgehog knows one big thing.” The tobacco industry is a huge, knowing hedgehog. Michael Pertschuk’s insight and intellect help explain how the tobacco control movement has outfoxed itself lately, but his Manichean dichotomy of Myers—good, Glantz—bad does the movement a disservice. The hedgehog rolls along. The fox needs a new game plan.

STAN SHATENSTEIN
Editor, GLOBALink Tobacco News
5492-B Trans Island,
Montreal, Quebec,
Canada H3W 3A8
shatenstein@sympatico.ca