Listening between the lines: what BAT really thinks of its consumers in the developing world

In an audio recording of the “Structured Creativity Conference” held in Hampshire, UK in June 1984, British American Tobacco (BAT) adds context to the written report of marketing and product applications. Employees are taped brainstorming creative ways to push their product in light of future marketing constraints and social pressure towards a smoke-free society. Project proposals included the “low yielding ultra low ‘tar’ cigarettes,” “front end lift” cigarette design to give the smoker more “impact” on the first puff, “pleasant smelling sidestream smoke,” and an urban sit-down—“Forget about smoking...GO FOR A QUICKIE. No tar with nicotine, and no inhalers—‘Forget about smoking...GO FOR A QUICKIE’. No tar with nicotine...is what makes the body kick.”

One of the most interesting proposals came from Ian Ross from a Finland subsidiary, who later became the head of international brand strategy at BAT in the early 1990s. Ross’s proposal, the “LDC (less developed counties) business at BAT in the early 1990s.” Ross later became the head of international brand strategy at BAT. In an audio recording of the “Structured Creativity Conference,” in Hampshire, UK in June 1984, Ross’s proposal, the “LDC (less developed counties) Project,” called for individually heat sealed cigarettes designed to lengthen the shelf life of cigarettes in arid climates found in Africa and the Middle East. This rather ingenious idea for stick sales would be sold to tobacco vendors in reels with visible brand imaging, containing 200 cigarettes that could be pulled off along perforations one at a time. What the 80 or so page written report did not include, the audio cassette captured with clarity. The taped conversations of the BAT conference participants offered rarely obtained loose discourse regarding product design proposals and a derogatory discussion of the people intended for end product use.

Ross relays that he wants to make “stick purchases seem like a consumer benefit” by supplying “factory sealed and factory freshness” every time. As for marketing the heat sealed stick product, Ross states: “I have not gone into psychographics...I have no idea what the psychographics of the average black farmer is.”

Another conference participant ruminates, “We could sell them to the Palestinians if we made the plastic hard enough that you could rip the end off and put your shells in them...”

This discourse, not found on the written presentation, between the BAT marketing and product development personnel was obviously not meant for public consumption, nor is it new information that the tobacco industry targets the developing world. A patent search in the UK resulted in no individually heat sealed cigarette applications. What is of great interest to those of us who spend our time sifting through pages of internal tobacco industry documents is the significant difference between what is written and what is said. David Schechter, the former BAT lawyer, recently explained the “mental copy rule” to the US Department of Justice, which assumed that anything one would write could end up being used publicly or legally against the company. This leads to the obvious question: Are we overlooking important research tools in the form of non-written material?
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Eclipse: does it live up to its health claims?

We read the recent article by Slade et al.1 with great interest and agree that reasonable regulation focused on the development and appropriate evaluation of potential reduced risk cigarettes is warranted. Furthermore, we agree with Slade et al. that the results of our evaluation indicate that Eclipse may offer potential benefits to smokers. However, we disagree with several of the other conclusions drawn by the authors.

The article challenges the merits of Eclipse and questions the fundamental differences between Eclipse and other cigarettes. It is not possible within the context of this letter either to fully describe the scientific data that has been developed to characterise Eclipse or to address many of the critical questions raised in Slade’s article. However, we briefly address pertinent issues below and encourage interested parties to independently evaluate all of the available information.

Slade et al. have inaccurately represented the claims that RJ Reynolds Tobacco Company (RJRT) has made regarding Eclipse. No cigarette is without risk, including Eclipse. Our advertising for Eclipse states: “The best choice for smokers who worry about their health is to quit. But Eclipse is the next best cigarette is without risk, including Eclipse. The authors disagree with several of the other conclusions drawn by the authors.

In the absence of any existing regulatory standard, RJRT assumed Eclipse’s risk reduction potential using a four step scientific methodology that included chemical testing and analysis, biological and toxicological testing, human testing, and independent scientific verification. In general, the evaluation strategy utilised was consistent with strategies outlined by the Institute of Medicine Committee that addressed this subject.2 RJRT has conducted an extensive comparative evaluation of Eclipse and has presented this research at scientific meetings in the both the USA and internationally. The results of these and other studies may be reviewed on the Eclipse website (www.eclipsescience.com).

In addition, much of this research has been published in the peer reviewed literature. The weight of the evidence from this research clearly shows that, compared to other cigarettes, Eclipse may present smokers with less risk of cancer, chronic bronchitis, and possibly emphysema. An independent panel of scientific experts reviewed the science and reached conclusions consistent with RJRT’s claims.3

RJRT’s comparative studies were conducted using Kentucky reference cigarettes (K1RF and K1MRF) and leading low “tar” and ultra low “tar” commercial brand styles. Combined, the cigarettes selected for comparison to Eclipse are representative of the vast majority of cigarettes sold in the US market.4 By contrast, the entire market segment of the very low yielding ultra low “tar” cigarettes used by Slade et al. as a comparison collectively represent less than 1% of the market. Furthermore, one of the two cigarettes selected as a comparison (Now Box) does not have a measurable US Federal Trade Commission (FTC) “tar yield.”

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.
Comparisons of Eclipse mainstream smoke constituent yields to the yields of very low yielding ultra low "tar" cigarettes (Now Box and Carlton Soft Pack) obtained by machine smoking do not change the fact that an extensive battery of scientific tests indicates that Eclipse cigarettes may present smokers with less risk of certain smoking related diseases than other cigarettes. RJRT scientists have recently demonstrated Eclipse is significantly less mutagenic on a per mg "tar" basis than either Carlton Soft Pack or Now Box over a wide range of machine smoking conditions. On a per cigarette basis, Eclipse was less mutagenic than Carlton Soft Pack under all machine smoking conditions tested and was less mutagenic than Now Box when evaluated using the machine smoking conditions mandated by both the Massachusetts Department of Health and the Canadian federal government in addition. Eclipse was significantly less cytotoxic on both a per mg "tar" basis and a per cigarette basis under the same range of machine smoking conditions.

As noted by Slade et al., smokers typically take larger and more frequent puffs than those specified by the US Federal Trade Commission puffing regimen and they typically smoke Eclipse differentially than their usual brand. Therefore, it is essential that a weight-of-the-evidence approach, including studies in smokers, be used to characterise potential differences between Eclipse and other cigarettes. Urine mutagenicity studies conducted in smokers demonstrate that smokers of ultra low "tar", full flavour low "tar", and full flavour "tar" cigarettes all experience substantial, statistically significant reductions (p < 0.05) in mutagen exposure when they switch to Eclipse. Furthermore, additional studies conducted in smokers have demonstrated reductions in bronchial inflammation and inflammation of the lower lung when smokers switched to Eclipse. These findings are consistent with reductions in smoker exposure to smoke constituents under actual smoking conditions and support RJRT’s conclusion that Eclipse may reduce the risks of certain smoking related diseases relative to other cigarettes currently on the market.
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Author’s reply
Swauger argues that based on the weight of the evidence, Eclipse, compared to other cigarettes, may present smokers with less risk of cancer and other harmful diseases. He bases this conclusion on "weighing" the scientific research RJ Reynolds Tobacco (RJRT) has conducted on Eclipse. Our study drew the opposite conclusion. Our analysis of the Eclipse research suggests that Eclipse is as toxic or more toxic than a number of conventional cigarette brands.

RJRT claims “there is no cigarette like Eclipse” based on a comparison of the smoke chemistry of Eclipse with a typical ultralight, Merit. We tested Eclipse against two other ultralight cigarettes, Now and Carlton, and found the smoke concentrations of four major carcinogens to be significantly higher or lower. RJRT’s claim of "no cigarette like Eclipse" may be misleading to consumers.

We tried to “weigh” the evidence but found that to be difficult since the control cigarettes kept changing between the studies. The smoke chemistry research used a commercial “ultralight” as a reference, the in vitro research a Kentucky “light” cigarette and the human research a “low tar” or brand of heavy (40 + cigarettes per day) smokers. The “usual” brands were not identified. We also examined changes in smoke chemistry between the 1996 version of Eclipse and the 2000 version and found that concentration of four major carcinogens doubled in the 2000 version. The concentration of NNK was 123% greater than RJRT’s early 1988 version of Eclipse called Premier.

In 2001, the Institute of Medicine’s report “Clear the Air” determined that there was insufficient evidence to conclude that any current market "ultralights" reduce risks of lung and cancer or other diseases, the company should request the FDA to evaluate its scientific research and claims before marketing it at the retail level nationally.

G N Connolly
Massachusetts Department of Public Health, 250 Washington Street, Boston, MA 02110-4619, USA; greg.connolly@state.ma.us

Seasonality in cigarette sales: patterns and implications for tobacco control

Cigarette smoking is the leading public health problem in the USA, contributing to over 400 000 deaths a year. Given its importance, the tobacco control community should be aware of all significant patterns in the seasonal consumption of cigarettes and other tobacco products. This includes the seasonal nature of smoking. Findings on seasonal patterns may have major implications for the timing of interventions designed to manage the tobacco problem, both in the USA and in other countries.

In this letter, monthly data for cigarette sales at the state level for the USA are analysed to test for the presence of seasonality and to characterise the phenomenon. The results reveal a seasonal pattern that is significant both in the statistical sense and in magnitude. This includes a significant drop in the winter months of January and February, and an increase during the summer months of June, July, and August. Because seasonality in sales does not reflect seasonality in production, it must be inferred that the seasonality is driven by wholesale and retail phenomena, including consumption.

The data used in this study are monthly figures for sales of cigarettes by wholesalers aggregated at the state level between January 1983 and July 2000. Until December 1997, the Tobacco Institute was responsible for their collection. For the period following this, the firm Orzechowski and Walker produced the data.
Two methods were used to examine seasonality. The first was spectral analysis, which identifies cyclical patterns in the data. If a cycle of a particular length is revealed to be identical. The first was spectral analysis, which identifies cyclical patterns in the data. If a cycle of a particular length is revealed to be
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The spectrogram was significantly (5% level) different from that produced by a uniform random process (table 1, column 2). Second, the time series were seasonally decomposed. This involved splitting the series into trend, seasonal, and irregular components. Using the seasonality analysis, a number of indicators were generated. The p values in table 1, column 3 correspond to the null hypotheses of no stable seasonality in different from that produced by a uniform random process (table 1, column 2).

Next, to identify the months for which sales were uniformly high or low for any state, for any one year cycle in the data, the two months with the highest and the two with the lowest seasonal components were selected, and the frequency of the appearance of the months in the “high-2” and “low-2” months was computed by state. Columns 5–8 show the most frequently appearing high and low months. January and February are a “low” season for

Two methods were used to examine seasonality. The first was spectral analysis, which identifies cyclical patterns in the data. If a cycle of a particular length is revealed to be important, then a systematic phenomenon may be inferred to underlie the pattern. In the case of seasonality, a cycle of period 12 months would stand out, and the spectrogram of the data would be statistically different from that produced by a white noise or uniform random process (Bartlett's test). The state level data contain a prominent 12 month uniform random process (Bartlett’s test). The p values in table 1, column 3 correspond to the null hypotheses of no stable seasonality in different from that produced by a uniform random process (table 1, column 2).

In percentage terms, the seasonal effect is large—as column 4 shows, the mean annual range (difference between high and low factors) across the 17 years is about 30%. To put this in perspective, assuming a price elasticity of −0.4, a 30% drop in sales would require a 75% increase in cigarette prices!

Two methods were used to examine seasonality. The first was spectral analysis, which identifies cyclical patterns in the data. If a cycle of a particular length is revealed to be important, then a systematic phenomenon may be inferred to underlie the pattern. In the case of seasonality, a cycle of period 12 months would stand out, and the spectrogram of the data would be statistically different from that produced by a white noise or uniform random process (Bartlett’s test). The state level data contain a prominent 12 month uniform random process (Bartlett’s test). The p values in table 1, column 3 correspond to the null hypotheses of no stable seasonality in different from that produced by a uniform random process (table 1, column 2).

Second, the time series were seasonally decomposed. This involved splitting the series into trend, seasonal, and irregular components. Using the seasonality analysis, a number of indicators were generated. The p values in table 1, column 3 correspond to the null hypotheses of no stable seasonality in different from that produced by a uniform random process (table 1, column 2).

In percentage terms, the seasonal effect is large—as column 4 shows, the mean annual range (difference between high and low factors) across the 17 years is about 30%. To put this in perspective, assuming a price elasticity of −0.4, a 30% drop in sales would require a 75% increase in cigarette prices!

Next, to identify the months for which sales were uniformly high or low for any state, for any one year cycle in the data, the two months with the highest and the two with the lowest seasonal components were selected, and the frequency of the appearance of the months in the “high-2” and “low-2” months was computed by state. Columns 5–8 show the most frequently appearing high and low months. January and February are a “low” season for

2) possible occurrences of “high-2” or “low-2” months are represented by the two tied “most frequent” months. × This was confirmed by parallel analyses of production data and discussions with an expert on the production of tobacco.
sales, and June, July, and August, a “high” season.

Possible causes of seasonality include the effect of climate on smoking behaviour (low in cold weather and high in mild weather, especially in view of now widespread indoor smoking restrictions across the USA), the timing of tax changes (December-January or June-July), the timing of the new fiscal year (June-July), the timing of school year (August-June), and the timing of quitting efforts tied to New Year’s resolutions (December-January). In the obvious extension to this research, the determinants of this potentially important statistical phenomenon will be analysed in detail.

The present findings demonstrate that sales of cigarettes in the USA have a strong seasonal component. This has potential implications for the timing of cessation initiatives and other time dependent policies. The phenomenon of seasonality could hold the key to significant advances in tobacco control and in the management of a leading public health problem.
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Way-out developments at BATCO

Working in tobacco control, it is easy to get the impression that the tobacco industry is a united front, with all parties carefully avoiding internal divisions that might undermine the greater struggle against the “antis”. However, tobacco industry documents that have been made public as a result of litigation in the USA frequently reveal ruthless competition for market share, as well as intense suspicion about competitors’ activities. This was brought home to us recently when reading a 1977 document on “developments in the scientific field” by Dr Sydney J Green, then British American Tobacco’s (BAT’s) senior scientist for research and development.1

After several pages of unremarkable reports on industry and external research on low tar cigarettes and smoking and health, Green informed his readers about two “way-out” developments at BAT:

• Way-out development 1: “A way-out development is that of compounds (such as etorphine) which are 10,000 times as effective as analgesics [such as morphine and which are very addictive. It is theoretically possible (if politically unthinkable) to add analytically undetectable quantities of such materials to cigarettes to create brand allegiance. But this thought may suggest the possibility of such compounds occurring naturally.”

We are grateful to Dr Green for clarifying what “brand allegiance” really means for the tobacco industry.

• Way-out development 2: “Another way-out development, which arises from work done in a quite different area, is that it would now be quite feasible and quite inexpensive to produce an unacceptable off-flavour in cigarettes from some factories for a prolonged period without approaching nearer than half to one mile.”

In the same spirit of scientific curiosity which no doubt motivated the BATCO researchers, we would be very interested to know the formula for this substance.

On a more serious note, while we were not able to come up with any plausible candidates for a substance that could make way-out development 2 feasible, we are concerned that Green was right about the feasibility of adding etorphine or some other addictive substance to cigarettes.

Green’s report followed an earlier memo from Keith D Kilburn to CI Ayres,1 expressing
How to critique consultancy reports?

The recent proposals for smoke-free legislation in many countries have spawned a multitude of studies which attempt to predict the financial impact of such legislation. As described by Scollon et al. in this issue of Tobacco Control, many of these studies fail to achieve basic quality standards and this is more likely when the tobacco industry funds the study. However, findings from such flawed studies can influence policy makers and it is essential that public health advocates have strategies to counter their impact.

In Hong Kong in 2001, the government proposed to make all workplaces, including catering venues, smoke-free. A consultancy report for the catering industry, funded by the tobacco industry, was published shortly after and concluded that the legislation would cause catering industry revenues to drop by 10.6% leading to job losses. This report was based on a survey of customers to catering venues, self reported spend on eating and drinking out, and self predicted changes in the event that catering venues were made smoke-free. Since the methods used were not made clear in the report, we had to attempt to validate or refute the report mainly by an assessment of its findings. We found the following questions useful:

(1) Was the sample used for the consultant's survey representative of the population being studied (customers of catering venues)? Since we could not verify whether the sample selection was done properly, we had to look at sample characteristics. The prevalence of smokers was much higher than in other survey data indicating a bias in the sample.

(2) Did the consultant use extrapolated/aggregated, agree with other standard data sources—for example, government statistics? Much of the basic data collected by the consultants was not disclosed in their report but even if they had to present some—for example, average weekly spends in the different types of catering venues. From these data we could estimate (a) expected weekly revenue in the catering industry, (b) approximate market shares for the different types of venue, and (c) weekly spend on eating out per household if the consultant's data were valid. Each of these estimates was quite implausible when compared with data from the census and other government sources.

(3) Could the consultant's findings be reproduced to shed light on the methods used? Using a new set of data based on random sampling, we tried to recreate the consultant's findings by deliberately introducing biases and incorrect aggregations which we suspected were present in the consultant's methods. In this way we were able to produce an almost identical set of results from the new data. On the other hand, when we analysed the new data in an appropriate fashion, we predicted a rise of 5% rather than a drop of nearly 11% in catering revenues. The best means of influencing policy on smoke-free catering venues is to use objective outcome measures and data collected both before and after the intervention, as recommended by Siegel et al. The study we were able to refute would have failed Siegel's quality criteria. However, since much of the lobbying against smoke-free legislation is done before such policies are put in place, local objective, before and after data are inevitably not available. In our case, presenting our rebuttal of the consultant's findings along with the evidence accumulated from overseas studies that smoke-free policies do not harm catering industry revenues, greatly reduced the harm that the consultant's report could have done to the proposed legislative process. Our approach may be helpful to policy makers faced with a similar situation in their own locality.
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The distinction between a cigarillo and a cigarette has important legal and financial implications. Since the wrapper of a cigarillo contains tobacco, cigarillos are taxed at the same rate as small cigars. In 2002, the US federal tax rate for small cigars was 4 cents per pack of 20, while the rate for cigarettes was 39 cents per pack of 20.\(^{1}\) While all 50 states impose a tax on cigarettes, only 45 states impose a tax on cigar,\(^{2}\) which are lower than their cigarette tax.\(^{3}\) If Voodoo cigarillos are taxed at the rate of cigars, the lower federal and state taxes means a higher profit margin for the merchant and/or lower prices for consumers.

In addition to tax differences, labeling the Voodoo product as a cigarillo has important consequences for their regulation. Several states have expanded their definition of tobacco products to include bidis, making sales to minors illegal. Illinois, Vermont, and West Virginia banned the sale of bidis completely.\(^{4}\) More recently, California passed a bill prohibiting the sale, distribution or importation of bidis except by businesses that prohibit minors, such as bars and casinos.\(^{5}\) Also, federal legislation to halt the importation of bidis into the USA was introduced in 2001.\(^{6}\) By being sold as a cigarillo, Voodoo cigarillos would get around the ban on bidis in sales in some states.

This new product emerges at a time when bidis sales are vulnerable to increased regulation at the state, and possibly the federal level, as well as higher cigarette excise taxes in 19 states in 2002.\(^{7}\) The Voodoo cigarillo may be a clever way for the tobacco industry to circumvent the regulations and restrictions imposed on bidis. Voodoo cigarillos should be reliably tested to determine if manufacturers and vendors are in compliance with federal and state laws.

C Delnevo, M Hrywna, M J Lewis, S Yulis
University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey
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\(^{1}\) By being sold as a cigarillo, Voodoo cigarillos would get around the ban on bidis in sales in some states.

\(^{2}\) Voodoo cigarillos are taxed at the rate of cigars, the lower federal and state taxes means a higher profit margin for the merchant and/or lower prices for consumers.

\(^{3}\) The US Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms previously concluded the bidis wrapper did not contain tobacco and, therefore, bidis were subject to the federal cigarette tax.

\(^{4}\) This is likely to be because of the high number of Asian women in the local population. Encouragingly, those women who were heavier smokers, and were therefore eligible for NRT, showed most interest in NRT. Around a quarter of the smokers wanting to stop were both eligible in NRT and eligible for NRT.

\(^{5}\) This new product emerges at a time when bidis sales are vulnerable to increased regulation at the state, and possibly the federal level, as well as higher cigarette excise taxes in 19 states in 2002.\(^{7}\) The Voodoo cigarillo may be a clever way for the tobacco industry to circumvent the regulations and restrictions imposed on bidis. Voodoo cigarillos should be reliably tested to determine if manufacturers and vendors are in compliance with federal and state laws.

\(^{6}\) By being sold as a cigarillo, Voodoo cigarillos would get around the ban on bidis in sales in some states.

\(^{7}\) The US Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms previously concluded the bidis wrapper did not contain tobacco and, therefore, bidis were subject to the federal cigarette tax.
Smoking in children’s picture books

The other day, one of the authors went to a public library with his 3 year old daughter to read some picture books to her. Various picture books, from classic to newly published, were available. Classic books are her favourite. First, she chose a book portraying adventures of a naughty monkey named Curious George (by HA Rey). He came to an industrialised country with a man in a yellow hat. My daughter pointed to a picture of the man holding a pipe between his lips. A smoking scene in a picture book for small children!

The next book she chose depicted an elephant named Babar (by Jean De Brunhoff) that fled from his country to Europe after his mother was killed by men. After coming back to his country with western technologies, he changed elephant society into Western-style society and became a king. Again, the King Babar was holding a pipe.

The third book was depicting a monster named Barbapapa living with François’ family (by Tison and Taylor). He had a mysterious ability to metamorphose into anything he desired. Unfortunately, in this attractive book, François’ father was always holding a pipe. Another supporting character was smoking a cigar. Smoking seems to be a symbol of manhood in these children’s picture books.

My daughter then opened books about Moominvalley (by Tove Jansson) and Tintin’s adventures (by Hergé) in which some characters were smoking. Finally, I myself selected a book depicting Father Christmas (by Raymond Briggs). On Christmas Eve, Father Christmas delivered presents to children all over the world. After the labourious job, he took a rest smoking a cigar and a pipe.

Picture books reflect the norms or perceptions of our societies. These classic children’s books were first published in times when smoking was not widely acknowledged as harmful and a smoking male adult was one of the sex stereotypes. In addition, pipe smoking seems acceptable in such picture books compared with cigars or cigarettes which are seldom seen.

Caregivers frequently read picture books aloud to children at home, kindergartens, or daycare centres, which may have a considerable influence on preschool children. Young children receive strong messages from pictures. Seeing adult males smoking in picture books, they may take it as a desirable behaviour.

It would be unacceptable to remove smoking scenes from these classic books or eliminate the books themselves. What we can do is to become aware of the potential influence of these books and take a negative attitude to smoking when we read to children. Fortunately, the man in a yellow hat seems to have quit smoking in the new series of George’s adventures.

S Nakahara, S Wakai, M Ichikawa
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Getting them while they’re young in China. Submitted by Professor TH Lam, Hong Kong.
Smoke-filled rooms: a postmortem on the tobacco deal

Smoke and mirrors
Cigarettes are a major cause of premature death. Cigarettes are addictive. Secondhand smoke can be annoying, but is really not enough of a health risk to justify banning smoking in indoor environments. Payments to states in the Master Settlement Agreement were unjustified since cigarettes are self-financing. States actually save money because smokers die young. Lawsuits against the tobacco industry are without merit, since smokers have long known about the health risks. Continuing efforts to warn the public about the health risks of smoking are unwar- ranted since public awareness of these risks are now universal. Filters and low tar technology have made cigarette smoking safer, but smoke can be annoying, but is really not enough of a health risk to justify banning smoking in indoor environments.

Viscusi recommends that the government refo-
moves the billions of dollars spent annually by cigarette companies to advertise and promote cigarettes. Viscusi also ignores the mountains of internal industry documents that openly discussed the importance of the youth market to the economic viability of the cigarette industry. Instead he accepts at face value the industry’s line that they don’t want kids to smoke. Viscusi’s remedy for the youth smoking problem is to get parents to monitor their kids from smoking and to enact policies to prohibit the sale of unconventional cigarettes like bids. The discussion of bids is especially odd since it is smokers who smoke these products; instead teenagers smoke Marlboro, Newport, and Camel. Thus, while one can hardly argue with Viscusi’s plea for better parenting, his failure to recommend stronger measures to curb how tobacco companies market their cigarettes to attract the attention of youthful smokers makes the sincerity of his recommendations suspect.

Viscusi’s chapter on the health risks associated with secondhand tobacco smoke is grossly uninformed. Much of this chapter reads like it was drawn from industry sponsored websites that have been designed to spread misinformation, downplaying the well documented scientific evidence linking secondhand smoke exposure to a wide array of health risk. Remarkably, Viscusi suggests that limits on indoor smoking are unjustified and bad for the economy because such restrictions cause smokers to consume fewer cigarettes, and, therefore, “losses accrue to society in terms of foregone taxes”. Viscusi’s sharp criticism of current public health campaigns to warn the public about the health risks of smoking defies common sense. According to Viscusi, since public awareness of the health risks of smoking are near-universal, there is no need to keep repeating these messages. In fact he argues that such efforts are counterproductive because people are likely to form unrealistic risk perceptions about smoking. Such reasoning is illogical. By analogy, if one were to accept Viscusi’s premise that once the public recognizes the health risks of smoking there is no need to reinforce health messages, then one would also have to accept the idea that there is no need to spend a dime advertising Marlboro cigarettes since the Marlboro Man is nearly universally recognised. Apparently, cigarette manufacturers don’t accept Viscusi’s logic and nor should the public.

In summary, Smoke-filled rooms reads more like a legal brief written by a team of tobacco industry lawyers instead of a thoughtful commentary on the legal, financial, and social consequences of smoking. As such this book is a must read for plaintiffs’ attorneys, but for the rest of us we should stick with “smoke-free rooms”.
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The lighter side
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