

DRAFT

June 8, 1977

MEMORANDUM TO FILE

Re: International Committee on Smoking Issues  
Shockerwick House, June 1977

*Wobbles / 101*

[Note: Attached are the preliminary Agenda, list of Company Representatives, and Position Paper, which was adopted by the meeting as revised by RJR after presentation and discussion as the "Charter" for the International Committee on Smoking Issues (ICSI). Also attached are Terms of Reference for the three Working Parties created by the meeting on Medical Research, Smoking Behavior, and the Social Acceptability of Smoking, as drafted and agreed by the meeting.]

*Wobbles / 101*

Prior to arrival at Shockerwick House on Thursday evening (June 2), Peterson, Hobbs and Witt discussed briefly an article appearing in that morning's paper on the Smoking or Health Report of the RCPS; looked briefly at the legal environment of product liability in the U.K.; discussed RJR's position regarding any necessary press release; and agreed that our main objective was to encourage the formation of working parties of experts who would meet and discuss in detail the proposals contained in the Position Paper.

*Wobbles / 101*

*Wobbles / 101*

On arrival, we were met by Tony Garrett, who had samples of IMP's new 25% NSM products, which had been announced at a Press Conference that morning, and in response to a question for BH whether positioning was motivated by economics or smoking and health, responded "a bit of both." Certainly, advertisements appearing that day in the British newspapers suggest that the product is positioned primarily to meet health concerns, despite a disclaimer by TG (at his press conference) that at no time had the company made any safety claims nor would it. In this respect, one has to consider not only the

*Wobbles / 101*

insert in each package of "NSM" cigarettes but also the IMP's position paper on the U.K. situation. TG felt the RCP's report contained "nothing new", and stated IMP's position to the effect that it was not their business to make scientific judgments, but rather to take advice from the medical experts and submit the results of their research to independent scrutiny. *which?*

After an early night, the meeting got underway the following morning with screening of a film recently produced by IMP for "internal" use, which TG said was intended to "reassure" employees in the present anti-smoking climate. (A transcript or print of the film is not yet available because approval is still outstanding from the doctors interviewed for public release of their remarks. TG promised to follow-up and make copies available if such approval was forthcoming.) The film was not one-sided, except for several references to the benefits of NSM; it took the form of interviews with "eminent doctors," summarized as follows:

1. Professor Austin Gresham of the University of Cambridge, Addenbrook Teaching Hospital, commented that as regards coronary heart disease, smoking "may" be caused, but as compared with other risk factors, its role was "relatively minor," and smoking might aggravate but was certainly not a prime cause. He suggested that there

*no good many other small things*  
*a judgement by choosing "which experts" this is making*

was no scientific support for the contention that smoke concentration produced dangerous levels of carbon monoxide, and concluded that causation of coronary heart disease had to be considered against the background of a person's whole life style.

2. Dr. Nick Barnes, consultant pediatrician at Addenbrook, noted that significant smoking after 4 months of pregnancy reduces the weight of a child by up to 1/2 a pound and would likely push any marginally low-weight children over the line. He too commented that "a host of other factors" contributed to the ~~system of~~ underweight, and it was very difficult to assess where smoking might rank among the others. He did however urge pregnant women to stop smoking before the fourth month.

3. Professor Tim Clark of Guy's in London (professor of Thoracic Medicine) pointed out that the nature of any link between smoking and respiratory diseases was purely statistical though it was "true" that those who smoke have a greater risk of disease. As a result, he proposed that concentration be focused on those "at risk".

Professor Gresham returned to comment on the "three damaging constituents", tar, carbon monoxide, and nicotine. In his view carbon monoxide was the main worry because of its attacks on the walls of arteries. He saw NSM as being "relatively free from these dangers."

4. Dr. Herbert Bentley, research Director of IMP's and a representative of NSM, and began by repeating the corporate litany that it was not his business to make scientific judgments but merely to take advice from medical experts and submit the results of NSM his research to independent research. He then discussed how product modifications had been made over the years in terms of tar reduction, carbon monoxide improvements, and nicotine delivery reduction. He commented that NSM reduced tar reductions <sup>by</sup> of roughly 50% below the previous levels, and suggested that "further development" <sup>of</sup> within NSM would help the carbon monoxide situation. In his view, but without mention of any scientific basis for this, he suggested that declining trends among instances of lung cancer was a result of the efforts of industry to lower the tar delivery in cigarettes.

The IMPS Director of Public Affairs ~~was presenter and he then~~ commented that although medical experts had identified the health problems in connection with smoking they must be held in perspective, <sup>and</sup> <sup>D</sup> pointing out that IMPS' efforts were directed toward correcting these problems, and concluding that NSM would produce a generation of cigarettes offering greater hope of combatting such problems. <sup>Bentley</sup> Incidentally, remarks <sup>ed</sup> that benefits <sup>(X)</sup> were primarily related to pleasure derived from smoking and the relief from stress. ~~it provided.~~

*This is my friend who is questioning everything, I just agree*

3 reasons for NU.

- 1) Could be a distraction  
that indirectly is seeking to make  
people to make (VS work to make  
better)
- 2) Possibly could be used to  
change. by a drug & follow  
indirectly under FDD.
- 3) Could be considered as a physical  
library & offer labels for people  
from labels

5. Professor John Butterfield of Cambridge, in responding to requests for his view of the film, pronounced it "well balanced," commenting that the move toward a "safer" cigarette represented a "great triumph for the industry." He then quoted Sir Richard ~~Dahl~~ <sup>Doll</sup> to the effect that as doctors have not been able to convince their patients to "stub out cigarettes," the answer was, <sup>to</sup> produce a safer cigarette. Professor Butterfield said IMP was setting a high standard for others who produce "hazardous products", and <sup>pointed to</sup> ~~Noted~~ the claimed significant reduction in biological activity in small animals that NSM produced. (Note: This point is mentioned in the advertisements which appeared on Thursday and Friday in connection with the NSM press conference.)

The film's punch line was simply that a safe cigarette would have a greater chance of success, although Professor Butterfield admitted there was probably some justification in Prince Phillips remark that government should not attempt to dominate people's habits if there were no risk for all concerned.

[Note in the margin  
to Jim & Bill -  
you may prefer not to  
have as much detail  
regarding the film  
in the body of this  
memo; perhaps it would  
be more appropriate in  
a separate memo or not  
at all. Please advise]

50029 8184

TG then proposed we move to the formal agenda, a copy of which is attached. (although it was not followed too closely). Pat Sheehy<sup>of BAT</sup> ~~made a~~ remark<sup>2)</sup> that genesis<sup>12</sup> of the Position Paper produced by BAT and Philip Morris was a concern that not enough was being done to ~~the~~ the social unacceptability situation, which he views as more dangerous than the doctors, nor had enough work been done to understand and promote the benefits of smoking. Bill Murray of <sup>PM</sup> TM ~~encouraging~~ agreement on a broad set<sup>12</sup> of proposals<sup>of the Position Paper</sup> and an action plan as the main objective of the meeting. TG then suggested review of the Position Paper, noting that RJR had modifications to propose. <sup>AT</sup> BH's suggestion, then, SBW presented our <sup>revisions</sup> proposals using as a guide Ed Jacob's letter<sup>as his 1.876</sup> and drawing support from JG and BH during discussion of the various points. We stressed the need in our view <sup>to</sup> for creating a communications vehicle to assess the current environment in each market place, and the present state of science, <sup>and the</sup> attracting as appropriate developments, trends and proposals. The British contingent seemed mainly concerned about our suggestion that <sup>the</sup> area of research be broadened to include the search into the causes for certain diseases popularly associated with smoking, and BAT/PM were clearly more interested in research into motivation and the benefits <sup>causation</sup> than causation. <sup>BH</sup> pointed out there was a <sup>serious</sup> present danger inherent in attempts to make smoking socially unacceptable, which he felt had produced

and would continue to produce the strongest impact on the market. Gradually a consensus<sup>u</sup> evolved that working parties be developed to consider motivation and benefits, causation and social/political aspects of the current activists<sup>campaign</sup> involvement against smoking. It was thought we should take stock of where we were to date, what information was available, and how useful it was, and how further it should be developed and used. Suggestions in<sup>for</sup> terms of reference were then drafted for the working parties<sup>y</sup> on Social Acceptability of Smoking, which was ~~said~~ ~~that~~ the model for the terms of reference of the other two working parties.

[Note: the progress ~~shown~~ during the morning session was generally accepted ~~by the Committee~~ to be substantial, and was achieved despite a number of diversions. For example, substantial time was spent explaining the background to the U.K. industry agreement with government on the use of bands<sup>labels?</sup> instead of numbers to define tar levels. Stewart-Moore<sup>~~~~~</sup> of Gallagher suggested that the industry got maneuvered into a corner by relying in its negotiations with government on tolerances ~~on~~ measurement of tar, and the consequent risk that statements using numbers would fall afoul of the U.K. Trades Description Act. PM took the view, which was supported by the Committee after discussion, that as stated in the Position Paper the industry should resist any attempt to impose requirements



New Tape Side 1 pg <sup>5</sup>10 6/8

to put figures on <sup>points</sup> facts or in advertising (Point 9 of the <sup>Position Paper</sup> policy statement), but if necessary industry should stick with numbers because they were not so subjective a measure. The English do not expect to revert to the government to try and change their recent 3-year agreement, despite arguments which might be available under EEC law and improve<sup>d</sup> measuring techniques, to support a return to numbers. They intend to urge a return to numbers if there is a push to change the bands, however.]

Just before lunch it was agreed that three Working Parties would be formed to exam<sup>ine</sup> the current state of each of the three areas of interest, and to develop strategy. A single company was chosen to be the "lead company" on each working party, charged to produce a report acceptable to the Committee as a whole. RJR will spearhead the Social Acceptability Working Party, BAT the <sup>Behavior</sup> Benefits Working Party, and IMPS the Medical Research Working Party. Nominees are to be sent to the Chairman of each respective company by the 17th of June. The Working Parties' <sup>first</sup> Reports are due by September 17, and will be considered by the full Committee at a meeting scheduled for November 10 and 11, to be hosted in <sup>Lausanne</sup> ~~Lozane~~ by PM. <sup>At</sup> After that point, the Committee will consider whether to broaden the list of companies involved to include the two other companies in the U.S., and one or two in Switzerland. PM was of the opinion that it was important to work through local Associations, and therefore proposed that

50029 6187

New Tape Side 1 pg <sup>9</sup>11 6/8

each company represented brief its industry representative as soon as possible with regard to the Position Paper. ~~It is contemplated that four quarterly reports will be produced by the Working Parties.~~ After discussion on the means and advisability of bringing Associations in at this juncture, there seemed to be agreement to approach this on a point-by-point basis, as appropriate given the concerns of each local Association.

After lunch, Steward<sup>†</sup>-Moore of Gallagher<sup>s</sup> expressed concern that <sup>from</sup> IMP<sup>s</sup> (and by implication the other U.K. companies) had responsibility for the Medical Research Working party, as it was their position to "accept causation...and make a safer product... by improving the smoke...." In his view, as long as the industry <sup>is soon</sup> would seem to make progress in this direction, the social acceptability issue would be overcome. TG emphasized that regardless of the results of the Working Parties' efforts in this area, ITL would not come off its stance of not being qualified to make medical judgments. They saw overall tar reduction as a sensible approach, similar to the German approach, although they would not be opposed to looking in <sup>to</sup> this causation area. Further, there was hesitation expressed in connection with the cost of research in this area of causation, interest in which they thought was generated by the more liberal U.S. product liability laws. Hotzmann and Witt cautioned the Committee not to assume that trends toward a more stringent product liability

50029 8188

law in the EEC would not be ~~too~~ successful in creating similar problems in the future in Europe, and saw reference to a link between allegedly fewer lung cancer deaths and lower tar as being potentially troublesome.

Spenglar<sup>e</sup> thought it useful to pursue this area of causation even though the German industry was "almost ready to accept causation"; his point was that he wanted to make sure that other causes got their fair share of the blame. (AS acknowledged that RJR had dis-associated itself from the recent Comment of the German industry, which is dealt with in a separate memo.) Anson of IMPs then pointed out that the major problem confronting the Committee in the future would be what to do with the results of the Working Parties efforts; he reckoned that arguments will come during the course of all the Working Party deliberations on this aspect, and therefore it was extremely important to reserve decisions about implementation of results or recommendations to the full Committee. The "official" U.K. industry review, therefore, on the question of causation seems to be that as it is the suggestion of "experts" that tar is harmful, the industry is responding to this perceived demand (within NSM and <sup>CyTrol</sup>Sydrel). "We are trying - cigarettes are getting safer." TG reiterated, however, that ITL was not claiming, nor has, nor will claim that their cigarettes were safer as a result of using NSM. The U.K. representatives also indicated their concern about the possibility of discovering bad

New Taper Side 1 pg 13 6/8

news in the course of any proposed medical research.

The Committee then discussed its opposition to taxing<sup>85</sup> ~~ba~~ on deliveries, and AH promised to provide backup information (probably from the Tobacco Tax Council) on the history of why a similar tax in New York had been repealed. This was thought to be useful in discussions with the U.K. and EEC governments.

The meeting adjourned with unanimous agreement on the success of efforts of all concerned, and with thanks to Tony Garrett for being the driving force behind getting the Committee organized and together. JP/BH/SBW agreed that the objectives we set in our May 26, 1977 memo had been more than amply met, and further agreed to meet on Tuesday, the 14th with appropriate persons in Winston-Salem to brief them completely and organize our Working Party efforts. SBW undertook to brief JTW/GDS and discuss TI's representatives if any on these three Working Parties.

SBW

cc: W. D. Hobbs  
J. R. Peterson

50029 8190