

THE TOBACCO INSTITUTE, INC.

1776 K STREET, NORTHWEST  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20006

296-8434

HORACE R. KORNEGAY  
PRESIDENT & EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

*file*  
January 12, 1971

INFORMATIONAL MEMORANDUM

TO: Chief Executives

FROM: Horace R. Kornegay

The following statement has been cleared and is available for your use in answering questions regarding the recent Royal College of Physicians report. The TI has not issued this as a press release because of the very light coverage of the RCP Report in American media.

cc: Company Presidents  
General Counsel  
Public Relations

690006753

The following statement calls attention to some of the glaring shortcomings of the recent report of a special committee of 12 members of the English Royal College of Physicians.

Their report appears to be an attempt by a British anti-tobacco group to exert political pressure to restrict the sale and marketing of cigarettes and to limit the free choice of English cigarette smokers. The report will no doubt be used by anti-smoking forces in the United States to influence government policy.

The American people and their public officials in the executive and legislative branches should be given the facts on both sides so that they can evaluate the issues and evidence in the continuing smoking and health controversy.

The Report of the Royal College of Physicians should not be classed as a scientific document. It does not reflect any research on smoking and health by the Royal College itself. The authors have looked at a number of existing studies but have provided no new information of importance nor a balanced review of those studies which are available.

690006754

In its zeal to force anti-smoking legislation in England, the Report contains several obvious inconsistencies which cast serious doubt on its validity.

Item: The Report states flatly that "air pollution is a much less serious hazard to life and health than cigarette smoking." Yet the very same authors, in the 1970 Royal College Report on Air Pollution, stated that "it is not possible to express the relative importance of individual exposure to cigarette smoking and air pollution."

Item: In dismissing air pollution and emphasizing cigarette smoking, the authors have chosen to avoid the implication of a Northern Ireland study which in their own words concluded that:

"Even when age and smoking differences were taken into account there remained a marked residential gradient in mortality ranging from 73 per 100,000 in rural districts to 310 per 100,000 for the center of Belfast."

These examples are not mentioned to point a finger at air pollution, but simply to illustrate how an emotional commitment may prevent an objective consideration of all factors.

690006755

Item: While conceding that "it remains to decide whether this association (between cigarette smoking and coronary heart disease) is due to cause and effect," the Report concludes that "cigarette smoking is an important factor in causing coronary heart disease."

Item: The Report states that all deaths among British doctors dropped 12 percent while deaths among all men in England and Wales dropped only 3 percent during the years 1953-57 to 1962-65. This difference is claimed to be due to a greater decline in smoking among doctors during such period of time. Yet the Report fails to explain several other statistics in the same tabulation which show that:

1. The reported death rate from coronary heart disease among doctors in 1953-57 was higher than the reported rate for all men in 1962-65.

2. The decrease in death rate from other cardiovascular diseases for all men was three times as great as for doctors.

3. Deaths from lung cancer and chronic bronchitis were much less frequent among doctors to begin with (in 1953-57) than for all men (in those same years).

690006756

Is it not likely that occupation and socio-economic level played a major role in these reported differences? Certainly, such factors should be considered and studied by objective scientists.

Item: In discussing an American Experiment in which dogs were forced to inhale cigarette smoke, the Royal College claims that "lung cancer" and precancerous changes" were produced. The researchers who conducted the experiment did not use the term precancerous and did not even claim that the two lung cancers reportedly found were a result of cigarette smoking (contrary to the original claim by the American Cancer Society that 12 dogs developed lung cancer as a result of cigarette smoking).

The smoking dog research report is highly controversial in the United States. Significant criticisms of the study, as finally published, have been made and a sponsor of the work, the American Cancer Society, has repeatedly refused to submit the data for review by an independent panel of experts. The report of this study was rejected for publication by two scientific journals before it was published in a journal of which one of the researchers is an editor.

690006757

Cigarette advertising has just been banned from the broadcast media in this country, and there is a great deal of speculation about future advertising. Therefore, it is worthwhile to examine some of the inconsistencies in the anti-smoking position on advertising set out in the Report.

Item: The Royal College Report cites Russia and Italy -- where there is no cigarette advertising and where smoking has risen steadily -- as examples of the ineffectiveness of a ban on cigarette advertising. Nevertheless, they demand that the British government prohibit cigarette advertising.

Item: The Report states that, "most smokers are unaware of the risks they run." Yet it cites national surveys showing that the claimed risks are known by "almost everyone." The authors call for more than factual information programs. They urge that people "must be persuaded," and the "evidence must be presented in a way which will produce more conviction of its truth." In other words, they urge government-directed behavior control through propaganda and restrictions.

690006758

In their analysis of current anti-smoking messages in Britain, the authors advise: "A communication which gives both sides of an argument is more likely to be effective than one which is biased." Ironically, they have not followed their own advice in writing the Report.

The American cigarette industry renews its dedication to objective scientific research as the only way to answer the perplexing questions which exist in the smoking and health controversy. It is ready and willing to cooperate with government and private groups in seeking to answer those questions.

690006759