Lesson Four
People Power vs. Tobacco Industry

Lesson Four provides an overview of Minnesota’s grassroots movements against the tobacco industry. Students will learn how various laws help protect them from some of the tobacco industry’s marketing strategies and the harms of tobacco use. It highlights the Minnesota tobacco settlement, the national tobacco settlement, Minnesota’s Freedom to Breathe Act, and other laws and policies related to tobacco control. In addition, this lesson enlightens students of their power to create change in their community.

Objectives and Competencies
- General understanding of how the tobacco industry has been restricted by tobacco control related laws and policies, and the Minnesota and national tobacco settlements—their impact
- Knowledge of how the laws and policies were started by grassroots movements
- Understanding of how the tobacco industry works around the laws and policies
- Knowledge of what additional laws could be passed in order to increase our protection from the harms of tobacco use

Activities
- Discussion: How the Minnesota tobacco settlement and other laws have brought us to where we are today
- Discussion: Freedom to Breathe – additional protections to the Minnesota Clean Indoor Air Act yet what is still not covered and what can be done?
- Adult Leaders: Review and become familiar with the store survey and store survey guide in Lesson Five
- Optional: Contact the RTC staff to schedule a date and time for one of the staff members to go through the store survey and store survey guide with the students for Lesson Five

Materials Needed
- Fact Sheet: Tobacco History Timeline
- Fact Sheet: Freedom to Breathe
- Fact Sheet: Minnesota’s Youth Access Laws
- Fact Sheet: Minnesota 1998 Tobacco Settlement
- Fact Sheet: From the Tobacco Industry’s Own Documents: Targeting Youth

Additional Resources
- Fact Sheet: Minnesota Tobacco Settlement – In Depth
- Fact Sheet: Minnesota Tobacco Settlement Payment Schedule
- Fact Sheet: Links to the Tobacco Industry’s Marketing Strategies Documents
Freedom to Breathe

Secondhand smoke is the leading cause of preventable death in the United States. In 2005, it was estimated that exposure to secondhand smoke kills more than 3,000 adult nonsmokers from lung cancer. According to the Surgeon General, there is no safe level of secondhand smoke exposure.

In 1975, Minnesota became the first state to pass legislation limiting smoking in the workplace. The historic Minnesota Clean Indoor Air Act required separate no-smoking areas in most indoor work environments with the notable exception of bars.

Over the years, parts of this law were changed and made stronger, to prohibit smoking in specific public places like schools, daycare centers, hospitals and clinics, state government buildings, public transport, and other public indoor areas. The law left several loopholes, however, including places like bars and restaurants, which the U.S. Surgeon General has found to be a major source of secondhand smoke exposure for children, teenagers, and other vulnerable populations.

In 2007, after a long and heated legislative debate and vigorous activism by public health advocates across the state, Minnesota passed the Freedom to Breathe (FTB) Act. FTB extended secondhand smoke protections to virtually all indoor workplaces, including bars and restaurants. The Freedom to Breathe bill was passed by a bipartisan majority of lawmakers and signed into law by Governor Tim Pawlenty on May 16, 2007. The law, which went into effect on October 1, 2007, made Minnesota the twentieth state to go smoke free.

Highlights of the Freedom to Breathe Act

- No smoking is allowed in bars, restaurants, private clubs or other workplaces
- Smoking is permitted on outdoor patios, but is subject to regulation at the local level
- Indoor smoking is prohibited in public places and places of work, except in scientific studies, theatrical productions (by actors) and traditional Native American ceremonies; in hotel and motel guestrooms, tobacco shops (for product sampling), a disabled veterans rest camp in Washington County and locked psychiatric units; and on family farms
Discussion Questions

What does Freedom to Breathe cover?
- Workplaces, including bars, restaurants, and private clubs. Also includes industrial workplaces, common areas of rental apartment buildings, hotels, and motels.

Was Minnesota the first state to have a comprehensive statewide smoke-free law?
- No, Minnesota was actually the 20th state to adopt a comprehensive law requiring protection for workers against secondhand smoke. Other states include, but are not limited to, California, New York, Colorado, Maine, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island.

Does Freedom to Breathe include electronic cigarettes?
- No, the law does not currently include electronic cigarettes (as of November 2013). However, individual businesses and cities can pass policies and laws that prohibit electronic cigarette use inside workplaces, including restaurants and bars.

Does Freedom to Breathe cover homes and cars?
- No, Freedom to Breathe does not cover homes and cars where many young people are exposed to secondhand smoke.

Additional information is available at the following website:
- [http://www.health.state.mn.us/freedomtobreathe/](http://www.health.state.mn.us/freedomtobreathe/)
Minnesota’s Youth Access Laws

What does Minnesota law say about selling tobacco to youth?

- It is illegal to give or sell tobacco (such as cigarettes, cigars, snuff, etc…), tobacco-related devices (such as pipes or rolling papers), and nicotine delivery products (electronic cigarettes) to someone under 18 years old. Similarly, it is also illegal for someone under 18 to possess or attempt to buy tobacco, tobacco-related devices or electronic cigarettes.
- All stores that sell tobacco must be licensed by the city or county. The store fills out an application and pays a licensing fee. The city or county chooses whether or not to give that store a license.
- Tobacco products cannot be offered for sale in open displays or be accessible to the public without clerk assistance.
- Licensed stores cannot sell single cigarettes, called “loosies.”
- Tobacco cannot be sold through a vending machine.
- The city or county must do one unannounced “compliance check” at each licensed tobacco store each year. A person between the ages of 15 and 17 years goes into each store and attempts to purchase a tobacco product. If asked, the youth must show the store clerk his or her real ID. If the store clerk sells tobacco to the minor, the store has failed its compliance check.
- If a store fails a compliance checks by selling tobacco to a minor, the store is penalized. They pay a fine and/or have their license to sell tobacco taken away for a period of time.

These Minnesota “youth access” laws are all enforced locally through the city or county. These city and county laws are known as “tobacco licensing ordinances.”

It is very important that cities’ tobacco licensing laws meet the minimum state requirements listed above. A main goal of all of these laws is to make it difficult for youth under 18 (the largest and most important source of new smokers for the tobacco industry) to obtain tobacco, and thereby to cut down on the number of youth who are likely to become the next generation of smokers to die from cancer, heart disease, and other tobacco-related diseases.

A city or county can pass laws that strengthen their tobacco licensing laws beyond the minimum required by the state. Here are some examples of what cities can do:

- Prohibit the sampling of tobacco in tobacco shops
- Require that people selling tobacco must be at least 18 years old
- Require that stores selling tobacco train their employees about youth access to tobacco
- Prohibit the sale of all flavored tobacco products
- Require that cigars be sold in a pack of five (often they are sold individually for very cheap)
Minnesota 1998 Tobacco Settlement

In 1994, the State of Minnesota sued the major cigarette companies for, among other things, violating Minnesota’s consumer fraud laws by marketing cigarettes to youth under 18 years old. The cigarette companies settled with the state in 1998, at the end of a long trial.

Why Did Minnesota and BlueCross BlueShield of MN Sue the Tobacco Industry?

- The State of Minnesota and BlueCross BlueShield of Minnesota (BCBS) sued the tobacco industry in a historic joint effort to protect the health and well-being of Minnesotans, and to expose the fraudulent and unfair business practices of the tobacco industry.
- The state had evidence and reason to believe that the industry had been defrauding the public for years about the hazards of smoking and about its efforts to lure children into the smoking habit, in violation of state consumer protection laws.
- Both the state and BCBS sued to recover money they paid out to cover the enormous health-care costs associated with the treatment of tobacco-related illnesses, incurred on behalf of Minnesotans who became smokers as a result of the industry’s deceptive business tactics.

What does the settlement cover?

- The settlement resulted in a court order prohibiting the cigarette companies from using youth-targeted advertising and certain other kinds of advertising, including: using Joe Camel and other cartoon ads, putting signs larger than 14 square feet outside of stores that sell tobacco products, using billboard ads, selling, giving away, or even using things with cigarette brand names on them (like t-shirts, matchbooks, and other items), paying for tobacco product placement on TV or in movies; and other restrictions on tobacco advertising.
- Minnesota’s court case and settlement also resulted in millions of pages of previously secret, internal industry documents being made public, the overwhelming majority of which had never been seen by anyone outside of industry insiders before. These documents are being used by tobacco control advocates each day to continue to focus scrutiny on the tobacco industry and its business practices.
- The tobacco industry was ordered to pay the State of Minnesota and BlueCross BlueShield of Minnesota $6.6 billion over 25 years.
Minnesota’s 1998 Tobacco Settlement – In Depth

Kids

- **First-ever court ordered ban on marketing to kids**
  Each year, the tobacco industry pours over $5 billion dollars into advertising. Evidence from Minnesota’s tobacco trial detailed how the tobacco industry used this money to hook their new and best customers – children. Tragically, their advertising worked: of the children who smoke, 86% smoke the most heavily advertised brands – Camel, Marlboro, and Newport. Under the Minnesota tobacco settlement, tobacco companies are specifically prohibited, by court order, from using any marketing techniques that target children. We are unaware of any comparable law or order anywhere. In the past, the only way to stop the tobacco companies from targeting children has been to argue that they have broken Minnesota’s consumer fraud and advertising laws. Now, they will be bound by a specific ironclad order. The court will have the power to do whatever it takes to ensure compliance, including the power to impose fines and penalties.

- **First-ever ban on tobacco industry branded promotional products**
  Tobacco companies spent almost $1 billion annually on t-shirts, hats, gym bags, backpacks, CD players, and other logo branded promotional items, making children walking billboards for cigarettes. An amazing 35% of children ages 12 to 17 years old, including nonsmokers, owned at least one of these promotional items at the time of this settlement. Research shows that with children owning these items, the items are one of the most powerful influences on their smoking behavior; they are four times more likely to start smoking. More than 78% of Americans believe that this type of advertising should not be permitted. This settlement now prohibits it. Violations of this ironclad order may lead to grave monetary penalties.

- **Ban on all cigarette billboards and transit ads**
  Cigarettes were the number one item advertised on billboards in Minnesota. The advertisements flooded our highways and invaded our neighborhoods, particularly our poorest neighborhoods. Under this settlement, all tobacco billboard advertisements had to be removed. Fifty of the advertisements came down within a month of the settlement, with the remainder being phased out in less than six months. Tobacco advertising on buses, bus shelters, and taxis were also required to be removed.

- **No more product placement in movies anywhere in the U.S.**
  One of the most insidious tobacco industry marketing techniques were the secret payment of fees to movie producers and stars such as Sylvester Stallone to feature cigarettes and smoking in films, sometimes in ways showcasing particular brands. The tobacco industry claimed it
discontinued this practice many years before the settlement, but a document uncovered showed that Philip Morris paid to have cigarettes used in youth-oriented movies such as the “Muppet Movie” and “Who Framed Roger Rabbit?” Speculation abounds about whether secret payoffs may have been made to the makers of smoking-intensive movies such as “Titanic” and “My Best Friend’s Wedding.” Under this settlement, the defendants are barred from making such payments directly or indirectly. This provision is nationwide.

- **Tobacco industry cannot oppose stronger laws to reduce youth tobacco use**
  Since the tobacco companies have unrivaled lobbying power at the State Capitol, it is very difficult to pass even the smallest provisions to reduce youth tobacco use. This provision bars the tobacco industry from opposing, directly or indirectly, legislative proposals and administrative rules to reduce youth tobacco use.

- **The best prevention program: keeping kids from becoming addicted**
  The tobacco industry’s own documents state that nicotine is harder to quit than alcohol, heroin, or cocaine. When kids start smoking, they think they will be able to stop. To their own and society’s consternation, they are addicted before they even realize it. Seventy-three percent of teen smokers who believe they will not be smoking in five years are still smoking five years later. Furthermore, almost 3 out of 4 teen smokers state that if given the opportunity to do things differently, they would have never started to smoke. Prevention measures work to keep kids from ever starting a life-long addiction to tobacco.

- **Subject to legislative approval**
  The Minnesota tobacco settlement earmarked more the $650 million for an endowment focusing on teen tobacco prevention. This effort included counter-advertising, community partnerships to reduce tobacco use, tobacco education in schools, enforcement of youth access policies, worksite interventions, and other innovative programs to meet prevention goals. **NOTE TO READER:** The endowment was created in 1999. The first money from the endowment became available for programming in the 2001 fiscal year. **Unfortunately, in 2003 the endowment was defunded with the money being diverted into the general fund.**
Truth

- **Millions of pages of industry documents remain public forever**
  One of the three major goals of Minnesota’s litigation was to uncover the truth about the tobacco industry’s forty year conspiracy of lies. During the four years of bitter litigation, the state forced the tobacco industry to provide their secret documents related to science and health, safer cigarettes, manipulating nicotine, manipulating kids, and manipulating public policy. Pressure forced the industry to open the Minnesota Document Depository and start providing the documents on the internet. In this settlement, health professionals, scientists, and members of the general public are assured access to the millions of pages of tobacco industry secrets. These documents will be maintained for at least ten years at the tobacco industry’s expense, and by the state thereafter.

- **Selected Guildford, England Documents will be sent to Minnesota and the Guildford depository will be maintained for ten years**
  Millions of pages of documents produced in the Minnesota case from BAT Industries PLC and its subsidiary British American Tobacco Company are now housed in a depository in Guildford, England. BAT Industries and its affiliates (including subsidiary Brown & Williamson), make-up the world’s second largest tobacco manufacturing business. Under this settlement, copies of the BAT documents were to be sent to the Minnesota Document Depository, where, as all the other documents there, they are made open to the public. In addition, the Guildford Document Depository will be maintained, at the tobacco industry’s expense, for ten years.

- **Subject to court approval, the more “privileged” documents will be made public**
  During the litigation, Minnesota alleged that the tobacco industry misused and abused the attorney-client privilege in an attempt to hide the most incriminating evidence. Time and again, the judge ruled in the state’s favor and ordered that the documents be produced. The tobacco industry lost its battle to keep secret 39,000 of these documents, a battle they fought all the way to the US Supreme Court. While some of these formerly privileged documents are now available on the internet, under this settlement, the state will seek the approval of the court to make all of the privileged documents produced to the state public.

- **The tobacco industry’s road maps to all the documents are now available to the public**
  Finally, the public now has access to the road maps (computerized databases known as the “4A indices”) that the tobacco companies made for themselves to navigate through the millions of pages of documents that are now housed in the Minnesota Document Depository. No longer will researchers, reporters, and others have to struggle with the cryptic, vague indices that the tobacco industry has made public.
• **All tobacco industry “formulas” go to the FDA for the first time**

Prior to the settlement, the tobacco industry never revealed how much or in what combinations they employed of the almost 700 additives in cigarettes. In the settlement, all cigarette “secret formulas” were to be turned over to the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). This revealed a complete list of substances present in tobacco products, how they relate in combination with each other, and the ways they are actually used.

• **Unprecedented court ordered ban against misrepresenting health hazards of tobacco use**

When the CEOs of the major tobacco companies told congress in 1994 that nicotine was not addictive, people were incredulous. When they said it again in 1998, after documents presented in the Minnesota trial revealed that the tobacco companies had known for 30 years how nicotine addiction works and had manipulated the levels and potency of nicotine to keep smokers hooked, people were outraged. For decades, the tobacco industry publicly stated that their products do not cause lung cancer, emphysema, heart disease, or other health problems. Under this settlement, the tobacco companies are prohibited from making any material misrepresentation of fact about the health consequences of using any tobacco product. For example, this means that they are prohibited from saying that nicotine has not been proven to be addictive, or that smoking has not been proven to cause disease.

**Reform**

• **Court ordered ban against further conspiracy to suppress research, withhold health information, or limit new products**

One of the main charges in the Minnesota’s case was that beginning in 1954, the tobacco companies conspired to keep smoking and health research, and information about the health hazards of their products, from ever seeing the light of day. The state also alleged that the tobacco companies conspired to make sure that their safer cigarette discoveries were never revealed or put into practice. Under this settlement, these industry practices are prohibited, or they will face contempt of court charges, including monetary penalties.

• **Dissolve the Council for Tobacco Research (CTR) – the tobacco industry’s “health” propaganda machine**

During the litigation, Minnesota alleged that the tobacco industry used CTR, its so-called “scientific arm,” as a tool in its conspiracy to mislead the public about health problems caused by tobacco and to suppress their research and development of safer cigarettes. The state alleged that CTR tried to protect the tobacco industry by perpetuate the myth that the link between smoking and disease was still unproved. Under this settlement, CTR has been dissolved. The tobacco industry is barred from reviving CTR or anything similar to it. CTR was required to forward all of its research on smoking and health to the Food and Drug Administration, which asserted regulatory control over tobacco. Since CTR was a defendant in numerous other state lawsuits against the tobacco industry, a shell continued to exist solely to represent CTR in the other trials.
Protecting the integrity of the legislative process
This settlement contains a provision that keeps the tobacco industry from attacking Minnesota’s current tobacco laws. The tobacco industry is specifically prohibited from challenging the validity of existing laws, including but not limited to, youth access to tobacco, Clean Indoor Air Act, ban to distribute free tobacco samples, and tobacco product ingredient disclosure requirement.

Unprecedented new lobbying and public policy disclosure
The tobacco industry is notorious for manipulating the political process and wielding its considerable clout through front-groups, highly paid lobbyists, and secret surrogates. This settlement imposes disclosure requirements that are beyond those of Minnesota’s lobbying laws, to provide public scrutiny on the tobacco industry’s efforts to influence Minnesota law making. The tobacco industry is now required to file quarterly reports, reveal the amounts paid to its lobbyists and to other organizations that lobby, reveal payments made to third parties who testify in hearings, and report on the use of industry controlled or funded foundations, non-profits, firms, or other affiliates that make gifts that benefit Minnesota officials.

Health
Smoking cessation for every smoker
About 750,000 Minnesotans smoke, even though 50,000 are under 18 years old. The vast majority of smokers do not want to smoke, but since nicotine is more addictive than heroin or cocaine, many people relapse. Treatment of tobacco dependence is the most cost-effective clinical preventive service in all of health care. Under the settlement, $102 million paid in January 1999 was set aside for a smoking cessation fund to provide free smoking cessation treatment for every Minnesota smoker wanting to quit. This fund is directed by the Minnesota Partnership for Action Against Tobacco (MPAAT) which in 2006 was renamed ClearWay Minnesota.

$100 million for research to get at the roots of the tobacco epidemic
Each year for the next ten years, the tobacco industry will pay $10 million into an account to fund research on why children start smoking, the best target prevention strategies, how to keep children and adults away from this highly addictive and harmful substance, and how to end the tobacco epidemic.
Minnesota Tobacco Settlement Payment Schedule

Since 1998, the tobacco industry has made payments to the State of Minnesota as part of the settlement.

In March of 1999, a tobacco endowment was created to address tobacco problems in the state through medical education and research, tobacco prevention, and public health with an emphasis on youth.

Unfortunately, the incoming tobacco settlement dollars are not thoroughly addressing the tobacco problem in Minnesota. In 2003, the endowment was eliminated and all incoming money to the state from the tobacco industry now goes into the general fund.¹

Payment Schedule²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>$10 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>$240 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>$102 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$220.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$10 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$114.75 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$242.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$10 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$127.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$242.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$10 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$165.75 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$42.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$10 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$165.75 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$121.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every June</td>
<td>2003-2007</td>
<td>$10 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every December</td>
<td>2003-2023</td>
<td>$204 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The general fund is the state’s main operating fund – this money goes towards things such as: property tax aid, health and human services, state government, transportation, economic development, public safety, and education.

² Payments made after January 1999 (with the exception of the $10 million payments each January) will be raised 3% or by the National Consumer Price Index (CPI) for the previous year – whichever is greater – and will be adjusted downward if profits decrease due to decreasing sales.
Discussion Questions – MN Tobacco Settlement

What does the settlement cover?
- Bans marketing to kids, tobacco industry promotional products, cigarette billboards and transit ads, and paid product placement in movies and TV across the US. The tobacco industry also cannot oppose stronger laws to reduce youth tobacco use.

Why did the state and BlueCross BlueShield sue the tobacco industry?
- The State of Minnesota and BlueCross BlueShield of Minnesota sued the tobacco industry in the interest of the health and wellbeing of Minnesotans. Minnesotans were suffering from the deadly effects of tobacco use and the enormous health care costs associated with the care of tobacco-related illnesses.

What did the tobacco industry have to pay the state?
- $6.6 billion to be paid over 25 years. Four and half times the $1.7 billion sought. In addition, tobacco companies had to pay the State of Minnesota and BlueCross BlueShield’s attorneys’ fees.

What did the lawyers discover while suing the tobacco industry?
- Over 33 million pages of secret industry documents, including how the industry was targeting youth, women, and ethnic communities. These documents are now open to the public.
From the Tobacco Industry’s Own Documents:
Targeting Youth

“The only source of replacement smokers” and “walking billboards”

Title: Camel Y&R Orientation
http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/sdj54d00/pdf

This lengthy 1989 R.J. Reynolds (RJR) document discusses the importance of young people to tobacco industry profits, noting that “[Younger adult smokers] are the only source of “replacement smokers.” It also praises the Jack Daniels whiskey and Budweiser beer ad campaigns. Among many other things, RJR admired how Jack Daniels "not only reached YA [Younger Adult] consumers but converted YA's into walking billboards….”

Title: Product Information
http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/tqn61e00/pdf

This is the famous Lorillard memo which states: "the base of our business is the high school student." It was written by a Lorillard salesperson to Curtis Judge, the President of Lorillard.

Title: Our target is (more) downscale...
URL: http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/pbs92d00

This marketing document summarizes RJR's "target market," mostly "kids," who do not attend college. It describes these targets as follows:

“less educated than others;” “into escapism because they have no intellectual diversions;” “more immature in some cases….” not having “long-term goals...nothing to look forward to;” “these kids see themselves as grownups,” having “a tunnel vision of the future because there's no college/greater opportunities to look forward to;” and “always on the prowl for instant gratification.”

It also describes kids as “less formed intellectually…more malleable,” and lists thoughts for how to exploit youth interest in music and sex for cigarette marketing purposes.

How Being “Bad” is “Good”

Title: A Public Relations Strategy for the Tobacco Advisory Council
URL: http://www.library.ucsf.edu/tobacco/batco/html/900/968/otherpages/allpages.html

This British American Tobacco document offers this positive perspective on smoking and the cancer it causes: “[I]n commenting on the alleged economic costs to the nation of the ill effects of smoking [a recent publication] asked whether the Royal College of Physicians had taken account of the savings in
support and medical attention after retirement in those cases where death before retirement had been induced by smoking. [The publication stated,] ‘It is part of this gruesome equation that tobacco has the social function of limiting the number of elderly dependents that the economy must support.’ This last point, a brutally realistic one, implies that, with a general lengthening of the expectation of life we really need something for people to die of. In substitution for the effects of war, poverty and starvation, cancer, as the disease of the rich, developed countries, may have some predestined part to play.”

Title: Research Planning Memorandum on Some Thoughts About New Brands of Cigarettes for the Youth Market
http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/i1u91f00/pdf?search=%22502987357%22

Here, Claude Teague of RJR's research department complains that it is “unfair” that RJR can’t market cigarettes directly to the youth market. He recommends that “if [RJR] is to survive and prosper, over the long term, we must get our share of the youth market. In my opinion, this will require new brands tailored to the youth market.” He further notes how peer pressure and youth desire to rebel can be manipulated by the industry: "The smoking-health controversy does not appear important to the group because, psychologically, at eighteen, one is immortal. Further, if the desire to be daring is part of the motivation to start smoking, the alleged risk of smoking may actually make smoking attractive. Thus, a new brand aimed at the young group should not in any way be promoted as a 'health' brand, and perhaps should carry some implied risk. In this sense, the warning label on the package may be a plus.”

The Tobacco Industry Cares – About Profits, Not Youth

Title: Responsible Living for Teenagers, A Public Service Proposal for the Tobacco Industry
URL:  http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/bvb51e00/pdf?search=%2204210397%22

As this document shows, the tobacco industry puts forth its own youth programs not because it’s concerned about kids’ health, but because, “unlike our [the tobacco industry’s] proposed project,” campaigns by anti-smoking groups "present smoking as repugnant and unhealthy."

Title: Tobacco Advertising Restrictions, Working Group Report, Strategy III
URL: http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/bzz52f00/pdf

This document shows the main reason the industry has "youth programs" is to minimize the perceived need for more regulations. It notes that “There is some risk that efforts to discourage youth smoking could decrease tobacco sales, both immediately and over the long term. However, the group agreed that, in the absence of credible industry efforts to address the youth smoking issue, various types of potential legislative and regulatory action would have a much more serious impact upon tobacco sales.”
Links to the Tobacco Industry’s Marketing Strategies
Documents

Title: SPANISH MARKET
http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/csx00f00

Title: Philip Morris, U.S.A., Proactive Public Relations Plan, African-American & Hispanic Market
http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/umf08d00

Title: A Study of Ethnic Markets
http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/luy62d00

Title: Kool 10’s
http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/xmc23f00

Title: XII SPECIAL MARKETS
http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/las05d00

Title: Project SCUM
http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/mum76d00/pdf

Link to a list of known “special projects” or “operations” (relating to target markets), many with links to industry documents:
http://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php?title=Tobacco_industry_projects_%26_operations

Additional Resources:

http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/

www.tobaccodocuments.org