



Corporate Affairs Department

2024978017

MR. H. CULLMAN

STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

AUSTRALIA : SMOKING AND HEALTH STRATEGY

Some Recent Developments in Australia

February, 1978

2024978018

LIST OF CONTENTS

Page 1	Background
Page 4	Industry Defence Groups
Page 5	Voluntary Advertising Code
Page 9	Sponsorship of Sporting and Cultural Activities
Page 11	Passive Smoking
Page 13	Advertising and Youth
Page 14	Smokers' Rights League
Page 18	Confederation of Australian Sport
Page 21	Corporate Advertising
Page 23	Senate Drug Inquiry
Page 25	Strategy for 1978 and Onwards
Page 27	Other Policy Facets

2024978019

AUSTRALIA: SMOKING AND HEALTH STRATEGY

BACKGROUND

1. Media Coverage and Overseas Influence

Our communications media give very extensive coverage to smoking and health. Through the various newsagencies such as Tass, Reuter, AP, UPI and AAP, any developments in U.S.A., U.K., continental Europe (particularly Scandinavia and France) and elsewhere are widely reported, usually with comments by spokesmen for local anti-smoking organisations. As the latter travel frequently to attend medical congresses around the world, the overseas influence on the Australian situation is an important factor to be considered in formulating future strategy.

2. Health Bureaucracy

On the home front, we have a massive health bureaucracy ranging from the Federal Health Department down to that of the smallest shire.

The National Health & Medical Research Council, advisory body to the Federal Health Department, closely adheres to W.H.O. policies and is strongly influenced by reports emanating from the U.K. Royal College of Physicians. Many of the Council's staff members are expatriate Englishmen and devotees of Fabian socialism. The Council allocates cash grants for medical research. Despite its outspoken views on the hazards of smoking, the Council funds little or no research into the effects of smoking on health.

2024978020

Each State has its own Health Department. The six State Health Ministers and the Federal Minister meet each year around June to discuss policy. The 1977 conference appointed a working party of health administrators to meet with the tobacco industry and draw up a new voluntary advertising code. The same working party recently met with the liquor industry to produce its voluntary code.

3. Political Parties

Both the major Australian political parties have been very outspoken on smoking and health. However, only the Australian Labor Party, currently in opposition at the Federal level, has an official policy. It reads:

"Prohibition of cigarette and tobacco advertising in all forms coupled with a vigorous campaign to educate the public, especially young people, on the serious health hazards associated with cigarettes and tobacco."

The governing Liberal Party has no official policy on smoking and health, but the Federal Health Minister, Ralph Hunt, has been a bitter opponent of the tobacco industry since coming to office in December 1975.

After considerable debate, the Liberal Party subscribed to an electronics media phase-out of cigarette advertising which was introduced during the Labor Party's term of office. The phase-out period ended on September 1, 1976, and a complete ban on cigarette advertising on television and radio took effect from that date.

2024978021

4. Anti-Smoking Organisations

Of the various anti-smoking bodies, the most vocal and effective is the Anti-Cancer Council of Victoria which is well-endowed and supported by a long list of private donors. Each of the other States has its own Cancer Council, and they meet under the umbrella of the Australian Cancer Society.

The Australian Council on Smoking & Health is a Sydney-based group of medicos headed by Sydney University's Professor of Surgery, W.G. Milton.

The National Heart Foundation also maintains continuous anti-smoking programs, both through its own printed material and in the media.

The Australian Medical Association has about 30,000 members. Through daily contact by doctors with their patients and through its weekly publication, The Medical Journal of Australia, the A.M.A. spreads the anti-smoking message to more people than all the other bodies combined.

The General Practitioners' Society of Australia, similar to the A.M.A., also has a strong lobby with the Government.

There are also Church and temperance groups, such as the Seventh Day Adventists, who organise five day smoking cures, and the Salvation Army, which now forbids its officers to smoke.

2024978022

INDUSTRY DEFENCE GROUPS

The industry defence organisation is regulated from the very top of the three Australian companies - Philip Morris, W.D. & H.O. Wills and Rothmans.

The three chief executives actively and continually monitor the smoking and health situation and actively attempt to resist any government intervention affecting the freedom of the industry.

The chief executives are constantly advised by the industry ad-hoc Committee, a small group which actively attempts to stave off any anti-smoking laws and regulations.

The ad-hoc Committee, which has been operating now for ten years, was originally rather large and unwieldy. A reduction in numbers has made the group more effective. Assisted by 15 specialists, including publicists, media experts and lobbyists, the Committee is in daily contact and meets frequently to monitor current events and plan future campaigns.

This Committee has close links with tobacco growers, tobacco unions, The Media Council of Australia, The Association of National Advertisers, The Federation of Australian Commercial Telecasters and Broadcasters, and sporting groups throughout the country. It carries out intense, ongoing lobbying with major federal and local political parties and groups, and a continuous contact program with the media.

2024978023

VOLUNTARY ADVERTISING CODE

The Australian tobacco manufacturers have strictly observed a Voluntary Advertising Code which was first established in 1965. The code has been revised several times to meet with changing conditions such as the ban on radio and television advertising. A copy of the current version is attached.

At the annual Health Ministers' Conference held in June 1977, the Federal Minister, Ralph Hunt, persuaded the State ministers to agree to the appointment of a Working Party of medical administrators to meet with tobacco manufacturers to develop a new industry code of advertising.

Our first tactic was to respond to the "invitation" with a proposal that the terms of the discussion should be widened to include the health aspects of smoking, and an offer to join with the Government in a research program. As regards the Voluntary Code, we have stated that we could not discuss this unless representatives of the advertising industry were present because any decision taken would ultimately affect a whole host of other product categories under attack by minority groups. Any "sweet-heart" agreement between ourselves and the government would weaken the whole concept of freedom and right to market legal products. A copy of a letter presenting our case to the Tasmanian Health Minister, Mr. Lowe, is attached, together with subsequent correspondence with him and the Tasmanian Director-General of Health, Dr. A.D. Ross.

Meanwhile, the health administrators' Working Party presented the industry with a proposal, or more correctly a demand, which closely resembles the January 1976 code for cigarette and tobacco advertising and promotion accepted by the Canadian Tobacco Manufacturers' Council. A copy of the Working Party's draft is attached.

The draft virtually condenses into 11 (subsequently 12) rules the 19 laid down by the Canadian code.

2024978024

Rule 1 of the Working Party's draft states:

"All advertising of cigarettes and tobacco shall conform to standards acceptable to the Advertising Standards Council, shall be directed only at adult smokers and be intended only to effect a change of brand."

This rule combines 6 and 7 of the Canadian Code in which rule 6 states:

"All advertising will be in conformity with the Canadian Code of Advertising Standards as issued in 1967 by the Canadian Advertising Advisory Board."

Rule 7 states:

"Cigarette or cigarette tobacco advertising will be addressed to adults 18 years of age or over and will be directed solely to the increase of cigarette brand shares."

Rule 2 of the Working Party's draft has a strong similarity to rule 2 of the Canadian Code.

Canadian rule 2 states:

"The industry will limit cigarette and cigarette tobacco advertising, promotion and sponsorship expenditures for any year to 1971 levels. The limit will be revised annually to compensate for cost increases or declines."

Rule 2 of the Working Party code uses these words:

"Tobacco companies will limit cigarette and tobacco advertising, promotion and sponsorship expenditures for any year to 1977 levels. Future levels may be indexed in accordance with the

2024978025

Consumer Price Index."

The similarity continues to rule 3 of both codes. The Working Party rule is:

"Advertising of sponsored events associated with brand or corporate name or logo will not include package identification, product selling line or slogan, or the words 'cigarette' or 'tobacco'."

The Canadian requirement is:

"Advertising of sponsored events associated with brand or corporate name or logo will be limited to non-broadcast media and such advertising together with promotional material will not include package identification, product selling line or slogan or the words 'cigarette' or 'tobacco'."

The Working Party's code introduces for the first time in rule 10 the restriction that "no cigarette or cigarette tobacco product may be advertised on posters or boards in the immediate vicinity of primary or secondary schools."

This has been lifted from the Canadian Code's rule 11 which states:

"No cigarette or cigarette tobacco product will be advertised on posters or bulletin boards located in the immediate vicinity of primary or secondary schools."

Rule 11 of the draft code combines the requirements of rules 12 and 13 of the Canadian code.

Rule 11 states:

2024978026

"The words 'WARNING - SMOKING IS A HEALTH HAZARD' will be used in all cigarette and cigarette tobacco print advertising. In addition, they will be prominently displayed on all public transport advertising (interior and exterior), market place advertising and point of sale advertising."

The requirements of rules 12 and 13 of the Canadian code are:

Rule 12 - "All cigarette packages, cigarette tobacco packages and containers will bear, clearly and prominently displayed on one side thereof the following words: 'Warning: Health and Welfare Canada advises that danger to health increases with amount smoked - avoid inhaling'."

Rule 13 lays down that:

"The foregoing words will also be used in cigarette and cigarette tobacco print advertising. Furthermore, it will be prominently displayed on all transit advertising (interior and exterior) airport signs and subway advertising, and market place advertising (interior and exterior) and point of sale material over 144 square inches in size but only in the language of the advertising message."

Noteworthy omissions from the requirements of the Canadian code are rules covering average tar and nicotine content.

To accept this draft would be a retrograde step for the Australian industry. It proves the point that if someone sneezes in Ottawa, we might well catch a cold in Canberra.

Following intense lobbying of State Premiers and Health Ministers, we are confident that the Working Party will face considerable internal problems particularly those of its members representing New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland where tobacco growers have been organised to present industry views forcefully to the Government.

2024978027

SPONSORSHIP OF SPORTING AND CULTURAL ACTIVITIES

The Australian tobacco manufacturers have sponsored sporting events and promoted cultural activities for a number of years.

Philip Morris Ltd. began its association with sport in the late 1950's, and is now a major sponsor of tennis, football, motor racing and other sports.

The Philip Morris Arts Grant has provided a notable stimulus in such fields as modern painting, photography and animation since its inception in 1973. The State Premiers of South Australia and New South Wales have warmly praised our company for the way in which it has fostered the arts.

We maintain that in today's business environment it is increasingly necessary to communicate a corporate image. This image is highly relevant in dealings with Government, other business firms and institutions, and the general public. It is important also in attracting the best possible recruits to management, sales and manufacturing. Sponsorship of sport, patronage of the arts, educational grants and scholarships, and assistance to a wide range of charities are some of the many ways of building a corporate image.

So far, there has been no attack on our assistance to the arts.

Sponsorship of sporting events, which attract excellent media coverage, including television and radio, has come under fire from various quarters.

In 1975, the Tasmanian State Government almost succeeded in passing legislation which would have made health warnings compulsory on all forms of cigarette advertising.

We persuaded the sporting organisations in Tasmania to attack the legislation as a threat to their survival on the ground that they would lose all tobacco sponsorship if warnings had to be displayed on

2024978028

signs erected at sporting venues.

South Australia had passed similar legislation to Tasmania, but agreed under pressure from sporting bodies not to enact the law until three other states passed the same type of bill.

In Victoria, the Minister for Sport & Recreation and the Minister for Health condemned sporting organisations which accept sponsorship from tobacco companies. Dr. Gray has made similar attacks.

So far, all the attacks on sponsorship have failed, for the following reasons:

- * Australians love sport, whether they are actively involved or merely spectators. We had little trouble in persuading sports writers to defend our sponsorships, as many of them are closely involved in corporate promotions.
- * Sporting organisations are desperately in need of funds and see tobacco sponsorship as either irreplaceable if they have it, or highly desirable if they do not have it.
- * Most importantly, we actively encouraged the formation in 1976 of the Confederation of Australian Sport, a national body representing about 5.5 million sports people.

2024978029

PASSIVE SMOKING

The passive smoking issue is one which has been very cunningly pursued by the anti-smoking lobby.

In March 1976, we published a pamphlet on "Cigarette Smoke & The Non-Smoker", which proved by chapter and verse that there was no proof whatever that tobacco smoke was a health hazard to non-smokers in normal, everyday conditions.

The pamphlet was widely circulated, and has had a noticeable impact. Before the Senate Committee, Nigel Gray conceded that the health risk from passive smoking is slight, and that the pressures for restrictions in such areas as modern trams and buses, small restaurants, lifts, etc. would be based on public opinion rather than public health requirements.

Nevertheless, State Governments have imposed smoking bans on metropolitan public transport - not necessarily for health reasons, but to save cleaning costs. Our efforts to combat the transport bans are detailed in the following section of this report.

There have been a number of attempts to have restaurants compelled to provide separate areas for non-smokers.

Recently, the Victorian Commission of Public Health sought the reactions of the Licenced Restaurateurs Association of Australia to a proposal to introduce legislation for separate non-smoking areas.

The licenced restaurateurs asked the tobacco manufacturers to assist them in preparing a reply. This was done, but as the restaurateurs in this country would not be expected to have an expert knowledge of the subject, we also prepared and presented our own submission detailing scientific evidence on the passive smoking issue. A copy of our submission to the Commission of Public Health is attached.

2024978030

We are endeavouring to enlist the aid of hotel proprietors, who also serve meals, and we are confident they will resist vehemently any move to legislate for non-smoking areas.

The Victorian Government is strongly promoting tourism, and we are stressing to the Premier that the State will become a laughing stock in the tourist trade if restaurants are segregated.

2024978031

ADVERTISING AND YOUTH

The anti-smoking organisations frequently state that cigarette advertising, particularly of the Marlboro brand, is responsible for an increase in the incidence of smoking by the young.

There is considerable evidence that advertising is not an important factor in young people beginning to smoke.

The Australian National Health & Medical Research Council published in 1969 a study on "Smoking Habits & Attitudes of Australian School-children", when television and radio cigarette advertising was at its height. The report listed nine reasons why children take up smoking, and advertising was not mentioned. As you know, overseas studies give similar findings.

It appears that more young people are smoking now than in previous years, yet we have had a complete ban on television and radio advertisements for one year, and a gradual phase-out over the preceding three years.

John Blizard, a Sydney based research psychologist, believes that children may be taking up smoking precisely because it is condemned by Governments, health authorities, etc. and that the ban on advertising may be a real factor in arousing their natural curiosity and rebelliousness to try the forbidden fruit.

We believe a survey to discover why children take up smoking could elicit a strong response along these lines, and further highlight the point that our advertising is designed to effect brand switching, not to recruit new smokers.

2024978032

SMOKERS' RIGHTS LEAGUE

Over the past two years, Australia's six State Governments and the Capital Territory administration have introduced smoking bans on all or some of the public transport systems operating within their respective capital cities.

The anti-smoking organisations have used their very considerable influence to persuade State Transport Commissions to prohibit smoking on health grounds. In reality, the motivation behind the bans has been mixed. The prime factor appears to be cost saving, disguised under pretexts of cleanliness, fire hazard, etc. Public transport notoriously runs at a loss in this country, and cleaning costs are very high.

On the whole, protest by commuters has been spasmodic and unorganised. However, in Sydney, our largest capital city, people tend to be less easily intimidated by officialdom than in the rest of Australia, and more resentful of the gradual undermining of their rights.

We have taken a number of steps to consolidate opposition to the ban. A Smokers' Rights League was formed after discussions between industry representatives and a Mr. Clive Anthony, an irate smoker who has had a number of letters and interviews published in the daily papers. Although Mr. Anthony tends to rush in where angels fear to tread, his enthusiasm has served to focus media attention on the issue, and to arouse public support for a return to the system of separate smoking areas on transport vehicles.

2024978033

By design, our tactics have been varied to avoid giving the anti-smoking zealots a fixed target. Newspaper advertisements have been inserted by the Smokers' Rights League, mainly to solicit members. Other advertisements have appeared under the banner of the New South Wales Retail Tobacco Traders' Association, highlighting in a deliberately unsophisticated way the results of a survey which showed that 60 percent of regular commuters favoured separate areas for smoking.

This survey, conducted by Australian National Opinion Polls, was funded by the tobacco industry. However, a popular Sydney newspaper, the Sunday Telegraph, agreed to commission the survey and publish the results. A telling point in the findings was that more than half the non-smokers interviewed agreed that smoking should be allowed if special areas are set aside.

Dr. William Whitby, a genial pipe-smoking family doctor, has entered the public transport smoking debate to defend the rights of smokers and to attack the prevailing view of his medical confreres. This is a most unusual event in Australia, where the medical fraternity either support the anti-smoking movement or feel they cannot risk their livelihood by opposing the party line set by grant-giving Government bodies, the Australian Medical Association and all other medical and quasi-medical institutions.

Dr. Whitby first came to our notice nearly two years ago when he published an anonymous letter in The Australian, our only national daily. His letter supported Professor Philip Burch, whose ideas on lung cancer causation had been written up by The Australian, and he congratulated the paper on giving space to the other side of the smoking and health story.

Judicious ferretting revealed the identity of the anonymous doctor, and he readily responded to our initial contact.

2024978034

When the Smokers' Rights league began to get under way, Dr. Whitby wrote letters to the press condemning the transport ban and attacking one of the leading anti-smoking spokesmen, Dr. Gordon Sarfaty, Medical Director of the N.S.W. State Cancer Council.

Two of Sydney's four television channels immediately sought to interview Whitby; one for a popular evening news program, the other to debate against Dr. Sarfaty on a leading current affairs program.

With very little time available, tobacco representatives briefed Whitby as thoroughly as possibly on the key issues and persuaded him to take a crash course in television interview techniques.

The interviews proved quite successful. Dr. Whitby told the current affairs director he would walk out unless he received fair treatment, and the first taping was stopped while the director asked Dr. Sarfaty to tone down his comments.

Whitby was introduced as a spokesman for the Smokers' Rights League.

Calm and confident, he quietly smoked his pipe and insisted that there was no scientific proof from laboratory experiments that smoking causes lung cancer or heart disease. While admitting that he was not a cigarette smoker, he insisted on the news program that the case against cigarettes was not proven.

Whitby is now being briefed in greater detail, and is continuing his debate with the smoking and health "authorities" in the major daily papers. Our objective in supporting him, apart from the transport campaign, is to encourage other doctors to join him in his stand.

Towards the end of August, the Transport Minister, Mr. Cox,

announced that the trial ban would be extended to the end of September to enable his Department's own survey of commuters to be completed and analysed.

For some unknown reason, Mr. Cox's statement was not published in Sydney, and we were able to go ahead with plans for an advertisement to coincide with the end of the trial period, as previously announced, on September 7.

This advertisement was inserted by the Federated Tobacco and Cigarette Workers Union of Australia. Spokesmen for a number of other unions have indicated they are opposed to the ban, and official union decisions are being sought.

The Tobacco Workers Union and the Clerks Union have sponsored petitions circulated at the two Sydney cigarette factories for presentation to Mr. Cox.

The secretary of the North Auburn Labor Party branch - Mr. Cox's electorate - has resigned in protest over the dictatorial attitude of the Minister to the smoking ban. This event and the trade union involvement are bound to cause some embarrassment to the Labor Party State Government.

Some members of the Liberal Party Opposition have strongly criticised the ban. Sir Eric Willis, Leader of the Opposition in the N.S.W. State Parliament, has called for separate areas for smokers to be restored on trains and double-decker buses. Sir Eric is a non-smoker. He had planned to raise the question in Parliament, but we advised against this, as the issue would then tend to be resolved on party lines, with the Government inevitably winning.

2024978036

CONFEDERATION OF AUSTRALIAN SPORT

The Confederation of Australian Sport was formed in 1976 to unite the wide range of sporting organisations scattered throughout the country.

Faced with increasing threats to our sponsorships of sporting events from the anti-smoking lobby, Philip Morris Ltd. took the initiative and invited a few of the key figures in Australian sporting administration to discuss the possibility of setting up a national Confederation.

The purpose was twofold: to enable the sporting bodies to lobby effectively for the restoration of Federal Government funds to assist Australia's national and international sport; and to create a strong defence of company sponsorships, particularly those of the tobacco industry.

The venture has been an amazing success. Within twelve months of its formation, the Confederation represents more than 80 sporting bodies with a combined membership of some 5.5 million people - the vast majority of those associated with active sport in this country. The Confederation has recently gained the Australian Olympic Federation and the Commonwealth Games Association as special members.

The salary and office expenses of the Confederation's President, Wayne Reid, are paid by the Australian tobacco manufacturers under a separate consultancy agreement with each of the three companies.

Mr. Reid is a popular, well-known and highly respected sporting administrator. Aged 39, he has just retired as President of the Lawn Tennis Association of Australia after eight years in office. A member of Australia's Davis Cup squad in 1960, he pursued a very successful business career as Managing Director of a large family business. He is also engaged in a number of other important civic undertakings.

2024978037

Mr. Reid defended the right of sporting organisations to accept sponsorship from tobacco manufacturers during a widely publicised inquiry conducted by the Australian Broadcasting Tribunal. He has effectively countered opposing submissions of various organisations. Naturally, we were closely involved in the preparation of Reid's submission.

As part of our preparation for the annual conference of Health Ministers held in June, Wayne Reid approached the State Premiers on behalf of the Confederation of Australian Sport, seeking assurance that the State Governments would not endorse any move aimed at restricting sponsorship or imposing unacceptable conditions on sponsoring companies. The reply of the Victorian Premier, Mr. Hamer, was typical of the response:

"I have discussed this matter with my colleague, the Minister for Health, and as you will appreciate my Government strongly supports any education program that will reduce the health hazards attributable to smoking. However, we are not at present considering any further restriction on cigarette advertising or requiring warning notices over and above those currently in force, nor have we any intention of interfering with current sponsorship arrangements."

Over a period of several months leading up to the announcement of the 1977-78 Federal Government Budget, Wayne Reid and his Confederation lobbied Federal politicians to win a guarantee of substantial aid for Australian sport.

As a result of this effort, the Liberal Government has at last recognised its obligations to national and international sport, and the extraordinary success of the Confederation has been widely acclaimed by the Australian press.

2024978038

Mr. Reid and another director of the Confederation have been appointed to the six member Sports Advisory Council recently established to advise the Federal Government on matters affecting sport, and to administer Federal grants to sporting organisations.

With the Confederation in such a strong position, it is unlikely that either the Federal or State Governments will take any action to restrict the sponsorship of sporting events by cigarette manufacturers in the foreseeable future.

2024978039

CORPORATE ADVERTISING

Having burnt their fingers somewhat by criticising sporting organisations which accept tobacco company sponsorship, our opponents have switched their attack against a particular form of corporate advertising.

A recent inquiry conducted by the Australian Broadcasting Tribunal was used by Dr. Gray to censure the tobacco manufacturers over television advertisements announcing a Test Cricket series sponsored by the Benson & Hedges Company (B.A.T.). Gray claimed the advertisements were in breach of the ban on electronic media cigarette advertising - if not against the letter of the law, certainly against its spirit.

Wayne Reid, President of the Confederation of Australian Sport, and at the time also President of the Lawn Tennis Association of Australia, brought the issue squarely back to the desperate need of sporting bodies for company sponsorship, and strongly defended the right of his member associations to accept support from the tobacco industry.

Dr. Gray has not conceded defeat on corporate advertising. We have now learned that he has approached one of the television stations with an offer to sponsor sporting telecasts. Gray says he has a large sum of money available for this purpose from World Health Organisation funds. He already has a series of anti-smoking advertisements prepared for television, and these are being test marketed in the Victorian provincial city of Ballarat. Gray's links with the International Union Against Cancer have served him well.

There is little likelihood that any of the major commercial television networks will be prepared to take up Gray's proposal since it would bring them into conflict with major sporting bodies.

2024978040

Our contractual arrangements with sporting bodies include an escape clause allowing us to withdraw sponsorship in the event of anti-smoking legislation being passed which would interfere with our freedom to associate a corporate name with the contractor's sporting event. This applies, for example, to the Marlboro Company and the Marlboro Australian Open Tennis Championships.

2024978041

SENATE DRUG INQUIRY

The Australian Senate Standing Committee on Social Welfare conducted an inquiry into the use and abuse of drugs (1976-1977).

The key attack on the tobacco industry was made by Dr. Nigel Gray, Director of the Anti-Cancer Council of Victoria. Dr. Gray is also Chairman of the International Union Against Cancer's Special Project on Smoking and Lung Cancer, and a member of the editorial advisory board of the U.S. publication "World Smoking & Health".

In his submission, Gray adopted the position that the smoking and health controversy had been resolved in Australia, since all State Governments had legislated for a health warning on cigarette packets and both Liberal and Labor Federal Governments had passed anti-smoking legislation. A strange way to resolve a highly complex scientific controversy!

The Victorian Anti-Cancer Council also pointed out that the tar content of Australian cigarettes had come down significantly since 1969, and that the number of ex-smokers had increased, particularly among older age-groups. The Senate Committee was asked to "consider the effect of these two factors on lung cancer death rates." The "effect" to which the Anti-Cancer Council alluded was an apparent downturn in Australian male lung cancer death rates in the 55-59 and 60-64 age groups between the years 1970 and 1973 - a remarkably rapid effect!

(Subsequently we have obtained figures from the Federal Health Department showing that male lung cancer death rates in 1974 and 1975 for ages 55-59 and 60-64 were considerably higher than 1973 levels. It remains to be seen whether this marks a resumption of the upward trend in these age groups.)

We responded by presenting a fully-documented case proving that there was still a very strong and continuing debate on smoking and health in scientific circles, at least overseas if not in Australia.

2024978042

The Federal Health Department felt obliged to prepare, in haste, a rebuttal of our evidence, which degenerated into mud-slinging abuse for lack of scientific proof.

We have vigorously attacked the findings of the Senate Inquiry, which would amount to an all embracing advertising ban and the use of excise as a tool to curb consumption.

In this, we have been joined by a number of other influential Australian organisations, notably among them the Media Council of Australia; the Association of Australian National Advertisers and the Advertising Association of Australia

2024978043

STRATEGY FOR 1978 AND ONWARD

We are faced with an inevitable and continuing struggle against powerful and implacable opponents.

Our basic position, as stated in evidence to the Australian Senate Standing Committee on Social Welfare in April 1977, is as follows:

"The industry knows of no experimental evidence which indicates that smoking causes diseases and the issue of causation remains controversial and unresolved. We are aware of a number of studies which claim that for a minority of smokers a statistical relationship exists and we are aware that a substantial number of medical authorities are of the opinion that a causal relationship exists. On the other hand, there is also substantial medical opinion of equal eminence which expresses doubt that the case against smoking has been proven. In our view this highlights the need for further research into the nature and causation of any relationship between smoking and disease."

We regard the anti-smoking forces as hypocritical and deceitful. In many cases they are ignorant of scientific research, and rely almost entirely on unfounded propaganda.

Dr. Nigel Gray, Director of the Anti-Cancer Council of Victoria, has expressed his attitude to smoking and the tobacco industry in these terms:

"Something should be done about it. The community should be able to control them in the same way as a mad dog is taken off the street."

Gray has said the issue is "purely political". He believes that what is required in the fight against smoking is:

2024978044

"a degree of commercial understanding; some ability to understand the motivations and prevarications of the tobacco industry; some capacity to communicate with politicians at their own intellectual level; the ability to appreciate the difference between scientific fact and what the public relations industry regards as truth and, finally, a modest amount of instinctive, intuitive and unintellectual animal cunning."

Regretfully, we must adopt methods similar to those of our opponents, and yet remain, like Caesar's wife, above reproach.

We cannot hope to win in a head-on confrontation. Our tactics must be to discover our opponents' weaknesses, attack those particular points, cause as much confusion as possible, and attack somewhere else while their attention is distracted.

Our method of attack must be constantly varied so as to deprive our opponents of a clear target. Surprise is a key element.

Applying this philosophy, we are continually studying our opponents and their strategy to discover any areas where we can embarrass or even defeat them.

Some recent examples of our endeavours are outlined in the following pages.

2024978045

OTHER POLICY FACETS

The three manufacturers have agreed to form an Australian Tobacco Institute, and are currently seeking a suitable Director.

However, we do not see the Institute as the focal point of all our endeavours in the smoking and health field. Our philosophy is to build up a number of strong bodies of resistance outside the industry itself, particularly in areas where public opinion can be marshalled on our side.

The Confederation of Australian Sport and the Smokers' Rights League, outlined above, are examples of how this policy is being pursued.

We are also enlisting the support of unions, not only tobacco workers, but those with membership extending through a wide range of industries as well as our own, such as the Federated Clerks Union of Australia. Their assistance in collecting petitions and forwarding letters to State Premiers and other politicians has been most valuable.

We have close contacts on the Media Council of Australia, which is vitally concerned with any attempts to restrict freedom to advertise. Members of the Council have strongly represented our mutual interests to politicians in e.g. Victoria and Tasmania.

Reference was made earlier in this paper to the strength and unity of the Australian medical fraternity in their opposition to smoking. Although we know there are many doctors in Australia who do not support the extreme position advocated by Dr. Nigel Gray and his followers, it is extremely difficult to find one who is prepared to make a public statement which conflicts with the accepted doctrine that smoking causes lung cancer, etc.

2024978046

Since the Federal Health Department controls research grants, there is a well-founded fear among medical scientists of losing financial support if they publicly oppose the official line. Similarly, both general practitioners and specialists are concerned at the very real possibility of losing patients if they speak out.

Hence the significance of Dr. William Whitby's stand on the smokers' rights issue. Now that a family doctor has emerged who is not afraid to publicly oppose the medical bureaucracy, we will be doing our utmost to persuade others who privately agree with Dr. Whitby to come out and support him.

The transport ban campaign demonstrates that, even in Australia, public debate will eventually bring out defendants of legitimate industries and established customs, provided civil liberty is involved.

At Philip Morris, we have made good use of our film library as a means of informing influential contacts that there is a continuing controversy over smoking and health, despite the repeated denials of the anti-smoking organisations.

We have learnt a great deal by undertaking the earlier described campaigns, and have seen some short-term successes. However, the streamlining of our efforts over the past couple of years will contribute to a more assured industry stance in the future. That is the best reassurance we can offer to millions of ordinary Australians who derive pleasure from smoking.

2024978047

2024978048