

CIGARETTE ADVERTISING AND "TARGETING"

- Proponents of tobacco advertising bans claim that cigarette advertising is improperly "targeted" at racial minorities, women and Third World populations.
- The "targeting" claim implies that women, racial minorities and people of less-developed nations are incapable of making their own decision and need to be "protected" by government censorship.
- Not only is this attitude patronizing and paternalistic, it is not supported by data.

Minorities

- The insulting claim that African-Americans are particularly "vulnerable" to cigarette advertising is not supported by data. According to the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Surgeon General:
 - black smokers tend to start smoking at an older age than white smokers.
 - black smokers smoke fewer cigarettes per day.
 - heavy smoking has been consistently more common among whites compared with blacks.
 - until very recently smoking among blacks overall was declining at about the same rate as among whites in recent years, or, in some instances, was declining at a faster rate.
- Patterns and trends in smoking among Hispanics do not suggest that Hispanics are "vulnerable" to cigarette advertising:"
 - According to the Center for Science in the Public Interest, based on several surveys, Hispanic women tend to smoke considerably less than blacks or whites, and Hispanic men, about the same rate as other men.
 - Rogers & Cranks study:" Hispanic males are as likely to smoke as anglo males, but consume few cigarettes. Hispanic females seldom smoke compared to anglo females.

2044030745

("Ethnic Differences in Smoking Patterns: Findings from NHIS 1988).

- A Centers for Disease Control 1988 survey reported that overall prevalence of smoking was lower among Hispanics than among non-Hispanics.
- The belief that minorities are peculiarly susceptible to cigarette advertising is not supported by data; it reflects a basic misunderstanding of advertising and an elitist attitude.

Women

- Cigarette advertising and promotion are not responsible for smoking among women, despite claims to the contrary.
 - Smoking among women has been increasing in a number of countries where cigarette advertising is banned, yet decreasing in a number of countries where advertising is permitted.
 - For example, in non-ban countries United Kingdom, The Netherlands, Denmark, Hong Kong and the United States, smoking incidence among women of most age groups has declined over the past several decades.
 - By contrast, in ban and near-ban countries Finland, Norway, Sweden and Singapore, smoking incidence among women of most age groups has increased since imposition of the bans.
- In many countries where smoking is increasing, this is part of a general disintegration of sex-based stereotypes. As more and more women enter the workforce, the traditional family structures and consumption patterns are changing.
- Trends in cigarette consumption are only one example of general disintegration of sex-based consumption patterns. Advertising reflects this, but is not responsible for it.
- As women have entered the workforce in record numbers around the world, it has altered traditional family structures and consumption of consumer products.
- Manufacturers of cars, electronic equipment and appliances, financial services companies, hotels and airlines have begun to solicit women for business. No one suggests that women are buying more cars, using credit cards more frequently or going

2044030746

out of town on business because they are being "targeted" by advertisers. Advertising followed the market.

- "[F]ar from being a moulder of society, [advertising] appears, for the most part, simply to reflect those attitudes and norms which prevail in a society at any given time." (John Jenkins, Tobacco Advertising and Children: Some Canadian Findings (1988).

Less-developed countries

- Studies show that advertising restrictions have had little if any effect on the level of cigarette consumption in less-developed countries. Factors such as urbanization, education and aging were found to be much more relevant.
 - Dr. Eugene Lewit (New Jersey Medical School's National Bureau of Economic Research): "Evidence from a sample of LDCs suggests that the existence of advertising restrictions per se had little if any effect in trends or on the level of cigarette consumption."
 - Each country shows its own pattern of consumption and reasons why certain groups might smoke, e.g., "urbanization is pinpointed as a "cause" of women smoking in Africa; urbanization, aging, education and employment are thought to cause more women to smoke in Latin America.

2044030747

TRADEMARK DIVERSIFICATION

- Trademark diversification is not an indirect means of advertising; it is a means of exploiting a trademark that has become known and, therefore has value.
- It's common practice for a company to "market" new products under a well-known trademark. For example, Coca-Cola has licensed its name for a line of clothing, the Jaguar logo appears on wallets and pens, and clothing designers lend their names to products like perfume, jewelry and bed linens.
- These efforts are not aimed at marketing of the "root" product, but at branching out into other product areas using a well-known, recognizable logo as a stepping stone.
- Trademark infringement is a problem for any company with a well-known logo. cigarette manufacturers, like manufacturers of other legal products, face unauthorized use of their trademarks, including on products marketed to children. Like other companies, tobacco companies take vigorous legal action to protect their rights.
- Some antitobacco activists argue that tobacco companies should not be permitted to use their logos on non-tobacco products. But tobacco companies are makers of a legal product and should not be denied the same opportunity other companies enjoy to capitalize on popular trademarks because of notions that condemn anything associated with tobacco.

2044636748

BRAND AND CORPORATE SPONSORSHIP

- Cigarette manufacturers have been long-time sponsors of sporting and cultural events through monetary grants and in-kind assistance; they were one of the first industries to do so.
- Sponsorship bans and restrictions intrude on the right of private groups and individuals to freely select their funding sources.
- Banning sponsorship of cultural and athletic events would have no effect on smoking rates, but would have adverse consequences for sporting and cultural activities. The monetary support provided by corporate sponsorships sometimes determines whether or not an event will be held.
- Corporate sponsorship can also provide other benefits -- it's not just money. There often is in-kind assistance in the form of mass marketing experience and knowledge, logistical support, and even the creation of financial management programs to ensure long-term viability of the donee organizations.
- This ultimately means higher quality, more professionally managed events, with reduced financial risk to the administrators of these organizations.
- There is no basis for claims that sponsorship is a form of advertising that influences people to smoke. It is absurd to suggest that non-smokers may be overcome with an irresistible urge to begin smoking by occasionally attending an event like Virginia Slims tennis, Kool Jazz Festival or Winston Cup stock car race.
- In addition, cigarette manufacturers do not sponsor sports or cultural events directed primarily at youth.
- The central goal of most corporate sponsorship is not to advertise a particular brand or product. Corporate sponsorship enhances the corporate image, and is a way to repay the loyalty of consumers and communities.
- It also demonstrates a corporation's responsibility to society and its good citizenship; internally, it's a real morale booster and encourages creativity.

2044030749

- If corporate sponsorship were replaced with government funding or earmarked taxes as some suggest, artistic, cultural and sporting groups could lose in-kind assistance, not to mention the threat of arbitrary and bureaucratic decision-making, and official censorship. Look what happened to the National Endowment of the Arts in the United States when the government got involved in determining definitions of art.
- Banning corporate sponsorship will have no effect on the incidence of smoking among adults or minors, but it could have a devastating effect on the future of many cultural and sporting events.

2044030750