

**SECOND-HAND SMOKE PLAN
APRIL 6, 1994**

OVERVIEW:

Federal agencies, Congress and state and local governments are pursuing increasingly aggressive regulatory measures to limit exposure to second-hand smoke, citing an alleged risk or hazard to the non-smoking public. Despite the inability or unwillingness of these lawmakers and regulators to base their policy initiatives on sound, credible science, they are proceeding with growing momentum and gaining a degree of public support in the process. We believe this increasingly threatening regulatory environment warrants a more aggressive and intense public affairs outreach program to bring fairness and accountability to the policy making process.

The stakes for RJRT and the industry have never been higher. We need to act immediately, within the next 60-90 days, reaching a broad range of audiences. We should be prepared to take greater risks than ever before. And we need to join the battle or engage the enemy on as many fronts as possible. What follows are suggestions for doing just that.

- **OBJECTIVE:** To ensure a more balanced public smoking policy

APPROACHES:

- Create new messages and/or refine old ones
- Develop new communications vehicles/avenues
- Find new allies, energize the old ones
- Engage in the debate
- Visibility, visibility, visibility

PROJECT IDEAS:

REDACTED MATERIAL

Refine messages:

Assign team to develop messages by 4/13/94 which appeal to the common sense of the general public: Science is weak, second-hand smoke is annoying but can be avoided, separation of smokers and non-smokers works, general public favors separation. Show there is a controversy, case is not closed. Show how unreasonable antis have become. Force them to moderate their positions or be held accountable for their extremism. Reveal unreasonableness of lifestyle discrimination, prohibition, extremism. - *Sath*

Reach the public to foster a more favorable public opinion climate. Need to increase the awareness of what OSHA/The Administration has proposed; what RJR has done on the issue; your lifestyle choices could be "next"; show how alleged risk compares with others.

- Convene a high-level think tank of philosophers, professors, scientific ethicists, sociologists, historians, economists, psychologists, to discuss the issue to provide insight or new ideas on the issue. - *Sharon Goffe*

Develop new communications vehicles/avenues:

REDACTED MATERIAL

- Brochures on politics vs. science - *Betty*
- Print, broadcast advertising - *Tom, cig. equiv. - print*
- Direct mail, phone - *Smoker Rights Groups*
- Debates, news media interviews, editorial boards, talk shows, op-eds, letters to the editor, cartoons, scholarly books on politics of science, joke books, use tabloids for science debate/discussion, country/rap songs

Much of the work involving debates and interviews will require more spokespersons than we have currently. Suggest Coggins, Meyne, PR staff, field coordinators and SRG candidates, as well as candidates selected from the allies list below.



REDACTED MATERIAL

- Surveys
News media is receptive to them. A few are in the works, but other ideas include blue-collar workers survey; economic impact of bans on various sectors.

REDACTED MATERIAL

● Science and policy forums

Increase the call for responsible use of science in formulating policy through a forum to debate and draw attention to the issue. Open to the media, the event participants could include scientists, risk assessment experts, legislators critical of improper use of science, syndicated columnists, science writers and policy reporters, and current or former health officials.

The forum could be held in Washington, DC and sponsored by an institute or reputable think tank. Program would be broad enough to include a myriad of issues and concerns regarding various substances and issues, but would include SHS as a centerpiece and current example. Could also include:

— An overview of examples of where issues were driven by flawed science or without scientific support, such as SHS, pesticides, asbestos, ozone depletion, acid rain and resource depletion.

— A discussion of how sensationalism and unjustified media frenzies have effected behavioral or policy changes without scientific support, such as scares over alar, electromagnetic fields, polystyrene and other issues

— A discussion of responsible policy, where despite public and media pressure, sound science prevailed

— A segment on risk assessment that includes hypothetical risks vs. real risks and illustrates the levels of risk associated with common and uncommon activities. This would put SHS into perspective

— A number of print or video news releases could be developed to publicize the event and its findings. Excerpts of comments and summary of the debate could be developed and distributed to media, think tanks, Congressional Research Service and mailed to legislators and their staff. Could be sponsored by Columbia Institute or Heartland Institute. SIPI also a possibility.

● Media forums

We can also explore working with the Media Institute to explore the media's treatment of public smoking issue. Could include a forum or event to consider what factors most influence coverage of SHS issues and whether science has been overlooked or if the media has been too accepting of suspect scientific evidence being used to justify policy debates.

● Economic studies

Hire an economist to conduct a major study of the economic impact of smoking bans on many sectors, with emphasis on travel, tourism, hospitality, retail.

Find new allies, energize the old:

- Scientific/technical
- Hospitality/tourism/COC/club owners
- Labor unions
- ACLU-type organizations
- Groups based on libertarian principles
- Smokers
- Suppliers
- Farm groups
- Media
- Employees, particularly sales force
- Minority groups
- Special interest groups, such as SCAN

REDACTED MATERIAL

These groups could serve a variety of roles, including spokespersons, writers of op-eds and LTEs, and should be considered for signatories of certain types of advertising.

Engage in the debate. Be visible.

Whatever we decide, make sure we're in the debate often. Take all comers. Be aggressive. Leave no chair empty.

