

PHILIP MORRIS

USA

120 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10017

FRANK E. RESNIK
PRESIDENT
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

January 7, 1988

TO: The Members of the Executive Committee

FROM: Frank E. Resnik

Attached for your information and review are materials relating to a discussion that will be held next Wednesday at our meeting in California. The materials concern the proposed "Operation Downunder," which you initially heard about at our November meeting.

I hope you will have an opportunity to review the attached materials before our meeting.

Attachment

MWM



T112050353

Conclusions of Downunder

- Science has not established a health risk to non-smokers from ETS
- ETS is nonetheless an annoyance to some non-smokers
- It is therefore proper policy for businesses, restaurants and other public places to accommodate the preferences of smokers and non-smokers even through designated smoking areas where necessary and appropriate
- Government intervention in this matter should only be a last resort and should place maximum responsibility on proprietors to assure smokers and non-smokers are accommodated in all public places

Situation

- perception of issue
- trends in smoking restriction legislation
- media reporting of this legislation
- business responses
- effects on smokers
- trends towards bans/anti-smokers have captured issue/popular support

Strategy

- provide public restatement of industry position to capture issue/popular support
- support private initiatives on smoking accommodation in private business
- use legislative process to compel accommodation of smoking
- continue scientific battle in separate forum

Benefits

- increase industry leverage in legislatures
- provide an acceptable area for smokers in all social contexts
- provide a statutory basis for smokers to assert a right to smoke
- isolate anti-smoking forces
- allow industry to claim victory for smokers with passage of accommodation legislation thus reversing perception that all smoking legislation is anti-smoking

Risks

- raise visibility of issue (already visible)
- concede smoking can be legitimately limited (right to smoke implies right to smoke-free area)
- promote government intervention (already a fact)

Tactical Plan

- Public Relations, Advertising and direct mail campaign stressing smoking accommodation including separation and designated areas
- When politically feasible, model legislation introduced in state where restrictive legislation is already at issue
- Initiative campaigns mounted in states to reverse state legislation and pre-empt local legislation
- Science (CIAR) and AISIE

RESULTS OF ETS SURVEY

1--AWARENESS OF ETS

- HALF THE COUNTRY IS AWARE OF INDOOR AIR POLLUTION
- ETS TOPS LIST OF CAUSES BOTH AS FIRST ITEM MENTIONED AND IN AIDED RECALL
- IN UNPROMPTED RESPONSE 55% SAY ETS IS HARMFUL TO HEALTH AND 31% SAY IT IS LIKE SMOKING CIGARETTES

*****HIGHLY VISIBLE, NEGATIVE ISSUE FOR US

2--ETS AND NONSMOKERS

- 70% OF NON-SMOKERS ARE ANNOYED BY ETS, 42% ARE VERY ANNOYED
- SMELL LEADS HEALTH DANGER INDICATING ANNOYANCE OVER HAZARD
- HALF OF NON-SMOKERS ARE ANNOYED BY ETS AT LEAST ONCE A WEEK OR MORE
- RESTAURANTS ARE MORE COMMON PLACE WITH WORKPLACE FOLLOWING (AREAS WHERE PEOPLE ARE TOGETHER)

*****REAL PROBLEM TO NON-SMOKERS

3--NON-SMOKERS REACTIONS

- NON-SMOKERS GENERALLY MOVE RATHER THAN ASK SMOKERS TO PUT OUT CIGS
- MOST SMOKERS ARE POLITE AND OBEY RULES MOST OF TIME
- IN RESTAURANT SEATING PEOPLE TEND TO BE ACCOMMODATING; SMOKERS MORE THAN NON-SMOKERS

*****A MATTER OF CONCERN BUT NOT YET A BATTLEFIELD

4--ETS AND HEALTH RISK

- 2/3 NON-SMOKERS SAY ETS IS PRIMARILY HEALTH RISK
- 80% OF ALL SAY IT IS A HEALTH HAZARD
- ALTHOUGH SMOKERS THINK IT IS PRIMARILY AN ANNOYANCE, THEY TOO THINK IT IS A HEALTH HAZARD
- BUT 70% OF NON-SMOKERS WOULD STILL OBJECT TO ETS IF IT WERE NOT HEALTH RISK

****AT THIS POINT WE HAVE LOST THE HEALTH DEBATE IN THE PUBLIC MIND BUT HAVE A SHOT AT SPLITTING ANNOYANCE FROM HEALTH ISSUE

5--SMOKERS AND PRESSURE

- OVER HALF OF SMOKERS ARE UNCOMFORTABLE SMOKING AROUND NON-SMOKERS
- RESTAURANTS AND OFFICES LEAD LIST
- 40% OF SMOKERS WOULD FEEL LIKE 2ND CLASS CITIZENS, MOST ALREADY DO IF ONE LOOKS AT RATING OF SMOKERS BY SMOKERS, 20% RATE VERY NEGATIVELY

****ETS IS A DRIVING FORCE IN THE SOCIAL UNACCEPTIBILITY OF SMOKING

6--GOVERNMENT AND ETS

- MAJORITY FAVORS PRIVATE APPROACH TO ETS OVER GOVT
- 85% FAVOR ACCOMMODATION AND COMPROMISE WITH FEW LAWS
- SOME NEGS ON AD BAN AND SURGEON SMOKE-FREE SOCIETY

****GOVT IS NOT PERCEIVED AS THE SOLUTION TO ETS

RESULTS OF ETS SURVEY

7--ETS POLICIES IN SPECIFIC AREAS

- SOME AMBIVALENCE AMONG NON-SMOKERS OVER PREFERENCE FOR BANS BUT FEELING IT IS IMPRACTICAL -- SENSE THAT COMPROMISE IS BETTER WAY
- STRONG SENTIMENT FOR SEPARATION AND COURTESY OVER BANS IN SPECIFIC AREAS
- STRONG PREFERENCE FOR BUSINESS RULES OVER GOVT INTERVENTION IN BARS, RESTAURANTS, AND WORKPLACES
- SMOKERS SUPPORT COURTESY AND SEPARATION MORE THAN NON-SMOKERS
- SMOKERS SUPPORT BUSINESS RULES OVER GOVT MORE THAN NON-SMOKERS

***OUR STRESS ON ACCOMODATION AND COURTESY COMBINED WITH KEEP THE GOVT OUT OF THE ETS ISSUE HAS BROAD SUPPORT ESPECIALLY AMONG SMOKERS

8--DOWNUNDER STRATEGY

- 40% OF PEOPLE CORRECTLY PERCEIVE OUR POSITION, THE REST ARE DIVIDED
- SEPARATION WILL DEFINITELY RESOLVE CONFLICTS IN SOME VISIBLE AREAS
- OVER 70% BELIEVE THE SEPARATION APPROACH IS WORKABLE
- THOSE OPPOSED ARE EITHER ANTIS OR BELIEVE PROBLEMS CAN'T BE SOLVED

*****NON-SMOKERS AND SMOKERS DID NOT DIFFER IN THESE RESPONSES/ NOW DOWNUNDER

9--DOWNUNDER PRESENTATION

- 82% OF PEOPLE AGREED WITH DOWNUNDER APPROACH, 40% STRONGLY AGREED
- SMOKERS AND NON-SMOKERS WERE IN ACCORD ON THIS ISSUE
- GENERALLY PEOPLE LIKED THE COMPROMISE, SEPARATIONS AND END TO ANNOYANCE (ALL VOLUNTEERED ANSWERS)
- 18% THAT DISAGREED APPEAR TO BE ANTIS OR CYNICS
- 37% SAID THEY WOULD LOOK MORE FAVORABLE ON US

*****IN THIS NATIONAL SURVEY DOWNUNDER HITS THE MARK 82%

10--ANTIS REACTION

- WE PUT THE ACS AND ALA OUT FRONT IN OPPOSITION WITH THEIR VERY HIGH FAVORABILITY RATING AND 57% OF PEOPLE OPPOSED THEM, 76% OF SMOKERS
- THIS ALSO HURT THEIR FAVORABILITY RATION AMONG NON-SMOKERS AND ESP SMOKERS

***SOME ISOLATION OF ANTIS

11--CONCLUSIONS

- ETS IS BAD ISSUE FOR AND IS GETTING WORSE
- RESOLVING HEALTH RISK WILL NOT RESOLVE ISSUE
- COURTESY, ACCOMODATION AND PRIVATE INITIATIVES STILL HAVE SOLID SUPPORT
- AS MUCH AS WE CAN MREASURE IN A SURVEY, THE DOWNUNDER APPROACH WILL WORK

DOWNUNDER PRESENTATION

1. Now, I am going to read you a short paragraph that might appear in your local newspaper. After I have read the paragraph, I would like to obtain your reactions.

"Today, a major cigarette manufacturer announced a new policy on public smoking. Because this company recognizes that cigarette smoke can be annoying to non-smokers, it has reconsidered its position on this issue. While this company believes that science has not established any health risk to non-smokers from cigarette smoke, it has decided to support policies providing for separate smoking and non-smoking areas in restaurants, hotels, work places and other public areas. This cigarette company is providing assistance to groups developing these policies. The company says that this change in their policy is in the best interest of both smokers and non-smokers and should help both groups get along better."

2. Do you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose, or strong oppose this policy?

		Smokers	Non-smokers
Strongly favor	40	41	39
Somewhat favor	42	40	43
Somewhat oppose	8	8	9
Strongly oppose	10	10	9

3. What do you feel are the good points of this policy (asked of favorables)?

Creates separate sections	20
Compromise/cooperation	18
Smokers won't annoy non-smokers	11

4. What are the potential problems (asked of favorables)?

Smoking is a health hazard	9
People will do what they want...	10
People disagree with policy	9

5. What do you feel are the problems with this policy (asked of unfavorables)?

Smoking is a health hazard	18
Cigarette companies won't back policy	17
Smoking should be banned	13
PR for cigarette companies	14

6. What are the good points (asked of unfavorables)?

No good points	26
Creates separate sections	12
Compromise/cooperation	11
A step in the right direction	11

7. Would this new policy make your opinion of this cigarette company more favorable, less favorable, or would it not make a difference to your opinion of the company?

		Smokers	Non-smokers
More favorable	37	33	39
Less favorable	7	7	6
No difference	56	59	54

REACTION OF ANTI-SMOKING GROUPS

1. And suppose you read a week later that groups like the American Cancer Society and the American Lung Association had declared that this company's new policy was inadequate and that these anti-smoking groups would support no policy other than a total ban on smoking in public places?

Would you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose the anti-smoking groups' stand?

		Smokers	Non-smokers
Strongly favor	19	8	25
Somewhat favor	23	15	27
Somewhat oppose	27	24	28
Strongly oppose	30	52	18

2. Would this make your opinion of these anti-smoking groups more favorable, less favorable, or would it not make a difference to your opinion of these groups?

		Smokers	Non-smokers
More favorable	18	9	23
Less favorable	22	34	16
No difference	59	56	60