

THE U.S. JOURNAL

OF DRUG AND ALCOHOL DEPENDENCE

JANUARY 1981

I'M SENDING CHESTERFIELDS to all my friends.
That's the merriest Christmas any smoker can have —

Chesterfield mildness plus no unpleasant after-taste

Ronald Reagan



CHESTERFIELD Buy the beautiful
Christmas-card card
...Once Upon A Time

Like many of his peers actor Ronald Reagan did a stint pushing cigarettes.
Read "What's Up Doc?" on page 6.

What's Up Doc?

Alan Blum, M.D. is a family physician at Lutheran General Hospital, Chicago, a fellow of the American Academy of Family Physicians, and the founder of DOC — Doctors Ought To Care, a national organization developing creative health strategies for the public.



ASIDE FROM TEACHING his wife to keep a "tiny little gun" by her bedside and giving friends like the president of Mexico a custom rifle as a gift, Ronald Reagan sounds like a man with a fair understanding of the importance of healthy lifestyles and moderation.

Asked last November by the publication *Medical Tribune* about the role of preventive medicine in federal health policy, Reagan responded: "I welcome the long-overdue emphasis on preventive health care and physical fitness that is making Americans more aware than ever of their personal responsibility for good health. Today's enthusiasm and emphasis on staying well holds the promise of dramatically improved health and well-being in the decades ahead.

"Additionally, health professionals, as well as individuals, have long recognized that preventing illness or injury is much less expensive than treating it. Therefore, preventive medicine combined with good personal health habits and health education can make a major impact on the cost of health care. Employers and employees, unions and business associations, families, schools, and neighborhood groups, as well as the federal government, can join in what is becoming a national crusade for better living."

Reagan did qualify his answer by adding:

"I emphasize that the federal government must not get in the way of local initiatives and should confine itself as much as possible to a support and/or advisory role."

That seems reasonable enough and consistent with conservative philosophy. But consider his answer to the question that followed.

Medical Tribune: "How do you reconcile Department of Agriculture support of the tobacco industry while federal health authorities spend

its use?

Mr. Reagan: "I do not believe that it is proper for the government to determine what crops farmers grow. Tobacco has long been a vital part of the economy of 17 states and I would not like to see the rug suddenly pulled out from under those who rely on the government's support price mechanism. Furthermore, the program often results in a surplus, or at least no cost for the government."

"I also recognize the need for the government to take precautions to safeguard the lives of Americans and support reasonable efforts to minimize damage caused by smoking. But I believe that people must be free to choose, even if that means they will hurt themselves in the process. It is simply a fact of life that people will hurt themselves as a result of drinking or driving or any number of human activities. As a matter of philosophy, I reject excessive government intervention in everyday life and thus reject any attempt to eliminate smoking; but I want to see the best possible health care made available to as many Americans as possible."

Pretty sappy, I'd say, but not as pitiful as Jimmy Carter's quick hop to North Carolina in 1978 to assure America and his tobacco industry colleagues that research will make cigarette smoking "even safer than it is today."

So Reagan doesn't want government intrusion into the lives of his countrymen — except to give away money to grow a lethal crop or, presumably to condone the continuation of significant tax write-offs for cigarette companies for their advertising campaigns.

But Reagan has his own hazy past involvement with the tobacco industry. In addition to hiring as a key campaign aide the recent past chief spokesperson for the Tobacco Institute, Reagan himself becomes perhaps the only president ever to have been on the payroll of a cigarette company. Thirty years ago Reagan was pictured in an advertising campaign for Chesterfields, manufactured by Liggett and Myers. A beaming Reagan was quoted as saying, "I'm sending Chesterfields to all my friends. That's the merriest Christmas any smoker can have — Chesterfield mildness plus no unpleasant aftertaste." Because Reagan did not smoke, the cigarette was drawn in.

Do things look bleak under Reagan in the battle to curtail cigarette smoking as a socially acceptable norm? Ironically, with the loss of Representative Drinan and other opponents of the cigarette industry and the Southern Republican take-over of the Senate, Reagan may come off looking progressive compared to Congress. The FDA and FTC grew increasingly impotent under Carter, and there's no cause for optimism there. Where, then, is there hope?

For one thing, whenever a "tight-fiscal-ed" conservative takes office,

support grows for private, non-profit groups who see the need to act where government obviously isn't going to. Much as he may dislike the role, Reagan now represents the Big Brother of federal government. Many people may even begin putting their money where their mouth is to get him and the cigarette companies off their backs. Once the federal government starts cutting back on health care payments, there will be an increasing awareness of just how great a percentage of health costs can be attributed to cigarette-related diseases. Inflation figures may even begin to consider the cost of cigarettes: I'm always amazed that few economists seem to mention that an unemployed couple who each smoke two packs of cigarettes a day will spend nearly \$1,500 a year on their habit (not including the cost of smoker's toothpastes, cold remedies, breath fresheners, dry cleaning, etc.) a greater amount than the average couple spends on health care.

GIVING CREDIT where credit is due, the Office on Smoking and Health doubtless played a role in this year's stunning Surgeon General's report on smoking and health. In the "What's Up, DOC?" columns of February, 1979 and January, February, and March-April, 1980, I commented at length on the Achilles heel of the tobacco industry: chemical additives. This year's Surgeon General's report suggests that these hundreds of "top secret" additives (including the same chemical used as a solvent in brake fluid) render meaningless the advertising claims of the alleged safety of "low-tar" cigarette smoking. Most consumers of the product hadn't any idea that there is anything other than tobacco and paper in a cigarette. Perhaps at long last cigarettes may become a consumer issue, as smokers demand to know what kind of poisons have been added to their product. Who knows? The tobacco may turn out to be the safest thing about a cigarette. (More on the report next month).

THE U.S. JOURNAL
OF DRUG AND ALCOHOL DEPENDENCE

THE U.S. JOURNAL OF DRUG AND ALCOHOL DEPENDENCE

VOL. 5 — NO. 1

Published in Miami, Florida

FEBRUARY, 1981

What's Up Doc?

Alan Blum, M.D. is a family physician at Lutheran General Hospital, Chicago, a fellow of the American Academy of Family Physicians, and the founder of DOC — Doctors Ought To Care, a national organization developing creative health strategies for the public.



WHEN IT COMES to totally preventable health problems such as cigarette smoking, I am both a therapeutic and research nihilist. That is to say, I believe there will never be a "safe" cigarette, a 100 percent (or anything close) cure for smoking behavior (so long as cigarettes are glorified by the media) or, for that matter, a cure for lung cancer. (You can't restore tissue that's no longer there).

The findings noted in "The Changing Cigarette" the latest Surgeon General's Report — and perhaps the last if President Ronald Reagan has any say — do not surprise me: In essence, it is said, there is no such thing as a safe — or even safer — cigarette.

Perhaps the major point of the well written 237-page report is that it is not so much what is in cigarette smoke that causes the multifarious health problems but the fact that smoking in any form can cause great harm. Switching from a so-called "high tar" to a "low tar" cigarette is, in the words of a recent ad of Great Britain's Health Education Council, "like jumping from the 36th floor instead of the 39th." (Tar, incidentally, refers to all the solid substances trapped in a certain laboratory filter; it is made up of thousands of chemicals including at least 30 carcinogens).

A key term is what the report calls "compensatory smoking," i.e. if the smoker compensates for reduced tar yield by increasing the number of cigarettes, the depth of inhalation or the volume of

smoke exposure (page 7). The Surgeon General is concerned that although per capita cigarette consumption is down slightly, the proportion of smokers who say they smoke 25 or more cigarettes a day increased from 23 percent in 1970 to 28 percent in 1978 (page 80). To put it in more relevant disease-oriented terms, "the smokers of lower-tar and nicotine cigarettes who compensate by smoking more or by inhaling more deeply might thereby increase their risk of developing obstructive airway disease (page 149). In addition, lower tar cigarettes do not decrease the risks among pregnant women of spontaneous abortion, premature birth, or low weight babies (page 159). And there may even be a higher rate of coronary heart disease among younger smokers of filtered cigarettes (page 120).

A related concern of the report is that the use of machine smoked cigarettes (from which data are derived that are printed on cigarette packs) greatly underestimates the tar yield. The average smoker takes larger and more frequent puffs than the machine. To that end, tar content of the average cigarette has fallen by 32.2 percent since 1968; nicotine by 25.6 percent. Why? There is simply less tobacco, greater length of filters, and more paper (page 23).

But that's not all: "An additional concern is that the production of cigarettes with lower tar and nicotine yields may involve the increasing use of additives for tobacco processing or flavoring. Some additives available for use are either known or suspect carcinogens or give rise to carcinogenic substances when burned. The use of these additives may negate beneficial effects of the reduction of tar yield or might pose increased or new and different disease risks (page 8).

"The nature of these additives, and their combustion products, that are currently used in marketed cigarettes is not available to the public or to the Government (page 56). In other words, tobacco companies refuse to name the ingredients.

So here we have an industry subsidized to raise a carcinogenic crop, then secretly adding chemicals that may even be more dangerous than the tobacco itself.

Dr. Joseph Davis, Medical Examiner of Dade County, Florida, sees one way out of the international genocide fostered by the cigarette industry. At the turn of the century, he points out, China's Boxer Rebellion, a native uprising, was an attempt to rid the country of the oppressive British Opium traders who thrived on the widespread debilitating opium addiction of a large proportion of the population. Could there be a latter day Boxer Rebellion in the U.S.? He hopes so.

THE U.S. JOURNAL OF DRUG AND ALCOHOL DEPENDENCE

Page 6/April 1981

What's Up Doc?

by Alan
Blum, M.D.



AR FROM BEING a tragedy for journalism, as chagrined newspaper editors across the country are wailing, the surrender by the *Washington Post* of a Pulitzer Prize won under fraudulent circumstances may be the worst thing to happen to the news media in many years.

It is ironic that "Jimmy's Story," the fabricated article about an 8-year-old heroin addict that won the award for the *Post*, dealt with drug abuse.

Jimmy does not really exist in Washington, D.C., he may well exist somewhere, partly, I submit, because of the mass media's largely uncritical promotion of a drug-oriented culture. From the more obvious examples — countless police shows dealing with drug pushers, the rock music world's appeal to adolescent rebelliousness (subsidiaries of the news media are actually in this big business), and the tacit acceptance for too many years of marijuana's alleged harmlessness to the endless pushing of the counter drugs and the veritable blitzkrieg of alcohol and cigarette advertising, the mass media have helped turn nearly every home to one kind of a drugstore or another. Only newspaper people would give each other an award for writing about a situation they themselves might have helped prevent.

The *Post* case should cause us to see what — and whom — news media defend and for. (One of the best places to turn for a glimpse of the publishing world is A.J. Liebling's essays *The Press*.) As I have tried to point out any times in this column, while newspapers are proclaiming great poses of cover-ups in government, medicine, or business (other businesses besides newspapering, that is), that victimize the little guy, they themselves fail for the most part to touch on unethical and illegal practices of the advertisers in such areas as retail stores, food markets, major league sports, and the cigarette and alcohol industries. Journalists could do well to start asking questions not just about reporting and writing but also about publishing.

In the libel case of Carol Burnett versus the *National Enquirer*, the case seemed obvious. The magazine lied. To me, its coverage of medical stories is not much better. "Top Doctors Reveal . . . DRINKING IS GOOD FOR YOU" reads the front page headline in a recent issue. The magazine's coverage of alcohol issues, apart from demeaning public

figures like Carol Burnett by alleging public drunkenness or alcoholism, seems almost designed to promote only the healthful benefits of alcohol. Could this have anything to do with the heavy sponsorship by liquor advertisers? Similarly, just about the only stories on smoking deal with miracle cures for lung cancer and heart disease or "simple" ways to prevent smoking-related diseases by means of vitamins or laboratory tests. (In other words, keep on smokin' 'cause there's bound to be a cure.)

Between 75% and 100% of the color advertising in any given issue of the *Enquirer* is for one product: cigarettes. There is a smug assumption in the medical profession that the *Enquirer* is a scandal sheet and not worthy of discussion. I think this attitude is contemptuous of the 5,000,000 people who buy — and are misled by — the *Enquirer* each week. Besides, the question remains: where should we strike back, at the distorted reporting or at the advertisers and publishers who keep it that way?

(The *Enquirer's* counterpart, *The Star*, similarly financed by the alcohol and cigarette industries, sends reporters to nearly every major medical meeting. It too, seems to tout lung cancer cures or preventives as just around the corner, but it has never run a front-page (or any page) story pointing out that cigarette smoking is the single most preventable cause of death and disability in the country.

Newspaper and magazine publishing are increasingly monopolistic businesses that manage to cloak themselves in the First Amendment whenever the least critical challenge is raised.

Two years ago as a member of the Resident Physicians Section of the American Medical Association, I proposed a resolution, passed after heated debate, that called on the House of Delegates of the AMA to vote on divesting several thousands shares of tobacco stocks from the holdings of the AMA Membership Retirement Plan. The vote still has not taken place, but the resolution has been written about in the *Wall Street Journal* and *Medical World News*.

I consider it a conflict of interest for a health organization to profit from an investment in anti-health industries. One argument in defense of the holdings is the kind of misinformed reasoning I am hearing more and more. "Why pick on the tobacco industry?" the argument begins. "It's losing customers and it's diversifying so rapidly it won't be in business much longer anyway."

The low profile of the industry (in contrast to the omnipresence of its brand names) appears to have succeeded in conveying the impression that it is losing money. Yet even American Brands, one of the few truly diversified cigarette companies, is reappearing on many brokerage houses' recommended "buy" lists. And on April 22, Philip Morris outbid R.J. Reynolds for a 22 percent share of Rothman's, one of the world's largest cigarette companies. Now who would pay astronomical sums for a losing proposition?

On the very same day, more than 1000 American daily newspapers carried full-page ads by Philip Morris that proclaimed, "Merit Family Expands." The use of the word "family" to introduce a new cigarette brand is obscene. Then again, leave it to Philip Morris to celebrate an abortion.

THE U.S. JOURNAL OF DRUG AND ALCOHOL DEPENDENCE

Page 6/June 1981

What's Up Doc?

by Alan
Blum, M.D.



WHEN THE INITIAL report came out on May 7 that the Office on Smoking and Health had cancelled the release of the Brooke Shields ad series, I was not surprised. I even fell for the reason given — that Brooke Shields was an inappropriate choice by virtue of her having portrayed a child prostitute in the movie "Pretty Baby", complete with nude scenes.

And, my initial reaction to the American Lung Association's condemnation of the government for canning the ads was that it was a publicity ploy. After all, what has the ALA done in the area of counter-advertising besides churning out dull ads with an annoying child saying, "It's a matter of life or breath"?

Although the ALA has a notable history in combatting tuberculosis, it is a relative novice when it comes to other problems, including cigarette smoking. The ALA has never spent a penny to purchase counter-advertising to discourage the promotion of the leading preventable cause of lung disease. It doesn't think it has to because of all the public service time it gets.

But public service time is not real advertising.

Even the U.S. government buys ad space when it truly wants to sell a message (This year alone, the government will spend over \$150 million to attract men and women to the armed forces).

In short, the purchasing of counter-advertising space to poke fun at cigarette promotion — a concept originated by DOC (Doctors Ought to Care) in 1977 — has yet to be done on a large scale by any health charity or government agency.

I contacted Frank Greve, the Knight-Ridder reporter who uncovered details of the cancellation of the Brooke Shields ads. I was not surprised to



Brooke Shields campaign modeled after DOC poster?

learn that those who screened the ads at the Department of Health and Human Services were of the right-to-life, moral majority orientation.

The only catch was that one of them, Carl Anderson, special assistant to HHS Secretary Schweiker, was most recently legislative assistant to Senator Jesse Helms, a man who would eliminate food stamps and retain subsidies for tobacco farmers.

HHS officials, including HHS Chief of Staff David Newhall III or Carl Anderson, chose not to respond to repeated phone calls. Rather, I was provided a news release which attempts to portray Schweiker as the savior of the Office on Smoking and Health, notwithstanding the fact that the \$1.1 million he "salvaged" is only a fraction of that budgeted four years ago.

It should be noted that the Office on Smoking and Health, which has heretofore produced a smattering of noncontroversial ads, is primarily a technical service to researchers and probably best serves the tobacco industry by providing updated bibliographies of the world's literature on smoking.

When word of the cancellation of the ads hit the mass media, I received dozens of calls and letters from people familiar with DOC's counter-advertising campaign. "You got ripped off," several suggested. "They stole DOC's ad."

I spoke with Paul Brickman, manager of the Chicago ad agency, Clinton E. Frank who explained how his agency recruited Shields and photographers Richard Avedon and Francisco Scavullo. "All three of these people are non-smokers and believe in non-smoking," he said.

Brickman also disagreed with any notion that Shields was an inappropriate role model. "Pre-testing of the ad among kids showed that it was very effective," he said. "It seems that adolescents don't see her as an older man's fantasy but as a trend-setter for American youth."

The best thing about the whole incident, as Brickman points out, is that "the exposure has been phenomenal. News programs on all three networks have run out of the commercials, and such primetime exposure probably exceeded anything it might have gotten."

Leave it to the moron majority at HHS to claim that their real reason for cancelling the campaign was that the ads would be "ineffective." In a strict sense, that's true, since the government would never purchase space in order to run a real campaign.

That leaves the American Lung Association to play hero and pick up the ads. DOC meanwhile has congratulated the ALA for at long last recognizing the satirical approach as an effective possibility.

DOC has also requested that the ALA credit DOC for the advertising concept and that it follow up by purchasing counter-cigarette advertising.

DOC has even invited the ALA to co-sponsor such advertising. Unfortunately, in the health charity business, it's every fund-raiser for himself, and no two health agencies are likely to cooperate — even in the interests of good health.

(Alan Blum, M.D., is founder and president of DOC and writes a quarterly column for The U.S. Journal).

THE U.S. JOURNAL

OF DRUG AND ALCOHOL DEPENDENCE

August 1981/Page 6.

What's Up Doc?

by Alan
Blum, M.D.



MIX 'N MATCH these headlines that have appeared in *The New York Times*, *Chicago Tribune*, and other American sports pages in 1980 and 1981:

- "Bob Welch: Young, Talented, and an Alcoholic"
- "Dennis Lick Stuns Bears: I'm alcoholic"
- "Fixers Paid Jockeys with Cocaine"
- "Plucknett, Holder of Discus Records, Barred in Drug Use"
- "Ex-Bear Charged in Cocaine Sale"
- "Twins Confirm Pitcher Fighting Alcohol"
- "Sox' Barrios Arrested on Drug Charge"
- "4 Drugs Reported Used by Ali"
- "Former Jet Speaks out on his Life of Drugs"
- "Why Drugs, Fergie? 'You get bored'"
- "Jenkins-Kuhn Accord Reached"
- "Phillies Denounced on Drugs"
- "Boat Races Buck Tide with Dope Trade's Big Cash"
- "Camel GT. Where a man belongs. Pabst 500 Week-end."
- "Racing at its finest. Smoking at its best. Nobody does it better."
- "Winston Pro series" (sanctioned by the American Motorcycle Association)
- "Winston Drag Series. (sanctioned by the National Hot Rod Racing Association)

Winston Cup Series.

Winston Rodeo.

"Miss Budweiser makes shambles of Gold Cup" (American Power Boating Association)

"DePaul Blue Demons: This Bud's for You. Here's to a Great Season!"

"Marlboro Cup winner Ready to Tackle Bid in Woodward"

"A pinch is all it takes" — Earl Campbell, football star for SKOAL smokeless tobacco."

"Smoothness counts in the making of a champion and in the making of a fine whiskey." Smooth As Silk KESSLER."

"Bill Russell Puts One Up for Our Olympic Team. Own the Budweiser 1984 Olympic Games Art Collection"

"Play Ball." We're all glad to hear those words again. The players are back on the field, the Hawk is back to the booth and the baseball season is back to normal. Busch is pleased to be able to bring it all to you again. So sit back, relax, pop open a cold, smooth Busch and enjoy the Red Sox on Channel 38. Head for the Mountains. Busch."

"Why Viceroy? Because I'd never smoke a boring cigarette."

"1981 U.S. GOV'T REPORT: CARLTON LOWEST."

"Raleigh Lights invites you to enjoy 'Genuine Tobacco Taste' and the Raleigh Lights Sioux Falls Expo 1981 Rodeo, Sanctioned by the International Rodeo Association."

"Free from NEWPORT! Reserved seats to a Chicago Horizon soccer game."

"Camel Expeditions. Maine's Allagash Wilderness. Where a man belongs."

They've switched to Natural Light: Wall Frazier, Catfish Hunter, Mickey Mantle, Nick Buoniconti, Joe Frazier.

"Win a KOOL balloon flight. Enter the KOOL Sensation Sweepstakes."

"The Thinking Man's Whiskey."

"Name the LITE BEER Celebrities."

"Can Nancy win three years in a row? Watch her defend her title in the \$125,000 Golden Lights Championship."

THE U.S. JOURNAL OF DRUG AND ALCOHOL DEPENDENCE

Page 6/September 1981/The U.S. JOURNAL

What's Up Doc?

by Alan
Blum, M.D.



THE FOLLOWING MAILGRAM was sent by DOC (Doctors Ought to Care) to the federal Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms which recently held a hearing on advertising practices in the alcohol beverage industry:

"On behalf of the membership of DOC, a national non-profit organization of 1,000 physicians and others that is counteracting the advertising of unhealthy lifestyles to children and teenagers, I wish to express our concern over the blitzkrieg of beer advertising at we have reason to believe is aimed directly at young people. As health professionals, we see daily the devastating toll taken by the moderate use of alcohol. It is especially enervating to see the innocent victims of traffic accidents caused by drunken teenagers.

Our interviews with liquor store owners, advertising copywriters, directors and salesmen, and our extensive documentation of newspaper sports sections and sports magazine advertising trends leaves no doubt whatsoever that the breweries — far more so than the wine or liquor segments of the industry — are aiming a major part of their messages at teenagers. By their increasing sponsorship of televised sporting events, especially those that associate risk-taking with manliness, the major brewers have abdicated responsibility for ethical promotion.

The sponsorship by Phillip Morris of "beer busts for Easter Seals" makes a mockery of the fact that alcohol is one of the leading causes of birth defects. The cooperative advertising of liquor and soft drink

companies (for example, Seagram's 7 and Phillip Morris' 7-Up) and the diversification of Coca-Cola into the wine business are ominous trends.

Even symbolic efforts such as requisite ingredient labeling, warnings to young women, and refusal to permit the words "light" or "natural" or the sponsorship by breweries of televised sporting events will encourage parents to believe that they again have society's support in taking back the rearing of their children from the false authority figures drummed up by Madison Avenue at the behest of the brewers.

As one who enjoys a beer with meals and has even recommended beer to some patients, I should add that DOC is not a prohibitionist group and would have preferred voluntary restraint on the part of the industry, but we have no reason to believe it is so inclined."

Alan Blum, M.D., President, DOC

JOHN R. RICHARDS, M.D., of Martinez, Georgia, brought to my attention the fact that Anheuser-Busch's Budweiser and Natural Light beers helped to fund the Muscular Dystrophy Association's 1981 telethon, hosted by Jerry Lewis.

An Augusta, Georgia, radio station co-sponsored a series of "Beer Busts for Jerry's Kids" with the brewery, notwithstanding a call from Dr. Richards to the station manager informing him that alcohol is a leading preventable cause of kids with birth defects. After a very pregnant pause, the station manager expressed his embarrassment and appreciation to Dr. Richards.

In the wake of its Chelsea baby beer fiasco, I would have thought Anheuser-Busch had learned not to mess with children. I'm indeed naive.

IF YOU SHOULD happen to have seen the movie "Superman II," you will have paid to see a 10-minute cigarette commercial sponsored by Philip Morris. Not only does Lois Lane smoke Marlboros but there is also a lengthy scene involving an overturned Marlboro delivery truck with a huge logo. Forget the fact that there is no such thing as a Marlboro delivery truck. Kids don't know that.

THE U.S. JOURNAL OF DRUG AND ALCOHOL DEPENDENCE

November 1981 6

What's Up Doc?

by Alan
Blum, M.D.



THE FOLLOWING is an excerpt of a letter from James H. Lutschg, M.D., Baton Rouge, Louisiana, to *Sports Illustrated*. So far, at least, it has not succeeded in altering the magazine's aggressive selling of cigarettes — athlete prevention, to coin a phrase:

"It is ludicrous that a publication that dedicates itself to reporting sports activities, where excellence in training and conditioning mark the winner, should promote cigarette sales. There may be light at the end of the tunnel yet. Noting one of your most regular advertisers (Philip Morris) has each pack emblazoned with, 'veni, vidi, vici' (I came, I saw, I conquered), and your lack of sensitivity in this area that results in 13 full-page ads for cigarettes (including the back cover, with the front cover being cut down to make the four-page fold-out even more conspicuous, I presume it is only a matter of time before you will succumb to letting the cigarette companies have the front cover. It may be then that the infamous jinx that plagues those that make your cover will then be their lot. By this method you may help conquer cigarette-related diseases which currently kill and cripple more people than any other preventable illness."

For an idea of how *Sports Illustrated's* publisher might respond to such a letter, I am indebted to Ron Davis, medical student at the University of Chicago School of Medicine, for passing along the following advertising copy in a recent issue of the U.S. Tobacco Journal:

(A photograph of horses leaving the starting gate. The caption:)
Comin' out smokin'.

Who can help tobacco advertisers keep a step ahead in the race to sell their product? *Sports Illustrated*. Each week 16,000,000 readers turn to our pages and many of them are the people you

most want to reach. In fact, no other newsweekly reaches men 18-49 as effectively as we do. And we reach them in a unique and vital way: with sports news. It's some of the biggest news in their world each week. It's news they're really involved in. And it could make them more involved in your advertising message as well.

What's more, we back it all up with the largest merchandising department in the business. We can take your company right to your salespeople, your distributors, and your best prospects in a variety of ways: with sports celebrities, sales incentives, direct mail, and more.

So call your *Sports Illustrated* sales representative or Guy Leedom, Smoking Materials Classification Manager, collect 212-841-4894. They can help your advertising message come out smokin'.

To my knowledge, not one sportswriter has ever written about a menacing subject that makes the greed of the baseball owners and players seem like a case of *Oliver Twist* by asking for a bit more gruel: the veritable take-over of the sport by the alcohol and cigarette industries. Small wonder why, since the leading advertisers in sports magazines and newspaper sports sections also happen to be the cigarette and alcohol industries.

This, then, is baseball today: Oakland manager Billy Martin and Yankees owner George Steinbrenner selling Lite Beer for Philip Morris; Steinbrenner and other owners expressing concern for the kids of America because of the baseball players' strike while accepting millions from Philip Morris, R.J. Reynolds, and British American Tobacco to put up huge signs for Marlboro, Winston, and Kool in nearly every major league stadium; Willie Mays and a prospective buyer of the Chicago White Sox being barred from baseball because of ties with legal gambling corporations, while the chairman of Annheuser-Busch continues to own the St. Louis Cardinals and the owner of the Atlanta Braves; drunk high school and college age rowdies leading to a doubling of the security force at Chicago's Comiskey Park; R.J. Reynolds sponsoring the entire sports results page in more than one hundred major daily newspapers; pretty, uniformed girls handing out free packs of Vantage cigarettes outside Chicago's Wrigley Field and other baseball parks.

In spite of the growing problem of teenage alcohol abuse and fully 30 years after the first conclusive reports of the devastating toll on the nation's health and economy by cigarettes, the beer and cigarette takeover is nearly complete. Thanks to major league baseball and other "sports," the pushers have succeeded beyond their wildest dreams in capturing yet another generation.