

Ongoing Relationships Between the Tobacco Industry and Universities: An Insidious Obstacle to Tobacco Control

Background: Although more than 1,750 colleges and universities in the United States alone have become smoke free campuses over the past 20 years (including nearly 1,500 that claim to have adopted entirely tobacco-free policies), progress in reducing cigarette, smokeless tobacco, and hookah use among U.S. university students has slowed. Prevalence may be as high as 25%. Globally, reported smoking prevalence among university students ranges from 14% in Brazil to 60% in Bangladesh. A little-studied obstacle to reducing tobacco use among university students is the ongoing financial relationships between the tobacco industry and academia.

Results and Conclusions: Significant ongoing ties between the tobacco industry and academia include funding of research, investment in tobacco stocks by university endowment and faculty pension funds, involvement in business school curricula, and underwriting of lectureships, professorships, and career centers. The world's largest cigarette company, Altria (formerly Philip Morris), continues to recruit students at career center job fairs on more than 35 U.S. university campuses for internships and post-graduate positions as Marlboro territory sales managers. The company's recruitment slogan is "Can't Beat the Experience." Few university endowments have divested tobacco stocks. The largest college teacher pension fund, TIAA-CREF, also remains a major investor in Altria. Although progress has been made in reducing tobacco use on university campuses, coordinated strategies to diminish the influence of the tobacco industry in academia are lagging and require greater attention by tobacco control proponents.

Even at schools, where policies of tobacco-free campuses have been enacted, there has been push back, lack of enforcement, or simply the feel-good mentality of having enacted a policy that isn't as observed or meaningful as it sounds. (A. Blum, personal communication to Kate Cole, Apr. 23, 2013)

"In the US, there really isn't much that one can do to break the ties between a public university and tobacco companies" (AB email to Leah J. Rosen, Dec. 31, 2014)

2002: AB gave keynote address at 1st national conference on tobacco and universities, held at the University of Minnesota, mainly concerned with getting campuses to go smoke free. Although 140 college campuses in the US are now smoke free, the prevalence of tobacco use among university students exceeds 25%.

1980s: As head of DOC, AB created Project SNUFF (Stop Noxious University Funding Forever) and devoted many years trying to get universities to divest tobacco stocks. He made specific efforts to get Rice University and University of Texas to sell their tobacco stocks and protested Rice University's hosting of tobacco-sponsored concerts.

Relationships between universities and tobacco:

1. Tobacco companies' participation in campus job fairs (Marlboro Journal of Medicine cartoon); University of Washington has been the only other entity that has continuously worked on the subject of tobacco company recruitment of college students at campus career fairs. Little attention has been paid by health groups to the extensive involvement

by Philip Morris at campus job fairs and at 35 major university career centers. Any university that has schools of public health, medicine, pharmacy, dentistry, and nursing should not host a cigarette or chewing tobacco manufacturer, must less permit it to recruit students. It is at the discretion of the President and Board of Trustees of a university whether or not to permit the presence of tobacco companies on campus for a job fair. UCSF's undergraduate campus in Berkeley is prime recruiting campus of Altria. A Tobacco Studies Program, which actively involved and trained students to participate in action strategies against tobacco use and promotion, exists at the University of Washington. Along with a group of students, Kate Cole, former Coordinator of the University of Washington Tobacco Studies Program, held a protest at the entrance to the University of Washington Career Fair in 2013, at which Philip Morris was a participant. The students handed out flyers (about 500 of them) that scrutinized Altria's claims of "social responsibility" and collected signature on a petition calling on UW to stop any kind of collaboration with the tobacco industry. Many dedicated students, faculty, and staff worked to pass a 100% smoke-free and tobacco-free policy on campus and a ban on tobacco company presence on campus. No university has yet passed a ban on tobacco company presence on college campuses for corporate recruiting.

"10 job recruiters from Philip Morris USA hosted a catered reception for some two dozen students to tout the benefits of working for America's No. 1 cigarette manufacturer. If hired as summer interns or full-time territory sales managers, these future University of Alabama graduates, who themselves are highly unlikely to smoke, will be working to reinforce the nicotine addiction of countless young, poor and less-educated Alabamians. The lead recruiter of the group, UA alumna Tiffany Elliott, spoke eloquently about Philip Morris' core values, integrity and social responsibility. Nor did she deny that cigarettes cause lung cancer and a host of other diseases. 'We're very honest about what we do,' she told me. 'We know the product we have causes harm. We haven't always been honest about that. Our culture has definitely changed.' And she was most adamant that 'we don't want to pull in children.' The Philip Morris recruitment brochure distributed at the school highlights its Youth Smoking Prevention campaign, which portrays cigarettes as strictly an adult custom that parents should discuss with their children. But every parent already knows that teenagers seek rebellious and risk-taking ways to reject authority, so such a campaign may make smoking even more appealing to young people... To reach its youthful consumers, then, Philip Morris USA has stepped up its recruitment on college campuses, cultivating ties with 35 universities across the country... [In 2006, AB] was barred by a UA administrator from observing this year's Career Day, at which both Philip Morris USA and the RJ Reynolds Tobacco Co. were given prominent space to meet and greet hundreds of Alabama students... The stepped-up involvement of Philip Morris on the University of Alabama campus confirms findings of my published research, namely that cigarette manufacturers have succeeded in forging close ties to academia as a means of assuring the future strength of cigarette sales in the face of medical admonitions against smoking." ("With Open Arms")

2. Investment of university endowment and pension funds in tobacco stocks (Chronicle of Higher Education commentary; Financial Times letter): Project SNUFF to influence universities to divest tobacco stocks, but it only had modest success. In 1990, he reported the Chronicle of Higher Education that few universities divested tobacco stocks. Since tobacco stocks are highly profitable, investing universities are reluctant to give up such a lucrative source of income. Tobacco stocks are still held in high regard by investment advisors and are doing very well. The last institution to divest tobacco stocks did so in the early 2000s. The divestment movement essentially no longer exists. The activists who might have kept up the momentum are all gone, replaced by government bureaucrats and academic researchers funded by pharmaceutical or government grants. (Page from the prospectus of the TIAA-College Retirement Equities Fund from May 1, 2012, that lists the Food, Beverage, and Tobacco category of investments) On Dec. 31, 2011, the CREF Equity Index Account held 1,583,571 shares of Altria Group, Inc. (with a value of \$46,953,000 or 0.5% of net assets) and 1,344,113 shares of Philip Morris International, Inc. (\$105,486,000 or 1.0%); In January 2011, the group Physicians for a Smoke-Free Canada published a document that listed which Canadian institutions owned tobacco stocks, the number of stocks each institution owned, the value of those stocks, and the estimated dividends each institutional investor received. Notably, the Ontario Teachers' Pension Plan Board owned 375,794 shares of Philip Morris International. The value of those shares was \$22,017,771, and the dividend received was \$958,274.70.
http://www.smoke-free.ca/pdf_1/tobaccoholdings-january2011.pdf In an April 24, 1996, article in the *Los Angeles Times*, it stated that the "endowment funds of several large universities, including Harvard and Johns Hopkins," both of "which have prominent medical schools," eliminated tobacco stocks from their endowment fund investments. It also reported that the College Retirement Equities Fund "faced so much pressure to divest tobacco stocks that it created a separate investment fund, the Social Choice Account, as a tobacco-free vehicle for retirement investors." Some of the colleges and universities that divested their tobacco company stocks include the University of Washington (2000), University of California (2001), Harvard University (1990), Johns Hopkins University (1991), and Stanford University (1998), as reported by the Council for Responsible Public Investment.
<http://www.socialfunds.com/education/pdf/colleges.pdf> Also, the California State Teachers' Retirement System (June 2000) divested \$238 million from its passive accounts, the New York State Teachers' Retirement (April 1996) underweighted its tobacco stock by 25%, and the Vermont State Teachers' Retirement System (June 1997) divested all of its tobacco holdings. <http://www.socialfunds.com/education/pdf/public.pdf> During the 1990s, a great deal of divestment of tobacco company stocks took place. The Council for Responsible Public Investment "tracks and monitors institutions that have divested from tobacco stock holdings. It also has support materials to help members, students, and administrators help their organizations understand the importance of not investing in tobacco related companies."
<http://www.socialfunds.com/page.cgi/article6.html> In his letter to the editor of the *Financial Times*, the author wrote that "trying to convince the larger investment

community to kick the cigarette stockholding habit has been quite another thing. In 1986 I attended a meeting on ethical investing convened by a group called the Council on Economic Priorities, a self-described corporate accountability watchdog. To the investment managers of the many elite liberal arts colleges and universities in attendance, the list of stocks to be scrupulously avoided was topped by companies with holding in apartheid South Africa and those that produced items used in the manufacture of nuclear weapons. When I raised my hand to ask whether cigarette manufacturers should be added to the list because of the many deaths and diseases that their products cause, I was greeted by a chorus of groans. I was accused of wanting to abrogate freedom of choice and the average guy's right to smoke... Only when I pointed out that Philip Morris held a major stake in the South African cigarette company Rothmans did the group acknowledge that investing in tobacco stocks might be worth reconsidering. Not that they followed through. Neither the vast majority of universities nor the largest college teachers' pension fund (TIAA-CREF) have divested their tobacco stocks, which are simply too lucrative. The tobacco industry trumpets its efforts to eliminate the risks of smoking and all the research it funds and oversees to make smoking safer. Altria increased its ties to academic medical centers, such as the University of Virginia, to which it gave \$25 million (May 17, 2008 "Alchemy, the safer cigarette, and Philip Morris," *The Lancet*).

DOC pushed for divestment of tobacco stocks. "In 1981, a group of young physicians that I coordinated finally succeeded in persuading the American Medical Association to eliminate several million dollars' worth of tobacco stocks from its retirement fund. In 1984, we focused on university-based medical schools in Illinois. The resulting publicity led a few institutions, such as the University of Illinois, to sell their tobacco stock, but others, such as Loyola, refused to do so. Until this past June, when Harvard University and the City University of New York separately announced that they would divest millions of dollars in tobacco-stock holdings, little more was said or done in the academic community about the ethics of profiting from the sale of tobacco. Harvard acted after a local newspaper pointed out the hypocrisy of the university's investing in tobacco companies while collecting \$54 million in research grants from the National Cancer Institute in 1988, and after a group of physicians at its School of Public Health purchased time on the campus radio station to urge President Derek Bok to press for the divestiture. At CUNY, a member of the Board of Trustees, Edith Everett, raised the issue at a board meeting, saying: "Owning a stock makes one a partner in that company. Ownership in a company whose purpose it is to addict as many young people as possible to a lethal drug calls education leadership into question." At its next meeting, the board concurred, in a 9-to-2 vote... The issue of tobacco companies' support of university-based research... a refusal to accept such support would emphasize not only the immorality of profiting from tobacco sales, but also the intellectual dishonesty of the tobacco industry in its purposeful misuse and distortion of research. Little has been written about the possible ethical compromise for universities in accepting research money from the tobacco industry... For a university in 1990 to continue to hold a stake in a tobacco company shows contempt for the very knowledge that has been gained by university researchers about

tobacco during the past 50 years. Yet the difficulty in communicating this to the academic community can be illustrated by my experience at a seminar on socially responsible investing I attended a few years ago, along with students and faculty members from a number of institutions in the Northeast. Discussion was largely devoted to the ethics of holding shares in companies involved in building nuclear power plants or with ties to South Africa. Toward the end of the day, I inquired whether participants might not also urge their institutions to divest stock held in tobacco companies. The reaction was unanimous and could best be described as one of restrained outrage. 'No one forces anyone to smoke,' a professor who was on his university's investment advisory panel icily admonished me. 'Everyone knows about the dangers and has the right to choose,' added a student. The gist of the responses from that liberal-minded crowd was that people can kill themselves if they want to... The fact that smoking takes 390,000 American lives a year hadn't been reason enough, but the mere mention of a socially acceptable moral buzzword was sufficient to convince the entire group in an instant. Exploitation of the majority black population by the white minority in South Africa ought to spark moral indignation in everyone, but so should exploitation of black, Hispanic, and white youths by the tobacco industry in the United States." ("Colleges must eliminate tobacco stocks from their portfolios," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 1990). In the TIAA-CREF Annual Report of Dec. 31, 2016, the total number of shares in Altria Group, Inc. was 5,151,626 (with a value of \$348,353 or 0.3% of net assets) and in Philip Morris International, Inc. was 5,121,336 (with a value of \$468,551 or 0.4% of net assets). "In 1984 DOC (Doctors Ought to Care) created Project S.N.U.F.F. (Stop Noxious University Funding Forever), which succeeded in getting several medical schools to drop tobacco investments. In 1990 a member of DOC led a successful effort to convince Harvard University to divest its \$40 million in tobacco stocks... City University of New York became the second major university to sell its tobacco stocks. In 1991 executives of Philip Morris were so alarmed by the prospect of the sale of tobacco stocks by Johns Hopkins University (a former US cabinet member and professor at the university was a member of the Board of Directors of the tobacco company) that they visited the university in a futile attempt to convince trustees to retain their stock. At the University of Texas, a single student succeeded in getting half of the Board of Regents to vote to divest tobacco stocks, but the chairman broke the deadlock by voting to retain the investment. As a consolation, the board prohibited smoking on the entire campus." ("A review of divestment by medical organizations and academic institutions of shareholdings in tobacco companies," *Tobacco and Health: An Encyclopedia*, 1995, pp. 1005-1006) "Encouraged by the Boston-based Tobacco Divestment Project, students, faculty and alumni at other universities have formed organizations that are urging their institutions to dump cigarette stocks. In a speech delivered at the University of Texas on Oct. 5, former Surgeon General C. Everett Koop strongly endorsed the efforts of a newly formed group, Students Against Tobacco Investments. Koop noted the contradiction of a 'great university with a world-renowned reputation for the treatment of cancer at your M.D. Anderson Hospital, where 10,000 people are there each year because they smoked, and at the same time this university has an investment of almost \$50 million in tobacco.'

Thus far the chairman of the UT Board of Regents, Louis A. Beccherl, Jr., has defended the traditional policy of maximizing the return on endowment funds. At Rice University, which holds more tobacco stocks (\$33 million) than any other private educational institution in the United States, 30 members of a group called Rice Alumni for Tobacco Divestment last week sent a letter to university president George Rupp urging Rice to follow the lead of Harvard and CUNY in selling off tobacco stocks. The group is coordinated by Rice alumnus Phil Huang, M.D., who led the Harvard divestment effort.” (AB, “Universities have no business holding tobacco stocks,” *Houston Post*) “In 1984, DOC created Project SNUFF (Stop Noxious University Funding Forever) which targeted Illinois universities with medical schools and succeeded in convincing the University of Illinois to drop its tobacco stocks. In 1990, the tobacco Divestment Project (TDP) was formally launched as a new national campaign championing the proposition that it is unethical to profit from tobacco addiction... Last year while a student at the Harvard School of Public Health, DOC member Phil Huang, MD, MPH, created a radio advertisement in a course taught by media expert Tony Schwartz. The advertisement pointed out the hypocrisy of Harvard President Derek Bok’s call for university leadership in demonstrating strong moral and civic values, while Harvard continued to invest in the tobacco industry. The advertisement was aired on the Harvard radio station and generated local media attention. At the same time, Dr. Huang began working with a student representative to the University’s Advisory Committee on Shareholder Responsibility (ACSR). The ACSR subsequently made a unanimous recommendation to the Harvard Corporation that it establish a policy prohibiting future purchase of tobacco stocks. A petition calling for Harvard’s divestment was signed by over 300 students and faculty in the School of Public Health. These effort led to the announcement in May 1990 that Harvard had divested almost \$60 million worth of tobacco stocks because of ‘a desire not to be associated as a shareholder with companies engaged in significant sales of products that create a substantial and unjustified risk of harm to other human beings.’ The university also formally adopted a policy ‘prohibiting future purchase of stock in companies producing significant quantities of cigarettes or other tobacco products.’ That same month, the Board of Trustees of City University of New York (CUNY) voted to divest its \$3.5 million of Philip Morris stock after trustees and TDP board member Edith Everett noted that owning stock in a company ‘whose purpose is to addict as many young people as possible to a lethal drug, calls our education leadership into question.’ ... In February 1991, John Hopkins University announced the divestment of its tobacco holdings. The Johns Hopkins movement was led by a graduate student in the school of Public Health, Dr. Carl Latkin. His efforts began by gaining the support of the deans of the schools of medicine and public health and were followed by his delivery of an address to the Board of Trustees. In spite of a personal appearance by the chairman of Philip Morris and the fact that a Johns Hopkins faculty member is on the Philip Morris Board of Directors, the trustees voted unanimously in favor of divestment. DOC has played an active role in divestment efforts at Rice University. DOC funded the airing of another Tony Schwartz-produced radio advertisement which targeted Rice University President Dr. George Rupp, using excerpts from his 1990 commencement address to

point out inconsistencies between his public statements and the university's decision not to divest its tobacco holdings. At the University of Texas, senior student Ron Turk, aided by DOC, has successfully mobilized political support in Texas for the tobacco divestment movement... Although the Board of Regents narrowly voted against divestment by the University of Texas System, (a 4-4 tie vote was decided by the dissenting chairman) the discussion led to passage of a resolution banning smoking from all University of Texas facilities." ("DOC efforts spark major universities to divest tobacco holdings," *DOC News and Views: The Journal of Medical Activism*, Vo. 6, No. 2, Summer 1991) "It's sad that Harvard wasn't prompted by a moral imperative when it sold \$5 million in tobacco stocks. Its reason was fear that liability suits threatened its investment." (*Physician's Weekly*, Aug. 10, 1987, vol. 4, No. 30, "Should universities and medical schools sell their tobacco stocks?" AB) Last week, Haverford College, a small liberal arts institution near Philadelphia, announced that it was divesting itself of all tobacco stocks, specifically its shares in the Philip Morris Companies, the RJR Nabisco Corporation and American Brands. The college joins at least a dozen other institutions that have taken similar action in recent years -- among them, Smith College in Northampton, Mass., the City University of New York, Harvard University, Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, Tufts University in Medford, Mass., Wayne State University in Detroit and the public universities of Texas and Vermont. ("Colleges Ending Investments in Tobacco Stocks," William H. Honan, <http://www.nytimes.com/1997/05/21/us/colleges-ending-investments-in-tobacco-stocks.html>)

3. Tobacco product sampling on and around college campuses
4. Music events sponsored by tobacco companies on, or in the vicinity of, university campuses
5. Direct gifts by tobacco companies to universities: In April 2013, the Altria annual report had an announcement of a college scholarship program it established for Richmond, Virginia, students.
6. Board of trustees members with links to the tobacco industry: in 1994, AB and ES compiled a list of "healthcare hypocrites": tobacco company board members who also serve on the boards of hospitals and universities with medical schools.
7. Participation of tobacco industry executives in courses and other activities in business schools: one university business school that severed all ties with the tobacco industry is the University of Texas. In 2007, the UT School of Business made national news by barring the tobacco industry from funding any activities in the school.
8. Research grants to universities and individual faculty members: In 1987, the author was hired as a faculty member at Baylor College of Medicine in Houston, Texas, was told, regarding his research, "You should get into something more socially acceptable like cocaine," which was where the bulk of substance abuse funding went, not towards tobacco. Even foundations such as Legacy or FAMRI that claim they will not give funding to universities that take tobacco money have not abided by that claim, having rationalized that giving to a certain school within a university that says it won't take tobacco money is acceptable. Universities have accepted tens of millions of dollars in research grants from Philip Morris. Duke, Boston College, UCLA, the University of

Virginia, and Virginia Commonwealth University, among others, have accepted such lucrative tobacco industry research funding in recent years (Strange Bedfellows poster). The University of California Faculty Senate and Board of Regents managed to create a policy prohibiting the banning of researchers from accepting tobacco industry funding. "Another academic connection to tobacco that has come under increasing scrutiny is the acceptance of research funding from tobacco companies or industry-related research councils. In 1982 the University of Sydney in Australia became the first institution to reject all future tobacco industry funding. A 1992 survey by the American Medical Association, which that year rejected a policy statement that medical schools should reject research funding from the tobacco industry and its subsidiaries found that 52 of 95 medical schools responding accepted such funding. The morality of comingling of tobacco industry grants with government funding, such as from the National Cancer Institute, has received scant attention in the scientific community." ("A review of divestment by medical organizations and academic institutions of shareholdings in tobacco companies," *Tobacco and Health: An Encyclopedia*, 1995, pp. 1005-1006) The industry uses selected findings from research it pays for in advertisements, legal and legislative testimony and publicity campaigns by the Tobacco Institute, its public relations arm. The institute promotes the views of industry-supported researchers, thus fostering the notion that there exists a serious scientific dispute about the risks of smoking. It plays down research that has found smoking to cause illness while publicizing finds on the role of other factors, such as stress, eating habits or air pollution." (AB, "Universities have no business holding tobacco stocks," *Houston Post*) The issue of tobacco companies' support of university-based research... a refusal to accept such support would emphasize not only the immorality of profiting from tobacco sales, but also the intellectual dishonesty of the tobacco industry in its purposeful misuse and distortion of research. Little has been written about the possible ethical compromise for universities in accepting research money from the tobacco industry... For a university in 1990 to continue to hold a stake in a tobacco company shows contempt for the very knowledge that has been gained by university researchers about tobacco during the past 50 years. ("Colleges must eliminate tobacco stocks from their portfolios," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 1990)

AMA Calls on Investors to Dump Tobacco Stocks

April 24, 1996 MICHAEL A. HILTZIK and ROBERT L. JACKSON | TIMES STAFF

He compared the growing sentiment against tobacco investments to the campaign against South Africa, which also began among small institutional investors. State and local governments also began enacting sanctions barring investment in South Africa, he observed, a movement that culminated in congressional sanctions in 1986.

As it happens, several large institutional investors have already moved to pare or eliminate tobacco holdings from their portfolios. The trend began with institutions concerned with public

health: After the AMA's move in 1986, the American Heart and Lung associations also dropped tobacco stocks.

In the early 1990s they were followed by the endowment funds of several large universities, including Harvard and Johns Hopkins, which have prominent medical schools.

But divestiture has recently been expanding. On April 16, the state of Maryland announced that it had completed a full divestiture of its \$75.5-million holding of tobacco-related securities in its public pension accounts, realizing a \$35.6-million gain.

Sources say that the New York State Teachers Retirement Fund, one of the largest public pension funds in the nation, may announce today that it will "underweight" tobacco stocks in its indexed investment accounts. The fund's officials could not be reached for comment.

Indexed funds are those designed to replicate the makeup and performance of a major stock index, such as the Standard & Poor's 500. "Underweighting" certain stocks means holding less of them than would be warranted by their prominence in the index.

For many other investors, however, divesting tobacco stocks may pose delicate legal and fiduciary questions.

The California Public Employee Retirement System, whose \$98 billion in assets makes it the nation's biggest public pension fund, says it is prohibited by a 1992 constitutional amendment from using any yardstick other than investment return in making investment decisions.

Although the state Legislature is considering a bill to bar CalPERS from investing in tobacco-related companies, the pension fund has opposed the bill on grounds that it would violate the amendment.

At least one other large institutional investor, the College Retirement Equities Fund, faced so much pressure to divest tobacco stocks that it created a separate investment fund, the Social Choice Account, as a tobacco-free vehicle for retirement investors.

Other investment managers noted that similar "socially responsible" funds are offered by many companies. The AMA's campaign, however, is aimed at broad-based mutual funds that treat tobacco stocks as conventional investments.

"Tobacco is a big business that flourishes because investors put their money into it," said George Lundberg, editor of the Journal of the American Medical Assn., which is devoting its current issue to the campaign.

"If you value the health of the public . . . don't invest in heroin, cocaine or tobacco stocks," Lundberg said.

The AMA's call for divestiture covered the following 13 publicly traded companies making and distributing tobacco products:

Philip Morris Cos. Inc, RJR Nabisco Holdings Corp., Brooke Group Ltd., American Brands, Culbro Corp., DiMon Inc., Loews Corp., Mafco Consolidated Group Inc., Sara Lee Corp., Schweitzer-Mauduit International, Standard Commercial Corp., UST Inc. and Universal Corp.

Hiltzik reported from Los Angeles and Jackson from Washington.

* ECONOMIC IMPACT: U.S. gains jobs if Americans quit smoking, AMA says. D5

http://articles.latimes.com/1996-04-24/news/mn-62162_1_tobacco-stocks

Participation in Campus Job Fairs

Little attention has been paid by health groups to the extensive involvement of tobacco companies in job fairs held on university campuses, as well as career centers at 35 major universities.[1] While it seems counterintuitive that universities with schools of public health, medicine, pharmacy, dentistry, and nursing should permit tobacco companies to recruit students, it still takes place (A. Blum, personal communication, March 6, 2013). For example, the University of California, San Francisco, famous for its School of Medicine, is a prime recruiting campus for Altria Group, Inc. (A. Blum, personal communication, April 14, 2013). The University of Washington (UW) is one of the few universities that actively took steps to try to ban tobacco company recruitment of students at career fairs. Organized by Dr. Abigail Halperin, founder of the UW Tobacco Studies Program, which actively involves and trains students to participate in action strategies against tobacco use and promotion, a band of dedicated students, faculty, and staff members protested the presence of Altria at the UW career fair in 2013 (K. Cole, personal communication, April 23, 2013; A. Blum, personal communication, April 14, 2013). They handed out 500 flyers to participants that scrutinized Altria's claims of "social responsibility" and collected signatures on a petition that called on the university to stop all collaboration with the tobacco industry (K. Cole, personal communication, April 14, 2013). Although the effort to ban tobacco company presence on campus ultimately proved unsuccessful, the endeavor to pass a 100% smoke-free and tobacco-free policy on campus was a successful one. The President and Board of Trustees of a university are the ones who decide whether or not to permit the presence of tobacco companies at job fairs, and no university has yet passed a ban to prevent tobacco companies from recruiting on its campus (A. Blum, personal communication, March 6, 2013). At these job fairs, company representatives eloquently praise the company's integrity and social responsibility to potential employees, stating that tobacco products are only marketed to adults who already smoke.[1] They emphasize their efforts and commitment to prevent people under 18 from smoking.[1] However, the fact remains that recruited college graduates essentially work to reinforce the nicotine addiction of countless young, poor and less-educated people and that the tobacco companies continue their attempts to assure the future strength of cigarette sales.[1]

Research Grants

Another academic connection to tobacco is the acceptance of research funding from tobacco companies or research councils related to the tobacco industry.[2] Universities like Duke; University of California, Los Angeles; and University of Virginia have accepted tens of millions of dollars in research grants from such companies as Philip Morris and R.J. Reynolds in recent years. Even research funding bodies like the Legacy Foundation or the Flight Attendant Medical Research Institute, which claim they will not give funding to universities that take tobacco money, do not abide by that claim, rationalizing that giving to a certain school within a university that says it will not take tobacco money is acceptable (A. Blum, personal communication, December 31, 2014). In 1982, the University of Sydney in Australia “became the first institution to reject all future tobacco industry funding,” but not many universities have followed suit.[2] On the contrary, the University of California Faculty Senate and Board of Regents, for example, created a policy prohibiting the banning of researchers from accepting tobacco industry funding in 2007.[3] In 1992, the American Medical Association (AMA) rejected a policy statement that medical schools should reject research funding from the tobacco industry and its subsidiaries.[2] A survey conducted by the AMA that same year found that 52 of 95 responding medical schools accepted such funding.[2] “The industry uses selected findings” from research it funds in “advertisements, legal and legislative testimony and publicity campaigns by the Tobacco Institute, its public relations arm.”[4] The Institute “plays down research that has found smoking to cause illness while publicizing finds on the role of other factors, such as stress, eating habits or air pollution.”[4] The morality of accepting tobacco industry grants alongside government funding, such as from the National Cancer Institute, “has received scant attention in the scientific community” and should be addressed.[2]

Investment in Tobacco Stocks

In 1984, DOC (Doctors Ought to Care) created Project S.N.U.F.F. (Stop Noxious University Funding Forever), which attempted to influence Illinois universities with medical schools to get rid of tobacco stocks and succeeded in convincing a few institutions like the University of Illinois to divest. However, others refused to do so, such as Loyola University Chicago. As a result, the project only had modest success.[5, 6]

In 1986, the author, along with faculty members, students and investment managers from many U.S. colleges and universities, attended a meeting on ethical investing. They discussed the ethics of holding shares in companies that produced items used in the manufacture of nuclear weapons or with ties to apartheid South Africa. The author asked whether the participants might not also urge their institutions to divest stock held in tobacco companies. The unanimous reaction was one of outrage at the author’s alleged desire to abrogate freedom of choice and the right to smoke. Only when the author pointed out that Philip Morris held a major stake in the South African cigarette company Rothmans did the group acknowledge that investing in tobacco stocks might be worth reconsideration. However, no one actively pursued such divestment.[5, 7, 8]

In 1990, DOC member Phil Huang, MD, MPH, led a successful effort to convince Harvard University to eliminate \$40 million in tobacco stocks from its endowment fund investments. As a student at the School of Public Health, Huang created a campus radio advertisement that pointed out the hypocrisy of President Derek Bok's call for university leadership in demonstrating strong moral and civic values, while Harvard continued to invest in the tobacco industry. Dr. Huang's efforts led to a petition calling for divestment, signed by over 300 students and faculty in the School of Public Health. A local newspaper brought some adverse publicity when it exposed the hypocrisy of the university's investing in tobacco companies while collecting \$54 million in research grants from the National Cancer Institute. All of this eventually led to the announcement that Harvard would eliminate its tobacco stocks due to "a desire not to be associated as a shareholder with companies engaged in significant sales of products that create a substantial and unjustified risk of harm to other human beings." The university also formally adopted a policy "prohibiting future purchase of stock in companies producing significant quantities of cigarettes or other tobacco products." However, Harvard acted due to fear of liability lawsuits, not a sense of morality.[2, 5-7, 9]

Other universities with prominent medical schools that divested their tobacco stocks include Johns Hopkins University (1991), Stanford University (1998), University of Washington (2000), and University of California (2001).[10] Not all divestment efforts were successful, however. The University of Texas (UT), with its world-famous reputation for the treatment of cancer at its MD Anderson Cancer Center, invested almost \$50 million in tobacco stocks. In 1991, a single student, aided by DOC, succeeded in persuading half of the Board of Regents to vote to divest tobacco stocks, but the chairman broke a 4-4 tie by voting to retain the investment. As a consolation, the board passed a resolution banning smoking on the entire campus. However, UT eventually divested itself of all tobacco stocks in 1997.[2, 4, 6, 11]

In April 1996, the *Los Angeles Times* reported that the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association-College Retirement Equities Fund (TIAA-CREF) "faced so much pressure to divest tobacco stocks that it created a separate investment fund, the Social Choice Account, as a tobacco-free vehicle for retirement investors." [12] However, TIAA-CREF has not divested its tobacco stocks, which are simply too lucrative. As of December 2016, the organization owned 5,151,626 shares of Altria Group, Inc. and 5,121,336 shares of Philip Morris International, Inc., with the former valued at \$348,353 and the latter valued at \$468,551.[7, 13]

Since tobacco stocks are highly profitable, investing universities are reluctant to give up such a profitable source of income. Tobacco stocks are still held in high regard by investment advisors and are doing very well. The last institution to divest tobacco stocks did so in the early 2000s. The divestment movement essentially no longer exists. The activists who might have kept up the momentum are all gone, replaced by government bureaucrats and academic researchers funded by pharmaceutical or government grants (A. Blum, personal communication, February 1, 2014; A. Blum, personal communication, December 31, 2014).[5]

As of October 2017, the organization owned 2,377,754 shares of Altria Group, Inc. and 1,981,639 shares of Philip Morris International, Inc. in its Equity Index Fund, with the former valued at \$152,699,361 and the latter valued at \$207,358,705. In its Equity Fund, TIAA-CREF owned 298,643 shares of Altria and 1,540,813 shares of Philip Morris, with the former valued at \$19,178,853 and the latter valued at \$161,230,673.

Equity Index Funds

1,128,161	Altria	72,450,499
846,497	Altria	54,362,037
403,096	Altria	25,886,825
906,478	PM	94,853,858
748,808	PM	78,355,269
326,353	PM	34,149,578

Equity Funds

298,643	Altria	19,178,853
204,059	PM	21,352,734
591,860	PM	61,932,231
744,894	PM	77,945,708

References

Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association-College Retirement Equities Fund. (2017, October 31). *TIAA-CREF funds: Equity index funds 2017 annual report*. New York, NY: Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association.

Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association-College Retirement Equities Fund. (2017, October 31). *TIAA-CREF funds: Equity funds 2017 annual report*. New York, NY: Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association.

References

1. Blum, A. (2006, March 5). With open arms: UA welcomes cigarette makers to campus. *The Birmingham News*, pp. 1B, 8B.
2. Blum, A., & Daynard, R. (1995). A review of divestment by medical organizations and academic institutions of shareholdings in tobacco companies. In K. Slama (Ed.), *Tobacco and Health* (pp. 1005-1006). New York, NY: Plenum Press.
3. Regents of the University of California. (n.d.). Tobacco at the University of California [Research policy]. *University of California Office of the President*. Retrieved from <http://www.ucop.edu/research-policy-analysis-coordination/policies-guidance/tobacco-industry-funding/index.html>.
4. Blum, A. (n.d.). Universities have no business holding tobacco stocks. *Houston Post*. Universities Collection. Center for the Study of Tobacco and Society, Tuscaloosa, AL.
5. Blum, A. (1990, October 17). Colleges must eliminate tobacco stocks from their portfolios. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 37(7), A56.
6. Doctors Ought to Care. (1991). DOC efforts spark major universities to divest tobacco holdings. *DOC News and Views: The Journal of Medical Activism*, 6(2), 1, 3.
7. Blum, A. (2008, May 17). Alchemy, the safer cigarette, and Philip Morris. *The Lancet*, 371(9625), 1644-1646.
8. Blum, A. (2013, October 25). Ethical investors have failed to spread the word. *Financial Times*, p. 8.
9. Blum, A. (1987, August 10). Should universities and medical schools sell their tobacco stocks? *Physician's Weekly*, 4(30), 1.
10. Council for Responsible Public Investment. (n.d.). *Educational institutions with restrictions on tobacco investments*. Retrieved from <http://www.socialfunds.com/education/pdf/colleges.pdf>.
11. Honan, W. H. (1997, May 21). Colleges ending investments in tobacco stocks. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/1997/05/21/us/colleges-ending-investments-in-tobacco-stocks.html>.
12. Hiltzik, M. A., & Jackson, R. L. (1996, April 24). AMA calls on investors to dump tobacco stocks. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from http://articles.latimes.com/1996-04-24/news/mn-62162_1_tobacco-stocks.
13. Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association. (2016, December 31). Summary portfolios of investments. In *College Retirement Equities Fund Annual Report*. Retrieved from https://www.tiaadirect.com/public/pdf/cref_ar.pdf.