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CREATING DEVIANCE:
THE COLLECTIVE STIGMATIZATION OF CIGARETTE SMOKING

Ronald Jay Troyer, Ph.D.
Western Michigan University, 1980

This study focused on the changing norms regarding cigarette smoking. Banned by a number of states in the early 1930s, the behavior was socially and legally accepted during the 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s only to once again become the object of public approbation and official sanctions in the 1970s. Examining events in both time periods, this research attempted to determine how and why this behavior came to be defined as deviant.

In explaining the negative public attitudes toward and official restrictions of the habit some commentators had cited the medical evidence that smoking has deleterious health consequences while others had suggested that anti-smoking strictures were the product of status battles between smokers and nonsmokers. These two explanations were interpreted as approximating two theoretical frameworks found in sociological literature. The medical explanation was seen as representing the strain model offered by social factist scholars while the status group conflict view more closely resembles the social definitionist approach to social phenomena. Strain, defined as a discrepancy among the system's elements, was seen as present when research reports claimed that an acceptable behavior pattern was harmful to health. The strain model suggested that the increase in research reports led to the redefinition of cigarette smoking. By
contrast, the status group conflict model suggested that the redefinition of cigarette smoking was the product of interest group interaction.

These two explanations were evaluated through analysis of government documents, interest group publications, public opinion survey data, mass media records, and personal interview data. The findings for the early 1900s and the current controversy indicate that in both time periods, health allegations against the cigarette were prominent. Yet in both instances, these allegations were not sufficient to bring about new restrictions. Only after specific interest groups took up the cause and used the health argument to support their interests was smoking defined as inappropriate.

In terms of the strain and status group conflict models, this study found neither one to be a complete explanation. While strain clearly was not directly related to the redefinition of smoking as deviant, it was also clear that interest groups were able to realize the restrictions because of the existence of strain. In other words, this study shows that strain was the necessary condition while interest groups taking up the cause provided the sufficient conditions for the definition of smoking as deviant. At the same time it was noted that the pro-smoking forces were able to have the restrictive measures of the early 1900s reversed by marshalling additional resources in the 1920s. In conclusion it was suggested that similar developments seem to be occurring today as the tobacco industry has begun to mobilize more resources in the conflict.
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CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

"Last year smoking was a major factor in 220,000 deaths from heart disease; 78,000 lung cancer deaths; and 22,000 deaths from other cancers..."  
Joseph A. Califano, Jr.  
Former Secretary of HEW

"I think we would be better off if there were no cigarettes in the U.S. I would like to see them banned by Congress."  
Dr. Benjamin Byrd  
Past President of the  
American Cancer Society

"The anti-smoking zeal that is widely translating into legislation is a brilliant-example of authoritarian rectitude—a manacling of the individual for his own good."  
Washington Star Editorial

This dissertation is a study of the controversy over cigarette smoking norms: should cigarette smoking be defined as permissible or even acceptable, as it was in the 1950s; or should it be defined as inappropriate and severely restricted, as it was in the early 20th century and might be in the near future?

During recent years both public attitudes and official actions have become increasingly anti-cigarette smoking. HEW sponsored surveys have found that over 80 percent of nonsmokers think the smoking of cigarettes should be allowed in fewer places than it is now, over 60 percent think cigarette advertising should be banned, almost 85 percent feel that teachers should set a good example by not smoking, and approximately 80 percent find it annoying to be near a person who is smoking (HEW, 1976b). By 1977 some 41 states had enacted legislation restricting smoking in such places as on public transportation, restaurants, public schools, health care...
facilities, department stores, entertainment and recreational facilities, elevators, and state-owned buildings (HEW, 1977). At the federal level regulations have relegated the smoker to the rear of interstate public transportation vehicles and former Secretary of HEW Califano launched an anti-smoking campaign characterizing smoking as slow motion suicide.

At the same time pro-smoking forces are beginning to resist such negative characterizations and restrictive rules. Claiming that the government has no business regulating the private habits of free individuals, the pro-smoking forces spent over $6 million to help defeat an anti-smoking referendum in California (Markle and Troyer, 1979). Basically this "freedom of choice" argument asserts that there is no proof that tobacco smoke is harmful to non-smokers. Consequently, the smoker has the personal right to engage in his pleasure (Tobacco Institute, 1978:25). Emphasizing this theme, the tobacco industry has formed the Tobacco Action Network with four regional offices and eighteen state directors to fight further restrictions on smoking (Tobacco Observer, December, 1979:3).

In discussing this social phenomenon, most commentators have interpreted the smoking controversy from a medical framework (Sobel, 1978; Whiteside, 1971; and Wagner, 1971). Since scientists claim to have demonstrated that smoking causes cancer and other diseases, the coercive regulations, laws, and public attitudes are attributed to the defensive behavior of the non-smoker. Convinced that smoking is a health hazard for all people, abstainers are simply asserting their right to health and long life. At the same time, the pro-
smoking forces are seen as being led by an industry interested in protecting profits.

The medical issue appears to be an important element since over 90 percent of the public accepts the claim that smoking is harmful (Gallup, 1978). At the same time it is clear that not all behavior and products believed to be harmful to health, for example coffee and soft drinks, have been restricted or become the focus of negative public attitudes. Furthermore, the medical model does not explain the periodic escalation of the controversy. It is difficult to identify any new medical findings which led HEW Secretary Califano to launch his anti-smoking program or led the Civil Aeronautics Board to consider banning smoking on all airplane flights.

Rejecting the medical model explanation, some sociologists (Nuehring and Markle, 1974, and Markle and Troyer, 1979) have argued that the anti-smoking public attitudes and official actions are better understood as products of status battles between vested interests. While not denying that the health issue has played an important role in the controversy, they argue that socio-political factors have been most decisive in shaping the smoking controversy. According to their view, smokers and nonsmokers should be seen as members of two status groups in conflict over "the collective conferral of legitimacy and consequent prestige" (Markle and Troyer, 1979:622). Smokers have been the losers in this conflict—being relegated to the rear of public conveyances, called polluters, and assigned special seating in restaurants. The anti-smoking groups have been so successful that Markle and Troyer (1979:613) speculate
that "Smoking, it appears, may become an activity permissible only for those of legal age in the privacy of their home."

Whether one uses the medical model explanation or the status group conflict argument, the point these authors are making is that smoking has come to be seen as deviant behavior. In the most general sense, deviance refers to a behavior that "violates institutionalized expectations" (norms) (Gibbons and Jones, 1975:3) and is subject to sanctions. Smoking is deviant in the sense that the person who engages in the behavior is in danger of being labeled as a social irritant or even subject to official sanctions.

As sociologists have conceptualized the phenomenon, deviance has two basic dimensions: behavioral and definitional. According to Friday (1980:2):

The behavioral dimension concentrates on the actor and the cause or etiology of the act while the definitional analyzes the societal reaction to the act and the process by which some acts become defined and reacted to as deviant, criminal or both.

Deviance scholars have spent a great deal of energy and effort in exploring the behavioral dimension and the societal reaction to the act. By contrast, the prior phenomenon, the definition of the act as deviant, has not been the subject of extensive sociological inquiry.

This situation is characteristic of most of the substantive areas grouped under deviant behavior. For example, if we examine the juvenile delinquency literature we find many studies describing the characteristics of delinquents, their social environment, their
subculture, and theoretical expositions on the causes of delinquency. There is also a growing body of literature describing the functioning and impact of the official processing system as well as the effectiveness of the multitude of treatment programs. Yet one is hard put to find an analysis of how specific categories of behavior came to be defined as delinquent.

According to Friday, this focus has fostered a tendency to view acts themselves as absolutes and a "failure to account for the variability in the definition of the act" (Friday, 1980). Deviance, after all, is a relative phenomenon. There are few behaviors which are seen as inappropriate in all situations and cultural contexts. It is the group, the collectivity, which establishes the rules (norms) which define the act as either inappropriate or acceptable.

Several scholars have noted that this problem must be addressed. Akers, for example, comments:

These, then are the two basic problems facing the sociology of deviance: How and/or why certain kinds of behavior and people get defined or labeled as deviant. How and/or why some people engage in deviant acts. Our research must provide the data on and our theories should explain both social definitions and behaviors. (1968:456)

More recently Kitsuse and Spector have suggested that a theory of deviance should provide a

...description and explanation of the definitional process in which morally objectionable conditions or behavior are asserted to exist, and the collective activities that become organized around these assertions. (And) ... to explain how these definitions and assertions come to be made...(1975:593)
The cigarette smoking controversy provides an opportunity to explore this collective definition of deviance process. First, the behavior has been subject to changing legal and social definitions. Legally prohibited by a number of states at the turn of the century, the habit gained acceptance during the post-World War II era but has come under increasing restrictions today. Similarly, the public perception of smoking has ranged from viewing the behavior as a symbol of immorality during the early nineteenth century to, perhaps, a symbol of sophistication during the 1950s but subject to social approbation today. Second, while the general pattern in American society seems to be one of decreasing stigmatization of behaviors once considered reprehensible (for example, homosexuality), smoking represents an attempt to put once accepted behavior back into the closet. Third, the events are currently unfolding which means that instead of dependence on historical materials it is possible to directly observe the process and collect data from the participants. Fourth, unlike many other instances where a behavior was defined as deviant, a powerful interest group has become active in opposing the deviant characterization adding a special dynamic to the process. Finally, a vast amount of data is available. The federal government, for example, has been conducting surveys on adult use of tobacco and public attitudes toward smoking, publishing data on tobacco production and cigarette manufacture, reporting the amount of money collected through cigarette taxes, and holding hearings (Congress and regulatory agencies) on the numerous pro and anti-smoking proposals. The tobacco industry also maintains an
extensive library on the subject and tobacco company annual corporate reports are available. In addition, since the controversy has received a great deal of public attention from the mass media over the years, a written documentary record exists.

Besides providing an opportunity to examine the deviance creation process, the study of cigarette smoking provides an opportunity to evaluate the applicability of several major sociological approaches to social phenomena. One approach has emphasized that contradictions or strains among the system's parts are crucial for explaining the emergence of social phenomena. With cigarette smoking, for example, this perspective would emphasize the medical model suggesting that since smoking is harmful it has come to be seen as inappropriate. The other sociological tradition places much less emphasis on strain arguing that the most important factor is the interest group interaction process. This view is represented in the Markle and Troyer (1979) argument that the restrictions on smoking are best understood as products of conflict between status groups. A major contribution of this study is that these two general models will be evaluated and the role of the major factors more clearly specified.

Since the problem being addressed is how the group (collectivity) comes to see some type of behavior as inappropriate, the focus of this study is on the institutional level of analysis. The analysis focuses on the role played by various categories comprising the structural order in getting institutions to define smoking as inappropriate. Other levels of analysis certainly would contribute to an understanding of the phenomenon and appropriate data could be
collected to conduct such analyses. However, such an expansive undertaking is precluded here because of time and resource constraints.

The central problem this research addresses is Why and how is cigarette smoking coming to be seen as undesirable? Subsidiary questions are: How does the anti-cigarette crusade at the turn of the century compare with the present anti-smoking movement? Why is cigarette smoking coming to be seen as deviant at this point in time? What social forces are responsible for this new definition? In what circumstances have they been successful? What social forces are opposing this characterization of the smoker and smoking? In what situations have the pro-smoking forces been successful? What is the likely outcome of this controversy?
CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL ORIENTATIONS

The sociology of deviance is the study of rule violation. Yet though we know something about how and why rules are violated, we know little about how and why rules are created. It follows, then, that we have little insight into the process by which deviant categories and designations are created. In an attempt to gain some insight, this chapter examines the literature from several areas that focus on phenomena closely related to this study's central concern. Specifically, we will begin with an examination of the collective behavior/social problems literature with organizational and sociology of law/criminology ideas discussed next. After the issues raised in this literature are delineated, the chapter concludes with a discussion of the major theoretical models to be evaluated in this research.

Collective Behavior and Deviance: Traditional Approaches

Theoretical explanations of collective behavior have developed from two general frameworks that sociologists have used to analyze socially disruptive phenomena (deviance, protests, riots, mobs, social movements, and so forth). One approach, perhaps historically the dominant one, has been that people get involved in such activities because something is wrong in their social environment. Many terms have been used to characterize this environmental condition.
Smelser (1962:47), for example, notes that among the more prominent concepts employed to describe this phenomena are "strain," "pressure," "malintegration," "disequilibrium," "disintegration," "imbalance," "disorganization," "inconsistency," "conflict," "deprivation," and "anomie." Smelser selects the term strain for his work and defines it as "an impairment of the relations among and consequently inadequately functioning of the components of social actions" (1962:47).

As can be seen from the variety of terms employed and even the definition Smelser uses, strain is a general explanation that has not been consistently limited to one specific phenomenon. Perhaps the most common conception of strain is in economic terms (Oberschall, 1973) but other scholars, especially Smelser also use the term to apply to discrepancies between different goals, different values, values and norms, knowledge and actions, technology and values, and so forth (Smelser, 1962:Chapter III). Whatever their conceptualization, these strain scholars focus on some discrepancy or disharmony in the social environment as the most important explanatory factor.

The other sociological approach has argued that disruptive social phenomena are best understood as emergent products of social interaction. Beginning with the assumption that man is an active creator of his own social reality, this view stresses that the individual's or group's interpretation of the situation emerges from interaction with others. It is on the basis of this interpretation that behavior occurs. Therefore, the explanatory emphasis is not on strain but the interaction process between individuals and
groups in the society.

Smelser (1962) has formulated the most elaborate strain explanation of collective behavior. His value added model suggests that strain must be present before collective behavior, including social movements, will occur. Of particular importance here is his discussion of strain as a cause of what he terms "norm-oriented movements," defined as "attempt(s) to restore, protect, modify, or create norms in the name of a generalized belief" (1962:270). Although he does indicate that economic factors and dissatisfactions are often involved, he appears to place greater emphasis on non-material factors. For example, he comments:

Sometimes the appearance of new knowledge initiates a movement to apply this knowledge in order to eradicate a condition previously taken for granted. (1962:287)

Any disharmony between normative standards and actual social conditions can provide the basis for a movement whose objective it is to modify norms (1962:288).

The rise of new values frequently creates bases for defining certain social conditions as "evils"—social conditions which previously passed less noticed (1962:289).

Although social problems and deviance scholars have not used the term strain, much of the work in these areas is based on that model. Most social problems textbooks, for example, focus on conditions that have come to be seen as problematic. Robert Merton (1976:7), perhaps the most eminent scholar in this tradition, comments that "a social problem exists when there is a sizeable discrepancy between what is and what people think ought to be."
Another leading proponent of this tradition argues that social problems are those conditions detrimental to human well being (Manis, 1976:25).

The implication of the above statements for understanding the collective definition of deviance is unmistakable: new definitions of deviance arise because of some strain (new knowledge, discrepancy between real and ideal, or harm to human well being) in the society.

The process tradition in collective behavior is usually traced back to Herbert Blumer (1969:103) who argued that instead of focusing on such things as structural strain, collective behavior and social movements must be understood as products of five interaction processes: agitation, development of \textit{esprit de corps}, development of morale, formation of an ideology, and the development of operating tactics. Basically, his view is that through interaction with the larger society and within the collectivity, a movement grows and becomes organized.

Blumer has applied these ideas to the social problems-deviance area. In an article entitled "Social Problems as Collective Behavior" (1971) he argues that social problems are the "focal point for the operation of divergent and conflicting interests, intentions, and objectives" (1971:301). According to Blumer it is the interplay of these interests and objectives that is involved in the collective definition and career of social problems, a process consisting of five stages: (1) the emergence of a social problem, (2) the legitimation of the problem, (3) the mobilization of action with regard to the problem, (4) the formation of an official plan of
action, and (5) the transformation of the official plan in its empirical implementation (1971:301).

The status politics formulation developed by Gusfield (1963, 1967) represents another one of the major processual approaches in the literature. Basically, Gusfield suggests that attempts to have a behavior designated as deviant are often symbolic battles "between opposed systems of moralities, cultures and styles of life" (1963:173). In other words, it is not the behavior per se or social conditions which cause the attempt to label the behavior as deviant. Instead, the designation of deviance must be seen as a product of status conflict, the competition for the official assignment of honor and prestige through legitimation of group norms. For example, Gusfield notes that the Temperance Movement represented, in part, the dominance of Protestant interests over Catholic. To rural, native American Protestants, drinking was a defiance of the important norms of sobriety, industry, and responsibility. Violators were to be punished with coercive legal strictures.

Also working from the processual approach, Lemert (1974) cautioned against the temptation of explaining the collective definition of deviance as the creation of one group, class, or elite since this is not the way legislatures work in formulating rules. Instead of looking only at one group, the sociologist, according to Lemert, must examine the group interaction process beginning with individuals who affiliate with groups for satisfaction of personal values and purpose priorities (1974:463). In this process individuals give up some values to satisfy others. Group action, then, reflects the
priorities of individual members plus the availability and costs, among other things, of achieving goals. Consequently, it becomes impossible to predict the emergence of new definitions and controls of deviance without examining the dilemmas, compromises, budget limitations, and so forth involved in the group interaction process. Lemert's point seems to be that existing approaches are inadequate in accounting for new definitions of deviance considering the complexities of modern society and the definitional process.

Following this tradition, Spector and Kitsuse (1977) have presented the most recent process argument suggesting that the scholar must focus on claims-making activities to understand the emergence of a problem or definition of deviance. In addition to stressing the significance of group interaction, as the authors reviewed above do, they also argue that the claims-making activities of individuals are important. This suggests that the collective definition of deviance may be the consequence of popular sentiment as well as organized social movements.¹

In summary it seems clear that attempts to gain new definitions of deviance can be seen as social movements (a type of collective behavior) although there are different explanations for the causes of such movements. The process approach suggests that collective definitions must be seen as a product of interest group activities. By contrast the strain explanation is that societal disjunctions are the major catalyst for new definitions.
Collective Behavior and Deviance: New Directions

During the past decade, a number of scholars have attempted to move beyond the traditional strain or process models. For example, Mauss (1975: Mauss and Wolfe, 1977) draws on both the strain and process approaches in explaining the public definition of conditions as social problems. Mauss argues that societal arrangements (structural conduciveness) must permit collective behavior which usually focuses on structural strains brought about by social change. While many strains are present in society, not all are defined as social problems by the public. Public recognition of social problems depends on consensual reality (defined as generalized agreement about what is true or factual) which is the product of numerous social influences including interest group activities. Economic, political, occupational, moral, psychological, and scientific interest groups attempt to have their definitions of reality accepted as part of the consensual reality by organizing social movements. In reference to the topic here, new social problems or new definitions of deviance are the products of social movements led by interest groups.

Another attempt to move beyond the strain and process models has been developed by Oberschall (1973), McCarthy and Zald (1973, 1977), and Gamson (1975). This framework begins with the assumption that society is composed of a number of categories (economic, status, racial, etc.) in conflict. Consequently strain is always present since there is disagreement among the categories over which values,
norms, economic arrangements, and so forth are to prevail in the society. The problem, therefore, is to explain how one category's preferences or definition of the situation come to be recognized and acted upon.

In trying to solve this problem, these scholars have employed the concept of resource "which can be anything from material resources--jobs, income, and the right to materials, goods and services--to nonmaterial resources--authority, moral commitment, trust, friendship, skills, habits of industry, and so on" (Oberschall, 1973:28). Group conflict and the emergence of social movements are then analyzed in terms of the ability of the collectivities to create and mobilize resources. A dynamic element is introduced into the analysis since the focus is on resources mobilized by groups in response to the employment of resources by the opposition group. Authorities, for example, are also seen as possessing resources employment of which requires some kind of response (mobilization of additional resources) from a social movement.

One major advantage of the resource mobilization approach is that it permits explanation of success and failure. In addition, it provides some direction pointing to crucial variables to be analyzed. With reference to the collective definition of behavior as deviant, the resource mobilization theory suggests that we can gain insight by focusing on the resources employed by the social groups involved.
Organizations

One aspect of social movements generally ignored by deviance and social problems scholars is the significance and role of organizational structure. However, if we are to see social problems and collective definitions of deviance as products of social movements, such neglect cannot continue. This point is supported by Oberschall's (1973:133-134) suggestion that many social movements tend to be short-lived because they do not solve the central problem of "cementing together an organizational network." He argues that an organizational base and a continuity of leadership are necessary for any sustained movement. Furthermore rapid mobilization occurs only through the recruitment of "blocks of people who are already highly organized participants" (1973:125).

The significance of these points is further illustrated by Olson's (1965:128) suggestion that small groups often "triumph over numerically superior forces ... because the former are generally better organized and active." In other words, small well-organized groups able to form coalitions seem most likely to be successful in achieving new definitions of deviance.

In an attempt to summarize the significance of organizational features for understanding social movements, Zald and Ash (1966) have formulated a series of propositions concerning the growth, decay, and change of social movement organizations. Distinguishing between exclusive (those with rigorous membership requirements) and inclusive organizations (those with minimal membership qualifica-
tions) they point out that social movement organizations do not remain static entities but change according to both external and internal conditions. Environmental factors such as the ebb and flow of sentiments in the larger society and existence of similar or competing organizations are most likely to effect the inclusive group. Additionally, the inclusive group is more likely than the exclusive group to participate in coalitions and mergers. With regard to internal processes, Zald and Ash suggest that the less the short-run chances of attaining goals, the greater the problem of maintaining the movement. Other interests and incentives will serve to weaken the membership base, especially as the organization must replace or routinize the original charismatic leadership. In other words inclusive social movement organizations attempting to implement new definitions of deviance will encounter organizational problems unless the goal is reached in the short-run. The same would not be true for exclusive organizations. Consequently, we would expect that when there is a campaign for a new definition of deviance extending over several decades, it will be backed by an exclusive organization.

Recently McCarthy and Zald (1977) have attempted to relate social movement organizational structure to the amount and nature of resources available. Their propositions suggest that the greater the amount of resources available to the various publics, the greater the likelihood that a social movement organization will develop to respond to corresponding preferences. Distinguishing between federated organizational structures (chapters in local areas) and
isolated adherent arrangements (direct contact between organization and members), McCarthy and Zald hypothesize that the latter will have less stable resource flow and will have to spend more on advertising. In addition, the larger the resource flow the more likely the organization is to have a professional staff who have social movement careers. Even though they argue that federated organizations will have more tension and conflict, these ideas seem to fit with the suggestion that the greater the organizational complexity (exclusive and federated) and the larger the size, the greater the resources and chances in gaining the new definition.

In an illustration of the relevance of organizational literature, Dickison (1968) argues that deviance creation may be related to bureaucratic needs and action. Drawing upon organizational theory regarding the goals of bureaucracies and environmental influences, Dickison argues that the Marihuana Tax Act can be seen as the organizational response to problems of maintenance and legitimacy. This example reminds us that the government and social control agencies must also be seen as possible sources for the creation of new deviant categories.

One of the earliest studies examining the creation of deviant categories was Sutherland's (1950) analysis of the creation of sexual psychopath laws. Sutherland viewed the passage of these laws from the vantage point of collective behavior suggesting a natural history model with three stages: (1) a state of fear developed, to
some extent, by the mass media and made explicit by a few spectacular sex crimes, (2) political agitation by individuals and groups within the community, and (3) the appointment of a committee with the organizational resources to draw up and insure passage of a law (1950:146-147).

This natural history model has potential for application to other laws but has not been extensively utilized. One reason appears to be that the sociology of law has been relatively neglected, probably because scholars have, by and large, accepted the consensus assumption that law represents the aggregate sentiments of the population. Only recently has this assumption been seriously challenged with the argument that laws have their origin in the conflict between groups in a society.

Quinney (1969) was one of the first to argue that the unequal distribution of power is the basic reality in the law formulation process. Based on the view that society is characterized by diversity, conflict, coercion, and change, his argument is that "Law does not represent a compromise of the diverse interests but supports some interests at the expense of others" (1969:25). In later writings Quinney (1977:45) more specifically identifies law as an instrument of the state and the capitalist ruling class.3

Chambliss and Seidman echo a similar theme stressing that law "represents an institutionalized tool of those in power which functions to provide them with superior moral as well as coercive power in the conflict" (1971:504). Consequently, with reference to definitions of deviance,"The laws that define deviancy or illegality,
therefore, are the result of political activity" (1971:67).

Both of the above approaches direct our attention to the possibility that laws, as collective definitions of deviance, may represent the coercive imposition of one group's norms. In general these sociology of law-criminology works point to the important role of political power in the creation of deviance.

Definitions of Deviance

Only a few deviance theory scholars have specifically addressed the collective definition of deviance problem. Hawkins and Tiedman (1975), for example suggest that "society creates deviance by the enactment of laws and the resultant setting of collective expectations" (1975:340). They apparently see collective definitions of deviance as emergent products of an interpretive process" (1975:60) emanating from interpersonal interaction. New definitions of deviance are seen as proliferating today because increasing urbanization means that people are living closer together and are more interdependent for longer periods of time. This produces a desire for quieter, more stable conditions which means that activities formerly acceptable are now viewed as intrusive. Consequently new laws are established to protect persons and property from such offensive activities (1975:150).

Such an emphasis seems to neglect the dynamic group process that other deviance scholars have emphasized. Even Becker, in his initial formulation, put great emphasis on the role of interest groups. It is true that Becker (1963:147) did say that "rules are
the products of someone's initiative," persons he called "moral entrepreneurs." While this term has gained wide usage careful examination of Becker's work also reveals statements such as "social rules are the creation of specific social groups" (1963:15). The position taken here is that he probably was referring to moralistic individuals who lead rule generating crusades when he used the term "moral entrepreneurs." As Schur (1979:423) has pointed out, activists on both sides could be viewed in such a manner. Consequently the most fruitful approach would seem to be viewing social rules as the product of interest group conflict often spearheaded by crusading individuals.

Davis (1975) has taken this theme and suggested that new collective definitions can be understood as power struggles between groups. His argument seems to be that public definitions of deviance reflect the values of those groups able to have their norms endorsed by the state. According to Davis, a group's deviance-defining norms are based on value beliefs, convictions about what is desirable or undesirable, and fact beliefs, convictions about what exists in reality. Changes in either kind of beliefs bring demands for new deviance-defining norms. For example, Davis suggests that "the diffusion of new knowledge is a major cause of collective searches for new norms in the modern world" (1975:53). This search for new norms is significantly influenced by the values, beliefs and vested interests of the people in the deviance controlling agencies (1975:58).
While Davis see changes in beliefs as the source of group efforts for new rules, Lofland (1969) has identified some group characteristics influencing the outcome of the conflict. Specifically he argues that new definitions are contingent upon the size and organization along with the economic and political power of the groups involved (1969:15). As a generalization his point seems to be that the greater the power and organizational parity among competing groups, the less likely the new definitions of deviance will be accepted.

In an attempt to develop a testable theory of the collective definition of deviance, Troyer (1979) has argued that the literature provides the basis for several assumptions. These postulates assume the necessity of certain structural conditions (structural conduciveness and structural strain) along with the presence of claims-making interest groups and that the state must be seen as an interested actor. Building on these statements, Troyer offered a number of propositions and hypotheses suggesting that coalition building, group organizational characteristics, power resources, and resource mobilization are important variables for predicting deviance construction outcomes. Specifically he argued that the ability to form coalitions, develop a good organizational structure, accumulate and employ resources to influence susceptible audiences are characteristic of successful efforts to secure new definitions of deviance.
Theoretical Issues

While general agreements and insights contained in the theoretical literature were highlighted above, there are also some areas of disagreement. These disagreements seem to focus around two general questions: What is the context for the origin of new collective definitions of deviance? and What is the nature of the collective dynamic?

One of the contextual origins issues, not dealt with extensively, concerns the role of the structural aspects of society. Blumer, for example, largely ignores this element while Smelser suggests that certain structural conditions (structural conduciveness and structural strain) are prerequisites for collective behavior including social movements. Quinney and Chambliss and Seidman also focus on the structural order analyzing how it shapes the collective definitions of deviance.

A second issue within the contextual origins question concerns the role of strain. Several authors emphasize that strain is a necessary prerequisite for the emergence of social movements (Smelser and Mauss) and social problems (Manis and Merton). Others, by contrast, seem to endorse the position that strain is largely irrelevant. According to this view, new definitions of deviance or social movements must be explained in terms of group interaction processes (Blumer and Lemert) or claims-making (Spector and Kitsuse). The resource mobilization theorists (Oberschall, McCarthy and Zald), however, assume that strain is present but not the prime mover.
A third contextual origins issue deals with the role of the state. One view implied in much of the collective behavior literature is that the state is largely a passive uninterested entity responding to demands made upon it with governmental action determined by those groups who have gained its attention. Quinney and Chambliss and Seidman, on the other hand, argue that the state must be seen as an interested actor, not only in shaping but promoting new definitions of deviance designed to help maintain its position. Resource mobilization scholars also see the state as an interested actor but argue that it is less powerful and monolithic. In other words, resource mobilization people do not see the state as always getting its way.

The second set of questions focuses attention on issues concerning the nature of the deviant category construction process. An initial issue deals with the importance of interest groups with most scholars assuming that organized groups are necessary. However Spector and Kitsuse suggest that collective definitions can and do emerge as popular movements while Hawkins and Tiedman offer an explanation based on interpersonal interaction.

A second collective dynamics issue concerns the variety of interest groups involved. Types of interest groups postulated to be the moving force in collective activities range from economic to status with some authors emphasizing that many groups play important roles in the attempt to change norms (Lemert, 1974) while others insist that the economically dominant group is the primary catalyst (Quinney, Chambliss and Seidman). Mauss seems to take the compromise
position that there are a variety of interests in the society but that involvement of any one group is dependent on the issue.

A final collective dynamics issue concerns outcome of the decision-making process. On the one hand, Blumer and Lemert emphasize that the interaction between interest groups produces compromise while Quinney and Chambliss and Seidman suggest that one group wins and imposes its wishes in a coercive manner.

Research Questions

Certainly it would be a monumental task for one study to attempt resolution of all these theoretical issues. Consequently this dissertation will focus on two general issues. The first concerns the role of strain in the generation of a new definition of deviance while the second focuses on explaining outcomes when social groups clash over new definitions of deviance.

On the first issue, the general research question is: Does strain provide a sufficient explanation for the emerging definition of smoking as deviant? In terms of Smelser's discussion of strain, it seems clear that the scientific research reports linking smoking with a number of deleterious health consequences have introduced a condition of strain to American society. In other words, to use Merton's terms, there is a discrepancy between the ideal and actual behavior.

The model suggested by the strain theorists might be characterized as follows:
In the case of cigarette smoking, the model would be:

- Scientific Research Reports → Definition of smoking as deviant

In other words, more specific questions addressed will be: Is there an association between appearance of research reports and public definitions? and: Is there a relationship between the appearance of research reports and enactment of laws and issuance of regulations restricting smoking?

The second general question this study focuses on is What role have the pro and anti-smoking groups played in the redefinition of smoking? This question draws on both the processual and resource mobilization approaches. A simple processual model, for example, would look like this:

- Interest Group Interaction → Definition

In the case of cigarette smoking, the model would be something like this:

- Anti-smoking group efforts → Definition
- Pro-smoking group efforts → Definition
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The resource mobilization model, as shown below, not only incorporates strain but provides a tool for predicting the definitional outcome.

For this study, the model is as follows:

In this model the term balance of resources mobilized refers to the net result after the two sides have employed their resources. In other words, the group that has employed the greater number of or most effectively used its resources will have the greatest influence on the definitional outcome.

More specific research questions here are Is there a connection between resource mobilization and new definitions? In what situations are anti-smoking groups' resources mobilized? In what situations anti-smoking resources ineffective? In what situations are pro-smoking resources mobilized effectively? In what situations are pro-smoking resources ineffective? What conditions led to a compromise?
CHAPTER III

REVIEW OF THE EMPIRICAL LITERATURE

The number of studies that have examined the collective designation of behavior as deviant is quite small. Furthermore, those empirical efforts have not explicitly evaluated strain, process, or resource mobilization models. These studies tend to be case studies without a statement of explicit theoretical foundations although a majority seem to be using the process model with only several seriously examining the role of strain. No collective definition of deviance studies have employed the resource mobilization approach since this strategy is quite new.

The empirical studies of the collective designation of deviant categories have largely dealt with health-related redefinitions or some phenomenon related to criminal law. This review will begin with the health redefinitions proceeding to the studies of new criminal definitions and survey the three articles on tobacco and smoking. The methods employed by the investigators will be briefly reviewed in a section toward the end of the chapter.

Health-Related Redefinitions

A number of scholars have studied the collective definition process by examining the way certain behaviors came to be defined as health problems. Conrad (1975), for example, has focused on the emergence of hyperkinesis as a medical problem. According to
Conrad, clinical work had produced the treatment (drugs) long before the disorder was clearly conceptualized. It was only with the emergence of an interest in child psychiatry in the late 1950s that the diagnostic label was developed. At this point, pharmaceutical companies launched a major advertising campaign promoting Ritalin as a treatment for the disorder. At the same time, the Association for Children with Learning Disabilities began a campaign sensitizing educators to the problem and possible treatment. In other words, Conrad suggests that the acceptance of the new definition was the product of group activities.

Clearly, in this example, strain (the hyperactivity) had been present for some time without a new definition arising. Pfohl's (1977) discussion of child abuse emphasizes a similar theme. He also reports a voluntary association playing an important role but more specifically relates the discovery of child abuse to the status problems of pediatric radiology within the medical community. Pfohl argues that pediatric radiology was a marginal specialty in medicine whose acceptance was assured by the discovery of child abuse as well as giving the medical profession in general domain over another area of behavior.

While the above studies focus on the discovery of new definitions, Levine and Schneider have written about the process of re-definition. Schneider (1978), for example, explores the changing conception of deviant drinking from a problem of personal morality to a disease. His analysis suggests that the definition of alcoholism as a disease can be attributed to three developments: the
establishment of the scientific Yale Center on Alcohol Studies, activity by Alcoholics Anonymous, and the Jellirek formulation. In Schneider's view, the acceptance of the definition of alcoholism as a disease did not represent the establishment of new facts but was the result of activities by interested parties. In Schneider's words "... the disease concept of alcoholism is primarily social rather than a scientific or medical accomplishment." Emphasizing the same theme, Levine (1978) attributes the greater responsibility for the disease concept to the 19th century Temperance Movement.

Finally, note must also be taken of Szasz's (1970) work on the discovery of mental illness. Basically he argues that definitions of mental illness can be attributed to the mental health movement and the Inquisition. This argument seems to incorporate both a process explanation (mental health movement) and strain (problems created by the Inquisition). By and large, however, these health related definitional studies have relied on process rather than strain frameworks.

**Definitions of Criminality**

As previously noted, Sutherland (1950) conducted one of the initial studies of the establishment of new definitions of deviance. His natural history model indicates that he placed greatest emphasis on process. He acknowledged that strain did exist (a few spectacular sex crimes) but clearly argues that the sufficient conditions for the new definition were group processes (fear developed by the media, political agitation by groups, and special committee efforts).
Chambliss' (1964) study of vagrancy law creation comes closer to a strain explanation than any study reviewed thus far. In his words, "The vagrancy statutes emerged as a result of changes in other parts of the social structure" (1964:69). Specifically, the strain was the breakdown of the serf system with the vagrancy laws representing the efforts of the ruling class to protect their interests. In other words, the landowners did have the resources to secure an official definition.

Several studies have focused on the creation of the delinquent definition. Platt (1969), in a study of the establishment of the first juvenile court in the United States, argued that this new definition was not the product of a dramatic rise in the crime rate but must be understood as a moral crusade which served symbolic functions for native middle-class Americans. Specifically, Platt suggested that the juvenile court was the product of the "child-saving" movement led by middle-class women interested in preserving their own prestige as well as establishing legitimate new careers for women. In effect, Platt's argument is that the creation of new deviant categories gave the ruling class a new tool for controlling the lower class.

Hagan and Leon (1977) have challenged this interpretation in a study of Canadian delinquency legislation. While similarly stressing a processual explanation, they argue that the ruling class model does not fit their data. Instead they suggest that Canadian delinquency legislation did not create new categories of deviant behavior and was the product of organizational conflict between supporters...
of the police and the probation departments. In other words, the new definition was the product of group interaction and conflict, not a moral crusade as Platt suggested.

In an analysis of the attempts to change the juvenile court law in California, Lemert (1970) also stresses the processual approach. Lemert does note that the group initiating the attempt at redefinition did perceive problems with the organization of the court (strain) but then explains how the tactics and strategies of the various groups involved determined the nature of the new definition. In other words, strain was involved in the beginning but most important were the group processes and interaction.

Perhaps the most often studied example of rule creation is the Marihuana Tax Act of 1937. In the initial examination of the law, Becker used a process explanation suggesting that there was no major increase in the actual use of the drug. Other scholars have accepted this general premise but disagreed about which process is the best explanatory one. Becker (1963) attributed the Act to the Federal Narcotics Bureau's success in generating publicity about the marihuana problem. He characterizes H. J. Anslinger, head of the Narcotics bureau, as a moral entrepreneur who organized this campaign.

Utilizing an organization perspective, Dickison (1968) formulated a bureaucratic process explanation. Citing a nonsupportive environment (strain) that was threatening the agency's survival, he suggests the agency needed to find a way to demonstrate its necessity. Consequently it generated a crusade against marihuana.
use, a crusade that solved the agency's legitimacy problem and insured its continued existence. In other words, the new definition was not produced by the strain but the product of the bureau's attempt to cope with strain.

Recently Galliher and Walker (1977 and 1978) have questioned these interpretations. After reviewing the evidence cited by Becker and Dickison and surveying newspapers of the time, Galliher and Walker conclude that the Federal Bureau of Narcotics' activities did not generate a public outcry and suggest that the truer situation was one of public apathy. Furthermore, citing Anslinger's testimony that he was not willing to have his agents spend a great deal of time enforcing the Act, Galliher and Walker reject Dickison's explanation. Instead they argue that the legislation was largely symbolic reassurance endorsing public attitudes of the day.

Kramer (1979) has also used a processual approach in an analysis of the creation of the "career criminal" program. In his view, the creation of this legal category of deviance was not due to the behavior of criminals or to fear of crime in the streets. Instead Kramer suggests that the legal category was produced by the activities of a small group of prosecutors. These persons were successful in getting the definition accepted because they were able to draw upon popular stereotypes and gain access to influential officials.

In two studies of sex offense definitions, Rose (1977) and Roby (1969) also emphasize processual explanations. Roby examined changes in the New York State penal law on prostitution and found that numerous interest groups and individuals worked to influence
the law. The final version of the Act was closely related to the relative power of these, much more than any incidence of prostitution itself. Similarly, Rose has attempted to explain the rise of the "rape problem" in terms of the ideology generated by the Women's Liberation Movement. In detailing how anti-rape organizations grew out of feminist ideology, she suggests that the recognition of the problem was a product of group activities rather than a change in the incidence of rape.

Zurcher et al (1971) have a little bit different approach to this problem in their discussion of anti-pornography crusades. After identifying several types of structural strain in the communities studied, Zurcher et al identify several precipitating events and the process of mobilizing anti-pornography crusade participants. Even though the crusades were unsuccessful in eliminating pornography and resolving structural strains, it is suggested that the very process has great symbolic import and satisfaction for the participants.

In most of these studies it must be noted that a strain was present. (For example, the existence of prostitution and rape certainly represent a discrepancy from cultural ideals.) Yet this strain was not, at least in the researchers' views, a sufficient explanation for definitions and redefinitions of behavior.

Smoking

There have been three studies on the definition of tobacco and smoking. In examining how tobacco became acceptable in 17th
century England after being prohibited, Best (1979) focuses on the social forces influencing the process. According to his account, the prohibition of tobacco became untenable because of the financial difficulties facing the British government. By changing the official definition of tobacco and attaching a tax, the government was able to solve financial problems.

The opposite definition process, that is from acceptable to unacceptable, has been examined by Nuehring and Markle (1974) and Markle and Troyer (1979). These studies clearly show that public attitudes now characterize smoking as undesirable and that an increasing number of government restrictions on the habit are being enacted. While these authors acknowledge that strain, the medical research reports that smoking is related to various diseases, has played a role, they argue that the changing definition also is the product of conflict between interest groups. Specifically, they suggest that anti-smoking measures are the outgrowth of a social movement but note that there is also a very powerful pro-smoking vested interest group attempting to maintain the definition of smoking as acceptable. In addition to the group conflict, Markle and Troyer also note that increasingly smokers and nonsmokers, on the individual level, are engaging in status battles over appropriate behavior.

**Methods Used**

Before leaving this literature it should be noted that practically all of the studies reviewed above are non-quantitative case
studies. The general research procedure appears (the studies do not contain sections describing methods) to be primarily one of tracing the chronological sequence of events and describing the actions of the participants. While highly empirical, these studies lack theoretical guidance and are not sharply focused by explicit research questions.

One of the major contributions of these efforts is the demonstration of the importance and potential of documents for sociological research. The variety of documents utilized is quite impressive. Agency records, testimony at legislative hearings, media materials (newspapers and periodicals), voluntary association publications, court records, and general historical materials have all provided important data.

One of the problems with these materials is that different researchers examining the same materials come to very different conclusions. (Note for example, the disagreement over the Marihuana Tax Act.) Therefore it seems advisable to attempt to achieve greater methodological rigor. Instead of impressionistic and selective interpretation, why not do some systematic content analysis? Why not attempt to convert the data into a form amenable to elementary statistical analysis? As the methods chapter indicates, this study will attempt to do just that.

Summary of Empirical Literature

After examining the collective definition of deviance studies, it seems clear that most have use of a processual model. Most have
deemphasized strain and focused on the process by which a definition of deviance came to be accepted. In general, the studies seem to agree that interest groups are the key force in the definitional process.

At the same time, it must be acknowledged that few scholars have given much attention to strain factors. Many of the authors seem to dismiss the importance of strain without any attempt to systematically explore such variables. The fact that such an emphasis can provide insight is illustrated by Chambliss (1964) and Zurcher et al (1971). Certainly it appears that strain, by itself, is not a sufficient explanation for new definitions but it may very well be a necessary condition. However, the above studies have not systematically investigated the relationship between strain and process explanations.

It is important to note that even though none of these studies drew on the resource mobilization approach, such an approach would probably have enhanced their arguments. Zurcher et al (1971), for example, could have compared the resources mobilized in the two communities with the anti-pornography crusades. Roby (1969) and Rose (1977) could easily have systematically compared the resources employed by the interests involved but they did not. In one way or another, much the same could be said for each study.

This should not be taken as a criticism of these scholars. The resource mobilization model was not available for them but it is available now. The question that will have to be asked of this study is Does the model contribute to our understanding of the
collective definition of deviance?
CHAPTER IV

METHODS

This chapter begins with a general discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of documentary research. After identifying and briefly describing the sources of the data, the measurements of key concepts are detailed. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the analytic techniques used.

**Documentary Research**

In the most general sense this research is a case study using documentary analysis. Perhaps it is true that most new areas of social research employ this technique (Markle and Petersen, 1979) but this does not mean that rigorous scientific standards should be sacrificed. Most case studies examine events representative of some more general social phenomena. Therefore they should be focused on concerns or issues that have relevance for wider generalization. Doing case study after case study, while providing rich detail, will not significantly further understanding until an effort is made to relate the research to theoretical models. This dissertation is a case study but differs from previous studies of collective definitions of deviance in that an attempt is made to systematically evaluate theoretical issues.

Similar to previous designation of deviance studies, data are gained primarily through analysis of documentary materials on
tobacco and the cigarette smoking controversy. Basically two kinds of documents are analyzed. Primary documents are original accounts and include materials produced by participants, eyewitnesses, official proceedings, and so forth. Secondary documents are mediated materials; that is the author has gathered information from others, including eyewitnesses, and produced a description and, sometimes, an interpretation. Most of the documents used in this study are primary materials.

There are, of course, distinct advantages and disadvantages in using documentary materials which should be noted. The major advantages for studying smoking include availability of materials, nonreactivity with the researcher, possibility for longitudinal analysis, relatively low cost, and high quality of materials. To briefly elaborate, most of the documents are part of the public record and are available in libraries or may be purchased at a nominal cost. The documents cover actions over a number of years and cannot be altered by researcher contact. Furthermore, most of the materials were produced by highly skilled communicators.

At the same time, several limitations must be acknowledged. One consideration is that some of these materials were not produced for research purposes but for very partisan goals. This situation is particularly characteristic of interest group materials. Not only are such materials designed to promote the organization's aims but they also clearly represent the group's attempt to manage its image. Such biases and distortions render these materials inappropriate as sources for accurate objective descriptions of events but it is just
such biases that are of concern in this study. These materials are a record of the group's effort to present an image, offer its interpretation of events, and enunciate its position. As long as the materials are used to gather data on these kinds of issues they are the best source available.

A closely related limitation is that while the documentary materials produced by organizations usually state the group's official goals, actual operative goals are often quite different (Perrow, 1961; Price, 1972). Such operative goals must be determined by analyzing the activities (Price, 1972), decisions, personnel practices, and elite characteristics in the organization (Perrow, 1961). In this study, an attempt was made to focus on organizational activities and organizational elites. However, often the only or major source was a document produced by the organization. Consequently, caution must be exercised in formulating conclusions.

Additional difficulties with most of the documents used here are that they are not quantified and not indexed. In other words, they are in a form similar to data obtained through open-ended questionnaires. This means that there must be a rigorous analysis of document contents.

Basically two types of documentary analysis have been used by social scientists. The relatively unstructured nonquantitative case study approach has characterized many collective definition of deviance studies. This study attempts to move toward the more structured content analysis approach developing quantitative indicators, when possible, from the documents. Quantification cannot
be achieved in all cases but the goal is to be as systematic as possible.

Data Sources

Table 1 identifies and briefly describes the data sources for this research. As Table 1 shows, government documents are one of the major data sources. Most of these materials were identified through a review of the Monthly Catalog, an annual index of United States Government Printing Office publications. This review yielded a list of over one hundred official publications on cigarette smoking, production, and taxes. With one exception, these materials were available from the university library. The Securities and Exchange Commission Reports were obtained directly from the Commission.

Insert Table 1 about here

The other data sources were obtained in a variety of ways. The source of the public opinion data was the published summaries of the 1964, 1966, 1970, and 1975 HEW sponsored surveys (HEW, 1969, 1973, 1976) and the published results of Gallup public opinion polls (Gallup, 1973, 1978). Advocacy publications were obtained through direct contact with the specific groups involved in the smoking controversy. Most of the media materials were gathered from the university library with several radio program transcripts being purchased at a nominal cost. An additional source of data was the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Further Description or Information Contained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture Department</td>
<td>Tobacco production, cigarette production, cigarette consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressional records</td>
<td>Committee hearing testimony, House and Senate Reports, Public Acts (Laws)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Education and Welfare Department</td>
<td>Anti-smoking pamphlets, attitude surveys, tobacco use surveys, Surgeon General Reports, Office of Smoking and Health Publications, Cumulated Index Medicus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securities and Exchange Commission</td>
<td>1978 Form 10-K annual corporate reports for tobacco companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury Department</td>
<td>Statistics on Cigarette taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gallup Public Opinion Polls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy publications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-smoking</td>
<td>Annual corporate reports of tobacco companies, Tobacco Institute materials (pamphlets, position paper, and so forth), Tobacco Observer (Pro-smoking newspaper)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-smoking</td>
<td>Action on Smoking and Health materials including newsletter and annual financial reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group Against Smoker's Pollution-selected materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Cancer Society—Report of the National Commission on Smoking and Public Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Further Description or Information Contained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Tobacco Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Dwyer, former director of communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Kloepfer, director of public relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walker Merryman, public speaking team member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Carol Sussman, Office on Smoking and Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. Gori, National Cancer Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Banzhaf, III, Director of ASH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
interviews with those involved in the controversy.

The advocacy publications listed in Table 1 are particularly important. Each side in the smoking controversy publishes newsletters reporting organizational activities as well as enunciating the group's position on various issues. The researcher has all issues of the ASH Newsletters (1971-1979), the major anti-smoking group, and all issues of Tobacco and Health (1957-1967), Tobacco News (1959-1964), and the Tobacco Observer (1976-1980), the pro-smoking publications. Such a complete record permits a thorough as well as longitudinal analysis.

Every article in every issue of these publications was examined to determine its nature and for material on the organization's operation. By tabulating the kinds of articles published in the periodicals each year (for example, noting the number of items focusing on health issues or political matters), it is possible to note theme changes over the years. In addition, these publications often report organizational activities (the hiring of new staff, filing of law suits, reorganization of staff, and so forth) that is not available from other sources.

This study does use the New York Times as a major source of data. Specifically, the Times is used in two ways. First, especially in the history chapter, the Times is used as a source of information when there is no other accessible record of the events. Here the information content of the item is of interest. Therefore, the item as it appeared in the Times is the focus of attention. Second, and most frequently, the Times is used to construct an index of
visible activities. Here the interest is not in the informational content of the item but the fact that the item appeared. In other words, the statements, viewpoints, and claims of a party involved in the smoking controversy were reported to the public. Since the group's ability to get the attention of the media is the central concern here and not the informational content, the indices are constructed from the New York Times Annual Index which provides summaries of all articles.

What about the reliability and validity of items in the New York Times? At present there is no way of evaluating the content of the items pertaining to the history of the first anti-cigarette crusade at the turn of the century. While the validity of news items is unknown there is some indication that the Times is the best newspaper available for constructing indices of activity. Jenkins and Perrow (1977) used the Times to construct activity indices (activity refers to the occurrence of an event) in a study of Farm Worker Movements and found that it was more reliable than the Chicago Tribune and Los Angeles Times even though the latter was geographically much nearer the activities. In constructing their indices Jenkins and Perrow were coding events, not the news stories. This is exactly what is done in this study and means that things like editorial bias do not effect the data.

As Table 1 indicates, several of the people involved in the smoking controversy were interviewed. In a sense these were interviews of elites since these persons were selected because they are important actors in the smoking controversy. As such, the general
intent of the interview was to tap the information or view they had developed as a result of their position and activities. Chaplin (1968) has noted that interviewing elites requires a well informed interviewer, an interviewer of equal status, and a fairly unstructured format. These guidelines were followed as much as possible. First, the researcher acquainted himself with all the printed materials available before each interview. Second, while it was not possible to claim equal status, each interviewee was sent a copy of a published article on the smoking controversy the interviewer had coauthored. This at least documented the seriousness of the researcher's interest. Finally, the interview style was designed to be "facilitating" (Mitroff, 1974:41). Taking Mitroff's discussion as a cue, I tried to convey the impression that I was there for the sole purpose of listening to and learning from each individual. This meant, to use Pfohl's (1978:76) term, providing "undifferentiated interest" for all kinds of respondent answers rather than trying to remain uniformly disinterested. The interviewees, for example, often digressed with multiple illustrations or offered detailed interpretation of specific health research reports. Not only had these statements been printed in the organization's newsletter but they were often irrelevant to the question that had been asked. However, I made an effort to appear interested by offering verbal support while trying to find a way to bring the conversation back to the question.
Focusing The Research

A major problem confronting documentary analysis is coding and analyzing the materials (Bailey, 1978). The major goal of structured content analysis is to take verbal non-quantitative documents and transform them into quantitative data. To do this in a form permitting rigorous hypothesis testing it is necessary to have a well developed theoretical framework or previous studies of the phenomenon which enable the researcher to ask very precise questions. With the study of smoking, neither of these conditions are satisfactorily met. There are, however, some general suggestions derived from the theoretical literature and suggestive empirical studies by Nuehring and Markle (1974) and Markle and Troyer (1979). From this literature two explanatory models have been developed which will serve as the basis for the research directions and questions.

As much as possible, the documents are converted into quantitative indicators designed to aid in evaluation of the models.

The phenomenon of central concern here is the collective definition of smoking as deviant. As conceptualized here, it has two components: official definitions and public definitions. Official definitions refer to actions by government and officials that label and/or restrict smoking and cigarettes. Public definitions refer to the attitudes of the general population that smoking is an undesirable act.

The focus will be limited to definitional efforts at the national level. It is true that most states have enacted measures
regulating or prohibiting smoking but including these anti-smoking definitions would make this study unmanageable. Therefore, the focus is limited to anti-smoking and tobacco actions taken by the federal government as well as national public opinion.

The public sentiment that smoking is deviant was measured by the response to the statement "It is annoying to be near a person who is smoking." This item was included in the 1964, 1966, 1970, and 1975 HEW sponsored national probability surveys of adult use of tobacco. The item has the advantage of not having any reference to the health issue and comes the closest of all the survey items to measuring the idea of deviance, that is that something is undesirable. Certainly this is not a measure that incorporates the notion of stigma often associated with deviance. However, this is the only statement approximating deviance that was asked in all four surveys.

To determine the nature and number of official anti-cigarette actions, Table 2 listing the federal government's decisions with respect to cigarette smoking was compiled. Table 2 identifies a diverse collection of decisions which vary greatly in terms of stigmatization of the behavior, product, or smoker.

Insert Table 2 about here

Gusfield's (1963) distinction between assimilative and coercive reforms is used to reduce these data into a dichotomy. According to Gusfield (1963:69), the assimilative action sees the transgressor
Table 2

Federal Government Decisions on Cigarettes and Cigarette Smoking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>FTC-no health inferences in advertising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>FTC-stop tar derby advertising, that is pointing to health effects of filters (reversed in 1966)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1965</td>
<td>Cigarette Labeling Act enacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1967</td>
<td>FCC equal time ruling for anti-smoking commercials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1970</td>
<td>New Cigarette Labeling Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Senate defeats Moss proposal to kill all government tobacco programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Federal Highway Commission denies Nader petition to prohibit smoking on buses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia refuses Nader request to ban smoking on commercial air carriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Senator Moss holds hearings on bill to regulate tar and nicotine content of cigarettes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1973</td>
<td>CAB orders commercial airlines to separate smokers and non-smokers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1974</td>
<td>ICC implements rule restricting smoking to the rear of the bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>Consumer Product Safety Commission prohibited from regulating tobacco by Congress (President Ford signed bill in 1976)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1976</td>
<td>ICC implements smoking regulation for railroads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Senate defeats Hart-Kennedy tax amendment-tax based on tar and nicotine content of cigarettes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>ICC amends 1974 regulation (smoking section enlarged)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>National Park Service bans smoking in federally owned caves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>GSA issues smoking guidelines for GSA buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>FAA prohibits smoking in mobile lounges at Dulles International Airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>House defeats bill to eliminate tobacco price support program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>PL 480-House removed tobacco-Senate included-Conference included (This is the Food for Peace program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>FAA denies Nader health group petition to prohibit smoking in cockpit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>FDA denies ASH petition to regulate cigarettes as a drug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1978</td>
<td>Califano launches a new anti-smoking program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>FDA requires warning in birth control packages about the dangers of smoking cigarettes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>House rejects amendment to eliminate tobacco from PL 480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Increased appropriation for Office of Smoking and Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Congress appropriates $4.6 million for smoking and health education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Public Health Services Act specifically includes money for studying smoking habits of youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Social Security Administration issues new smoking policies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with pity rather than anger. Consequently,

While legislation may be sought to aid the process, the major activities are efforts to persuade the sufferer and to remake his habits and customs. The orientation of the movement in this form is toward the welfare of the potential abstainer by his conversion to the habits of abstinence.

(Emphasis added)

Coercive reform, by contrast, embodies a more hostile attitude toward the norm violator.

The object of reform is not someone to be helped but someone who is hostile and must be approached as an enemy; who must be forced to accept the dominance of the reformer. (Gusfield, 1963:69).

(Emphasis added)

Using these statements, this study defined assimilative actions as those efforts attempting to persuade the individual (smoker) to change his habit. For example, all calls for programs to educate people about the health dangers of smoking were categorized as assimilative. Coercive measures, on the other hand, were defined as those actions which involved some compulsion, a forceful restriction. This type of measure is best illustrated by those official actions which prohibit smoking in certain areas or relegate the practitioner to a special place.

Since the focus of this study is the definition of smoking as deviant, the coercive actions which resulted in some restriction being placed on smoking or cigarettes are of central concern. Furthermore, such decisions as the 1976 National Park Service order banning smoking in federally owned caves seem of minor significance. Consequently, five actions, indicated by asterisks, that significantly label and/or restrict smoking and cigarettes were selected as
representative of official definitions of smoking as deviant and will receive the most attention in the analysis of the data.
(The three actions requiring the segregation of smokers and non-smokers in transportation are lumped together and considered as one event. This was done because they are quite similar.)

With this conceptualization of the definition of smoking as deviant, this research addresses two major questions: What is the relationship between strain and definitions of smoking? and What is the relationship between interest group activities (specifically their mobilization of resources) and public as well as official definitions of smoking? In other words, strain and resources mobilized are two possible models for explaining the definition of cigarette smoking as deviant.

In this study strain is seen as the appearance of research reports that smoking is deleterious to health. Reports that smoking is harmful to health show that there is a discrepancy between an accepted behavior pattern and the well-being of society's members. This definition is consistent with Smelser's (1962) discussion (see Chapter III) and Davis' (1975) ideas. Both theorists cite the appearance of new knowledge as the source of attempts to change norms.

This study measured strain by focusing on two indicators of information circulation and one indicator of information accumulation.

To determine the availability of information concerning the deleterious health consequences of smoking, this study used the Cumulated Index Medicus. Index Medicus is the National Library of Medicine's bibliography of the bio-medicine literature, both serial
journal literature as well as selected monographs. Published annually, this index surveys all medical journals, including foreign periodicals, and lists original journal articles, editorials, and letters under general subject headings. In this study, all entries under tobacco and smoking were checked.\(^6\)

In order to determine the number of items focusing on the link between cigarette smoking and deleterious health consequences, it was necessary to carefully read each entry. To be included in the tally an item had to specifically refer to smoking and a health consequence. Items that referred to tobacco chewing and cigar smoking, for example, were not counted. In addition, entries on smoking history, prevention, control, psychology, occurrence, and therapy were excluded since the focus here is only on the allegation that cigarette smoking is bad for health.\(^7\)

While Index Medicus provides an indication of the information available in the medical literature, it does not reveal the extent to which the public was exposed to the health claims about smoking. To measure the extent to which the health issue was popularly discussed, the New York Times Annual Index and the Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature were consulted. The New York Times was selected because its scope and coverage are the most comprehensive of any newspaper in the United States and it is indexed back to 1857.

The New York Times Annual Index provides exceptional detail and is compiled on the basis of article content. To illustrate, the 1964 Surgeon General's Report on Smoking and Health is summarized in 16 lines in the 1964 Annual Index. Furthermore, a careful scrutiny of
over fifty indexed items revealed that the index is very thorough since any passing reference to cigarette use or smoking has been indexed. For example, in checking the accuracy of the Annual Index, an item for April 21, 1937 was examined. The headline read "New Light Thrown on Blood Pressure" with no reference to smoking until the twelfth paragraph.

To determine the number of items on the cigarette smoking health link, the New York Times Annual Index categories "Smoking" and "Tobacco" were checked for the years 1930 to 1961. In 1962 the Annual Index began listing the items under "Medicine, Smoking, Health Effects of." In order to be included in the tally, the item had to make reference to the smoking health link. This meant that entries referring to smoking patterns, tobacco consumption, morality of smoking, cigarette advertising, and proposed legislation were excluded unless there was a specific mention and discussion of the health issue. Letters to the editor and editorials were included if they discussed the smoking health link. In addition, the items on developing a "safe" cigarette were counted since these items reviewed the hazards alleged to be associated with smoking cigarettes.

The Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature was selected because it provides an indication of what is being discussed in the periodicals of general public interest. Since items are indexed by general subject, Reader's is well suited for this study.

Applying the tallying criteria used for Index Medicus and the New York Times Annual Index was more difficult since Reader's Guide lists only the title of the article. While these titles are not
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always as descriptive as one would like, a general judgement can be made as to content. Only those items that appeared to include reference to the cigarette smoking health link were tallied. Excluded from the frequency count were items such as "Companies put up no Smoking Signs" and "New Measures to Restrict Smoking."

One of the hazards of using the Reader's Guide is that topics are often listed under several subject headings. For this study, for example, it was necessary to look under "Cigarettes," "Smoking," and "Tobacco." Some articles were indexed under more than one of these subject headings making it necessary to cross-check all items to avoid counting the same article twice. A big help for this study was the discovery that the subject heading "tobacco" had a subcategory "physiological effect of." This helped determine the relevance of an item for the frequency count.

Data was collected over 49 years, 1930 to 1978. There was several reasons for selecting 1930 as the starting point. First, it was during this decade that the first reports that cigarette smoking was associated with cancer began to circulate. Second, the last law prohibiting the smoking of cigarettes had been repealed in the mid 1920s. This meant that, at least officially, cigarette smoking was defined as acceptable in 1930. The reason for stopping with 1978 is that this is the last year for which complete indexes are available.

The second model draws on some of the recent social movement literature (Gamson, 1975, Oberschall, 1973) where outcomes have been attributed to group possession and use of resources. This process
resource mobilization, as conceptualized here, refers to the use of goods (both material and non-material) in an effort to influence definitions. Three types of resources (economic, communication skills, and political skills) are considered.

In this study, economic resources refers to financial assets and personnel available to and used by the various groups. Communication skills are defined as the ability to be recognized by and gain access to the media or public to convey a point of view. This means that we will be focusing on the number of times the media quote a group spokesperson, report the group's views, speeches made to public audiences and so forth. Political skills, as used here, refers to the ability to influence government action. In other words, the focus will be on the group's efforts in Congress, realization of requests to regulatory commissions, and so forth.

This conceptualization and delineation of resources represents a composite drawn from the published works or resource mobilization scholars. Specifically, Oberschall (1973, 1978), Jenkins and Perrow (1977), McCarthy and Zald (1973), Gamson (1975), Walsh (1978), and Carden (1978) have analyzed the use of these kinds of resources although they have not specifically classified or grouped them this way.

These resources were measured in a variety of ways. The financial and personnel numbers were taken directly from financial reports, interviews, and the Encyclopedia of Associations. Communications skills were measured by counting the number of times the organization was able to get its view presented in the New York
Times. A survey of the Times Index yielded this result. In addition, the organization's newsletters reported the speaking activities and media appearances of group spokespersons. Finally, the number of newsletters published was also counted as a measure of communication resources.

Political skills were measured in terms of the organization's activity. A count was made of the number of times the group filed law suits, testified before Congress, and took action before regulatory commissions. Except for Congressional hearing records, the researcher was forced to rely on interest group publications for this information.

Analysis

The approach employed here draws on Bloor's (1976) suggestion that analysis should be causal, impartial, and symmetrical. The analysis will be causal in that an attempt will be made to identify the factors leading to the definition of smoking as deviant, "impartial with respect to truth or falsity, rationality or irrationality, success or failure" (1976:5) with regard to interest group claims, and symmetrical in that an attempt will be made to locate factors that explain both success and failure.

Causal analysis in the social sciences has been attempted through two general strategies. The comparative proceeds by collecting data on a number of cases and analyzing differences between cases as a basis for developing generalizations. This study draws on the older tradition, internal analysis, which has the same
goal although the analysis is limited to one case. According to Lipset (1956:426), internal analysis can establish generalizations by focusing on variations which occur within the system over time or between different parts of the system. This study relies most heavily on variations over time.

Some of the data are presented in tabular form with percentages being computed and analysis focusing on percent differences. Statistical tests are not performed since this study does not formally test hypotheses and the measures are rather crude indicators. It does not appear that additional statistical tests would be either appropriate or make a substantial contribution to the goal of the study.

The rest of the data are presented graphically. Graphic presentations are particularly useful and more meaningful for showing trends over time. Since this study often uses longitudinal analysis, graphs are used whenever possible.
CHAPTER V

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES: CHANGING DEFINITIONS

As a substance, tobacco has long been the subject of social controversy. This chapter is designed to place the current controversy over cigarette smoking in that historical context. While the prevailing attitudes and official policies toward tobacco up to the invention of the cigarette are sketched briefly, most of the chapter discusses the anti-cigarette crusade at the turn of the century with the goal of identifying some of the reasons for that movement's initial success but eventual failure. While the data are too limited to permit definitive conclusions, the evidence is sufficient to provide a background for understanding and making suggestive comparison to the present anti-smoking movement.

Discovery of Tobacco To the Late Nineteenth Century

Europe

When the natives of the new world gave Columbus some dried leaves he discarded them as worthless. Eventually recognizing that the natives placed great value on this plant, he took some back to Spain thereby introducing Europe to tobacco.

As the contacts between Europe and the new world developed, tobacco became one of the major trade items. Initially it appears that tobacco use spread throughout Europe because it was viewed as a herb with great medicinal value (Corti, 1931). England was an
exception in that "tobacco seems to have been regarded from the
first ... as a means by which the pleasant habit of smoking might
be enjoyed" (Corti, 1931:68). The habit caught on among "all
classes of society" to the extent that Apperson (1914:33) concludes
that "tobacco was triumphant" by the end of Queen Elizabeth's reign.
Before long smoking was also popular on the Continent.

The habit, however, had its critics including some persons in
positions of authority. James I, who succeeded Queen Elizabeth to
the British throne, was such an ardent foe that he launched an
anti-tobacco crusade by publishing *A Counterblaste to Tobacco* (1604)
and imposing high import duties on the substance. Similar campaigns
to discourage use of the substance were waged by the authorities
on the Continent with most promulgating laws designating criminal
penalties for smoking.

This seventeenth-century campaign raised two objections to
tobacco, particularly smoking. First, there were claims that it was
injurious to health. Excessive use of tobacco was claimed to cause
sterility, birth defects, lead to insanity, and a number of other
ills (Best, 1979). A second category of objections were moral in
tone drawing analogies to drunkenness, suggesting that it induced
irresponsibility, was religiously offensive, and led to disorderly
behavior (Corti, 1931; Best, 1979). In spite of such allegations
and the crusaders' efforts, tobacco consumption increased. As Corti
(1931:187) notes, "by the beginning of the eighteenth century the
whole world had surrendered to tobacco" and most of the prohibitory
laws had been revoked.⁠¹⁰
Although no longer prohibited tobacco use patterns fluctuated during the next few centuries. Apperson (1914) notes that smoking fell out of favor with the English upper class during the eighteenth century reaching its low point the first two decades of the nineteenth (1914:131). The coming of the cigar reversed this trend. By 1830 cigars were freely smoked although usually not in public since the Court (Queen Victoria) opposed the habit (Apperson, 1914:139). In spite of the Court's opposition, smoking continued to grow, especially with the introduction of cigarettes. In Apperson's words, "the coming of the cigarette completed what the cigar had begun" (1914:179). Smoking was now practiced by all classes and both sexes.

United States

It appears that Americans have always used tobacco although there have been several different consumption patterns. According to Gottsegen (1940), the pipe and snuff were most popular during colonial times. From 1790 to 1870, Americans turned to chewing tobacco with cigar smoking gaining popularity toward the end of the period. In 1850, for example, the annual per capita consumption of cigars was 10 but by 1860 it had risen to 26 (Gottsegen, 1940:10).

Smoking cigars was the most preferred form of tobacco use during the last part of the nineteenth century but cigarettes had appeared on the scene. Cigarettes began to gain popularity for several reasons. First, Union soldiers learned to use the cigarette during their Civil War expeditions into the South (Sobel, 1978:14)
and brought the habit home with them. A second factor was technology. The development of a cigarette machine enabled manufacturers to produce the product at a relatively low cost. And finally cigarette manufacturers developed organizational and marketing techniques that gave them major advantages over cigar producers (Sobel, 1978).

Initially the cigarette was not associated with high social status, usually being identified with the disreputable social element. However, as more and more soldiers came back from the war, the cigarette's image began to change. The cigar was still the symbol of prestige and success but by 1880 the cigarette "became the kind of smoke the middle-class male might not have preferred, but one that he would accept" (Sobel, 1978:22).

Table 3 illustrates the cigarette's growing popularity showing that by 1890, over two billion were produced with annual per capita consumption at 35. By 1910, cigarettes were the most popular tobacco product with per capita consumption up to 85. This figure rocketed up to 976 by 1930.

---

Insert Table 3 about here

---

_Saving America's Youth: The Anti-Cigarette Crusade Before World War I_

**Definitions and Themes**

While the cigarette was rapidly gaining popularity during the latter part of the nineteenth century, opposition to the new
Table 3
Small Cigarette* Consumption by Decades, 1870 to 1930

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Total** Cigarettes millions</th>
<th>Increase Over Preceding Decade number in millions</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Per*** Capita in numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>408.7</td>
<td>384.6</td>
<td>2,766.9</td>
<td>8.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>2,233.3</td>
<td>1,824.6</td>
<td>446.4</td>
<td>35.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>2,635.4</td>
<td>402.1</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>34.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>7,863.2</td>
<td>5,227.8</td>
<td>198.7</td>
<td>85.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>50,408.8</td>
<td>42,545.6</td>
<td>541.1</td>
<td>470.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>119,941.3</td>
<td>69,532.5</td>
<td>137.9</td>
<td>976.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Weighing less than three pounds per thousand

**Withdrawals for consumption, ending fiscal year June 30th in annual reports of Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

***July population as reported by Bureau of Census.

product also began to develop. In the early years the predominant theme of this anti-cigarette movement was that the nation's youth, more specifically boys, must be protected from the perils of the cigarette. This was clearly the intent of a number of official actions. By 1890, 26 states had enacted laws prohibiting the sale of cigarettes to minors (Gottsegen, 1940:155).¹¹

Much to their disappointment, members of the anti-cigarette movement found that these laws did not stop smoking among youth.¹² Consequently they pushed for more stringent measures in state legislatures. By the end of 1909, Arkansas, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Washington, and Wisconsin had enacted statutes prohibiting the sale of cigarettes and Tennessee and West Virginia had imposed such heavy taxes on cigarettes that the effect was the same as prohibition.¹³ Such complete prohibitions were generally not endorsed by eastern states although the New York City Board of Alderman passed an ordinance prohibiting women from smoking in public (New York Times, January 21, 1908:1). However, this measure was vetoed by the mayor.

Although officially designated as undesirable in a substantial portion of the United States, cigarette consumption kept increasing.¹⁴ This increase continued despite the fact that popular attitudes were also anti-cigarette. Among women, cigarette smoking was seen as a symbol of the prostitute while males tended to see it as effeminate (Warfield, 1930). Cigar and pipe smokers characterized cigarette smoking as the improper use of a fine product
(Sobel, 1978:52). Clearly, the cigarette did not represent propriety and sophistication.

Anti-Cigarette Forces

Many of the official actions resulted from pressures exerted by the anti-cigarette movement. This movement appears to have been supported and led by three groups: educators, reformers, and businessmen.

Educators appear to have been in the forefront of the efforts to enact anti-cigarette legislation. In discussing the anti-cigarette crusade, The Outlook (March 16, 1901:607-8) notes that pending bills have received the support of school teachers. Educators wrote articles for periodicals detailing the dangers of smoking for youth and school boards were issuing anti-cigarette pronouncements and warnings. Furthermore, school officials were not hesitant to use the schools in their anti-cigarette crusade. In Chicago, a Board of Education member arranged for Lucy Page Gaston (discussed below) to gain access to and lecture in the public schools (Warfield, 1930). In New York, Charles Hubbell, president of the Board of Education organized a city wide campaign among schoolboys. Even though he was a smoker himself, he believed that the cigarette was the cause of many problems among boys. Organizing the Consolidated Anti-Cigarette League, he recruited 25,000 New York schoolboys who pledged not to smoke until the age of twenty-one (New York Times, December 3, 1893:13).
While recognizing that educators did play an important role in the anti-cigarette movement, most commentators have attributed greater importance to the efforts of reformers. The latter part of the nineteenth and early part of the twentieth century saw many reform movements flourish. Perhaps most notable was the Temperance Movement led by the Women's Christian Temperance Union (WCTU) and the Anti-Saloon League but there were many others such as the Suffrage Movement, the Juvenile Court Movement, and so forth.¹⁷

The person most often recognized as the leader of the anti-cigarette movement is Lucy Page Gaston. Miss Gaston grew up in Illinois with nonsmoking and prohibitionist parents. After attending the State Normal School where she apparently was active in the local W.C.T.U. chapter, she taught school for ten years. According to one account (Warfield, 1930), it was during her years as a school teacher that she became convinced cigarettes were a major threat to youth. After leaving the classroom and moving to Harvey, Illinois, near Chicago, she took a job on a newspaper using her pen to wage war on Harvey's saloons. She soon turned her attention to the cigarette lecturing to church groups in the Chicago area. Expanding her campaign and with her brother's help,¹⁸ she began an effort to persuade state legislatures to outlaw the cigarette. In 1899, with the support of businessmen, she founded the Chicago Anti-Cigarette League. In 1901 the organization became the National Anti-Cigarette League changing its name to the Anti-Cigarette League of America in 1911 to accommodate Canadian branches. Working through the organization, Lucy Page Gaston was instrumental in the passage
of a number of anti-cigarette bills. Most of her activities were confined to the midwest although she made several trips to New York asking women to abstain from tobacco and lecturing boys on the street about the evils of the cigarette. In spite of her efforts, the state of New York never passed an anti-cigarette law and New Yorkers did not flock to her crusade.

In Chicago the League flourished. Among its activities the League began promoting a cigarette cure. Several clinics were established where doctors swabbed the throats of clients with a diluted silver nitrate solution which made the person ill if they smoked. The League also employed special officers to arrest anyone under 18 years of age smoking in public (Literary Digest, December 6, 1913:1118).

While Lucy Page Gaston has received much of the credit for organizing the anti-cigarette movement, her League was not the only organization attempting a national campaign. During the same time period, at least one other group, the Non-Smoker's Protective League of America, was active. This group's incorporation papers, filed in 1911, listed a distinguished group of directors from California to New York (New York Times, August 3, 1911:16). The driving force behind this organization was Dr. Charles Pease from the city of New York. The group's major accomplishment before World War I was getting the New York Public Service Commission to hold hearings on a complaint about the nonenforcement of no smoking laws. At the public hearing, the Non-Smokers' Protective League presented a number of witnesses who complained about smoking on
street cars, railway trains, public waiting rooms, and ferry stations (New York Times, June 19, 1913:7). The League won its complaint when the Public Service Commission reaffirmed the validity of the law prohibiting smoking in these areas.

Most commentators have attributed the anti-cigarette legislation of the early 1900s to educators and reformers but at least two publications of that time pointed to business as the key anti-cigarette force. In a survey of the "War on the Cigarette," the New York Times (August 8, 1907:8) argued that the reformers' campaigns and the rhetoric had been relatively ineffective. Then, according to the Times, business began to support the anti-cigarette movement by taking actions such as refusing to hire cigarette smokers. In the Times' view, this led a number of states to enact restrictive legislation. The Times concluded "... business has done or is doing what all the temperance agitators, prohibition propagandists, and the anti-cigarette specialists could not do."

Harper's Weekly came to a similar conclusion. In "The Cigarette and Its Users" (September 17, 1910:25) the writer comments that "legislation against the cigarette has not been brought about directly by the agitation of those reformers who crusaded against it." Instead the author points to business support of anti-cigarette arguments by discriminating against smokers.

While businessmen, in general, were not speaking out in public against the cigarette, one major industrialist did. Henry Ford published and distributed a little book entitled The Case Against the Little White Slaver (1914). The volume contains statements
from businessmen, educators, civic leaders, and athletes on the harmful consequences of cigarette smoking. How widely this volume was distributed is not known.

These educators, reformers, and businessmen made three general assertions about smoking. All three groups claimed that smoking was harmful to health. Lucy Page Gaston and her Anti-Cigarette League charged that some twenty drugs were present in the cigarette (Warfield, 1930:246) including deadly furfural which supposedly was fifty times as poisonous as alcohol. Among other things, Miss Gaston also claimed that "cigarette face" resulted from smoking the "coffin nails." Many claimed that cigarette smoking led to decreased mental ability and academic performance. In summarizing the alleged problems, Towns (1912) claimed that cigarette smoking hurt the wind of athletes, resulted in nicotine poisoning, irritated the bronchial tubes, heightened blood pressure, was narcotic, produced insomnia, and depreciated nerve cells. Furthermore, he argued that tobacco led to alcohol which in turn led to opium. Tobacco was so dangerous, Towns concluded, that "no physician doubts that smoking may be a factor in almost any disease from which his patient is suffering" (1912:767).

The second major assertion against smoking cigarettes was that their use led to moral degeneration. A Doctor L. Pierce Clark, a neurologist at a Manhattan hospital, suggested, for example, that tobacco affected the brain, spinal cord, and surrounding nerves. Therefore, Dr. Clark concluded, the growth in the numbers of the degenerate and the spread of smoking are closely related (Current
More typical are the charges made by Charles Hubbell, President of the New York Board of Education. Writing in The Independent (February 18, 1904) he claimed that the cigarette habit "is more devastating to the health and morals of young men than any habit or vice that can be named." He asserted that 'cigarette fiends' in the New York schools stole money from parents in order to purchase cigarettes and indicated that

"the Police Magistrates of this and other cities have stated again and again that the majority of juvenile delinquents appearing before them are cigarette fiends, whose moral nature has been warped or destroyed through the instrumentality of this vice" (1904:378).

Lucy Page Gaston and others also emphasized the moral theme charging that cigarette smoking weakened will-power, led to drink, delinquency, petty larceny, and divorce (Warfield, 1930). Similarly, Towns (1912:769) suggested that "if a father finds that his boy is fibbing to him, is difficult to manage, or does not wish to work, he will generally find that the boy is smoking cigarettes."

The final theme that was stressed by the anti-cigarette forces was the rights of nonsmokers. This emphasis, although not voiced as frequently as the health and morality themes, was the main focus of the Non-Smokers' Protective League of America. In a letter to the New York Times (November 10, 1911:10) League President Charles Pease forcefully stated the group's position:

The right of each person to breathe and enjoy fresh and pure air-air uncontaminated by unhealthy or disagreeable odors and fumes-is a constitutional right, and cannot be taken away by
legislatures or courts, much less by individuals pursuing their own thoughtless or selfish indulgence.

A member of the League, writing in The Outlook (Abbott, 1910:766), specifically mentioned smoking in restaurants, hotels, and public transportation facilities as offensive arguing that restauranteers and hotel managers should be required to provide separate accommodations free from tobacco smoke for nonsmokers.

A few others echoed similar claims. The editors of the periodical The Independent complained that the smoker "insists on sharing his pleasure" (1908:1307) and Towns (1912:771) charged that smokers "have a callous indifference to the rights of others."

Pro-cigarette forces

The pro-cigarette forces were not well organized during the pre-World War I period. Certainly the cigarette manufacturers opposed the anti-cigarette movement but it is difficult to document their activities. There is some evidence that the companies provided lawyers to help test the constitutionality of the anti-cigarette laws in court and that company officials wrote letters to state legislators opposing anti-cigarette measures in Tennessee (New York Times, February 7, 1898:1). Whether the companies did the same in other states is unknown.

Among merchants there is one case of a company taking some action. The United Cigar Stores Company in New York did organize a petition drive, collecting 72,000 signatures, requesting that the Public Service Commission permit smoking on elevated railways and
street cars (New York Times, October 12, 1913:6). The Commission
did call a hearing but refused to grant a favorable ruling.

More than attempting to encourage or defend cigarette smoking,
several groups raised objection to anti-cigarette movement tactics
and claims. Some newspaper and periodical editors objected to the
attempt to legislate against personal habits. The New York Times,
for example, editorialized against the Indiana Anti-Cigarette Law
calling it "fussy legislation" characterizing it "as scandalous
an interference as can be conceived with constitutional freedom"
(April 19, 1905:10). Similarily, The Outlook (March 11, 1905:611)
discussed the Indiana law under the title "A Foolish Piece of
Legislation" arguing that the measure represented paternalistic
interference with personal habits and actions.

A number of people, including some doctors, questioned the
health claims made by the anti-cigarette movement. One point often
raised was that the persons making the health claims against
cigarettes, such as Lucy Page Gaston, lacked medical credentials.
Among medical authorities, for every doctor claiming that smoking
was harmful, there was another physician discounting the claim.
An example of this latter point is provided in a 1913 article by
Dr. Hirshberg of Johns Hopkins. After reviewing a number of the
charges against tobacco, he writes (1913:12);

Does it cause cancer, catarrh, bronchitis,
locomotorataxia, paralysis tuberculosis, dys-
pepsia, Bright's disease, insanity, blindness,
deafness, and all the other fearful things charged
to it? In answer I may refer to the conclusions
of a physician of world wide reputation...
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"I have yet to see," he said, "in either a clinic or a pathological laboratory, any evidence to condemn tobacco in any form, not excepting cigarettes."

It must be noted that there was agreement that young children were harmed by smoking cigarettes. Even Dr. Hirshberg agreed that boys were probably harmed by smoking but concluded that the effect on grown men was much different (1913:12).

Cigarettes and Patriotism

World War I muted the voices of the anti-cigarette movement. The New York Times, for example, did not carry a single item reporting activities or pronouncements of anti-cigarette groups during 1918. Instead, the Times was reporting on the activities of citizen groups organized to send cigarettes to soldiers and carrying statements by Army personnel on the need for tobacco. On July 18, 1918, for example, the Times quoted an Army doctor as saying the cigarette is an "indispensable comfort to the men."

Cigarettes were quickly elevated to a vital part of the war effort. General John J. Pershing is reported to have cabled Washington, D.C.: "Tobacco is as indispensable as the daily ration; we must have thousands of tons of it without delay" (Wagner, 1971:44). On another occasion, Pershing was quoted as saying "You ask me what we need to win this war. I answer tobacco as much as bullets" (Sobel, 1978:84).

In this kind of setting, the symbolism of the cigarette changed. Now the association was positive as the cigarette "came to
be identified with all the positive values—quiet dignity, courage, and dedication above all" (Sobel, 1978:84). In this atmosphere, any objection to cigarettes was likely to rouse the ire of citizens. Occasionally individuals did raise some objections only to have cigarette supporters suggest that such persons might be prosecuted under the Espionage Act of 1917 (Wagner, 1971:45). In such an atmosphere, there was little the anti-cigarette forces could do but bide their time.

**Coffin Nails and Women:**
The Post-World War I Anti-Cigarette Crusade

**Definitions and Themes**

Although relatively quiet during the war, the anti-cigarette movement stepped up its activities at the end of the European Conflict. Initially the movement scored some victories as Utah and Idaho enacted cigarette prohibition laws in 1921 but the tide soon turned and legislatures began repealing anti-cigarette statutes. By the close of 1923, only North Dakota and Kansas still prohibited cigarettes and these states repealed their measures by 1927.

Officially and unofficially the major debate during the 1920s was over women smoking. Few women smoked before World War I but this began to change in the post-war period. Many citizens and officials defined this as offensive and the behavior became the subject of much public comment. The New York Times, for example, ran enough items on the subject in 1921 that the Annual Index listed
"women's use" as a subcategory under tobacco.

Some officials wanted to take action against women smokers. In Washington, Representative Paul Johnson from Mississippi introduced a bill that would have made it a crime for women to smoke in the District of Columbia. This measure never became law but some policemen acted without the support of legal statutes. In July of 1922, a New York woman was arrested for smoking a cigarette. Even though the judge dismissed the case (New York Times, August 7, 1922:16), a month later a policeman hit a woman smoker with his nightstick knocking her cigarette to the ground (New York Times, August 19, 1922:1). Quite clearly, smoking in public was seen as inappropriate behavior for women.

By the late 1920s the social attitudes were changing. Even though anti-cigarette crusaders like Dr. Kress, vice-president of the Anti-Cigarette League of America, claimed that women smokers were leading the nation to ruin (New York Times, July 8, 1927:2), women smokers were socially accepted. On August 8, 1927, for example, the New York Times ran an article entitled "Woman No Longer Hides Her Cigarette" with the subtitle "She Now Finds She Can Smoke Anywhere." Support for this assessment was provided in 1928 when a Methodist church in Oak Park, Illinois canceled a lecture by an English woman touring the United States because she smoked cigarettes. Newspapers in the United States reacted indignantly and editorialized against the church's action (Literary Digest, January 28, 1928:29-29).
Postwar Anti-Cigarette Forces

The pre-World War I anti-cigarette movement was led by three major groups: educators, reformers, and businessmen. Only one of these, the reformers, was prominent in the postwar anti-cigarette movement as churches and Temperance Movement personnel assumed more significant roles.

Lucy Page Gaston was still the most prominent anti-cigarette crusader in the post-World War I period. In 1919 she helped organize the Anti-Cigarette League of the World (New York Times, August 19: 1919:16). However times had changed and tactics that worked in the early 1900s now brought law suits. The International Anti-Cigarette League asked her to resign and she did (Warfield, 1930:247). Undaunted she announced her candidacy for President of the United States on an Anti-Tobacco platform (New York Times, January 10, 1920:1). She withdrew in six months, formed a new organization using an old name (The National Anti-Cigarette League, Warfield, 1930:275) and launched a campaign in Kansas pushing for enforcement of that state's anti-cigarette law (New York Times, November 16, 1920:14). But even here her tactics were now objectionable and in a dispute over her plan to publish Coffin Nails in Topeka, the Kansas League cut off her salary (Warfield, 1930:275). After some futile efforts in Iowa she returned to Chicago where she died in 1924. Shortly thereafter the League she had headed ceased to exist.28

The other major reformer active in the prewar movement, Dr. Charles Pease, also seems to have lost effectiveness in the postwar
period. In 1923 he announced that his Non-Smokers' Protective League was opening a campaign for a national curb on smoking (New York Times, September 2, 1923) but there is no evidence that this effort ever got off the ground.

The W.C.T.U. (Women's Christian Temperance Union) became active in the anti-cigarette movement of the 1920s but the organization never worked for the statutory banning of cigarettes. After a debate at the 1919 national convention, the W.C.T.U. took the position that education, not prohibition, would be the organization's approach to tobacco (New York Times, November 23, 1919). This policy was never changed as the organization focused on curbing tobacco use by minors, primarily by getting youth to sign pledges (New York Times, July 21, 1927).

A few churches were active in the 1920s anti-smoking movement with Methodist, Presbyterian, and Baptist denominations all adopting anti-cigarette policies. In 1920, for example, the Methodist Episcopal Church's Board of Temperance, Prohibition, and Public Morals issued a statement referring to women smoking as a "menace to the nation" (New York Times, February 6, 1920). Similarly, the Board of Temperance and Moral Welfare of the Presbyterian Church announced a nationwide campaign against the cigarette (New York Times, December 27, 1919) and the Baptists pledged themselves to "wholly banish the use of cigarettes" (New York Times, June 30, 1920).

The anti-cigarette claims these groups advanced in the 1920s were virtually the same arguments that had been used in the early
1900s although the rights of nonsmokers received much less attention. On the health issue, most of the same charges leveled in the prewar movement were reiterated. Doctor Pease, for example, continued to assert that "nicotine is far more injurious than alcohol" and "tobacco is more poisonous than opium" (New York Times, February 13, 1921:See VII:1) while Lucy Page Gaston was talking about furfural. Several new claims were added including the allegation that smoking ruins the voice for singing (New York Times, April 2, 1923:18) and increases the danger of lip cancer (New Republic, September 5, 1923:43). Even the effort to discourage women from smoking was stated in medical terms. The Methodist Board of Temperance, Prohibition, and Public Morals argued that because of women's more sedentary life, tobacco use "produces more serious results" than when used by men (New York Times, February 6, 1920:13). In addition, it was charged that smoking would have a negative health impact on the fetus and nursing babies.

The moral argument was the theme most frequently sounded by the church groups. In fact most of the church groups speaking out against cigarettes had the word moral in their official title (see above discussion for exact names). Many of the statements issued by the W.C.T.U. had moral overtones but did not include the specific charges that cigarettes produced moral depravity, a claim stressed by the prewar movement.

The demand for nonsmokers' rights was almost nonexistent during this period. The only reference to this theme was a statement by Dr. Pease in 1923 (New York Times, September 2, 1923:Sec.VIII:2).
Postwar Pro-Smoking Forces

The pro-cigarette forces had been poorly organized during the initial anti-cigarette crusade but this changed in the post-World War I era. Actually, cigarette manufacturers began to organize a counterattack in 1915 with the formation of the Tobacco Merchants Association (Robert, 1967:246) whose major goal was to fight anti-cigarette legislation. Another organization, The Association Opposed to National Prohibition, set up the Allied Tobacco League of America whose purpose was to wage a militant campaign against prohibition of tobacco (New York Times, October 10, 1919:18). And in 1920, the tobacco growers established a committee with a "war chest" to campaign against the anti-cigarette crusaders (Robert, 1967:248).

The above groups were all closely allied with the tobacco industry but there were also at least two general membership groups: The Smokers' Against Tobacco Prohibition which was incorporated in New York (New York Times, August 9, 1921:2), and the Freeman's League in Utah. Organized specifically to gain repeal of Utah's anti-cigarette law, the Freeman's League held mass protest meetings and appears to have been influential in the eventual repeal of the law (New York Times, February 24:15 and 25:15, 1923).

In states other than Utah, it is not known how influential these industry and membership groups were in the repeal of the anti-cigarette laws. All that is known is that the pro-smoking forces organized. From that fact, it seems reasonable to guess that they
played a significant role but this is conjecture, not fact.

As in the early 1900s, many of the nation's popular publications opposed the anti-cigarette laws. The *New York Times* continued to editorialize against these laws and the *Literary Digest* (March 24, 1923:14-15) noted that the *San Francisco Bulletin*, Washington *Post*, *Boston Transcript*, *Cincinnati Times-Star*, Wichita *Eagle*, *Omaha World Herald*, *Philadelphia Inquirer*, and others had all taken positions opposing Utah's anti-cigarette law. Similar positions were taken by periodicals such as *The Independent* (April 12, 1919:50) and *Current Opinion* (March, 1921:316-317).

The pro-smoking arguments focused on three themes. First, there were a number of medical authorities claiming that cigarette smoking was not harmful. In 1919, for example, *Current Opinion* (October, 1919:243) carried an item entitled "A Physician's Vindication of Tobacco" in which a Doctor Spitzka was reported to have concluded that "A sound healthy man—but not a youth—may safely continue smoking." This statement seems to set the tone for the pro-cigarette arguments of the 1920s. More and more doctors were reported to hold similar opinions. A Doctor O. Victor Limerich, director of the Department of Pharmacology of the Brooklyn, New York Diagnostic Institute was described by the *Literary Digest* (November 14, 1925:88) as concluding that the "widespread belief that the use of tobacco is injurious is a myth, arising from ignorance and fostered by a peculiar mental bias common to many 'professional reformers' ."

The argument used by the media was the same one as emphasized
During the earlier anti-cigarette crusade. The New York Times, The Independent, and Current Opinion all argued that cigarette prohibition was an infringement on personal freedom. As noted in the discussion of the opposition to Utah's anti-cigarette law, many newspapers across the country endorsed this position.

A new theme, developed primarily by the cigarette manufacturers, was that the industry was making a significant economic contribution to the nation. The tobacco industry, for example, began sponsoring exhibitions and conducting public relations campaigns complete with charts demonstrating the economic importance of tobacco (Robert, 1967:252). Along the same line, periodicals like Current Opinion (July, 1919:62) pointed out that the United States government collected $50 million in taxes from tobacco products in 1918 and that many jobs were associated with the industry.

Conclusion

By 1930 the triumph of cigarette smoking was complete. The anti-cigarette laws had been repealed and smoking not only became an acceptable behavior but socially desirable by the 1950s (Hollander, 1969). Then attitudes began to change. By the 1970s states were once again passing laws restricting the habit, regulatory commissions were issuing anti-smoking rulings, the federal government was spending millions of dollars to discourage the habit, and sociologists were writing about cigarette smoking as deviant behavior.

The reasons for and dynamics of this change are the focus of the remainder of this study. Before moving to that discussion, it
is important to formulate some generalizations about the first anti-smoking movement.

First, it is quite clear that the use of tobacco has been subject to changing definitions since its discovery. Initially European rulers outlawed tobacco only to embrace it later. The same process occurred in the United States with regard to the cigarette.

Second, the anti-tobacco forces have used very similar arguments in all time periods. Most prominent have been charges that tobacco use endangers health and undermines morality, although the moral argument was heard much less frequently in the 1920s. A final theme, not employed as much but nevertheless present, was that smoking is offensive to third parties.  

Third, the proponents of tobacco and smoking have also used remarkably similar arguments. There have always been medical authorities defending tobacco as not dangerous; in fact, doctors were prominent among those that used the substance. Perhaps just as important historically has been the economic argument. Best (1979), for example, has argued that the economic importance of tobacco led to its vindication in the seventeenth century and it was shown above that the economic argument was employed during the triumph of cigarettes in the 1920s. Similarly, the argument that government had no business interfering with its subjects' pleasure has also been used in all historical periods.

Fourth, wars have played a very significant role in the acceptance of tobacco and its use. Apperson (1914), Corti (1931),  
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and Sobel (1978) have all pointed to soldiers adopting new tobacco use habits with the general population imitating their habits when they returned home. The discussion above clearly showed the significant role of World War I in the cigarette gaining acceptability in the United States.

Finally, and this applies primarily to the United States' experience, it seems the definitional outcome is closely related to the organizational strength of the antagonists. In the early phases of the anti-cigarette movement in the United States, the pro-cigarette forces were poorly organized. Consequently Lucy Page Gaston and her groups achieved some success. After the war, however, they failed to recruit new supporters for their cause. The W.C.T.U., while willing to wage an educational campaign, for example, refused to support the prohibition of cigarettes. Failing to attract new recruits and faced with a much better organized pro-cigarette force, most of the achievements of the anti-cigarette movement were reversed. Cigarettes had won the first round.

The above generalizations are important for the rest of this study because they provide the guidelines for the questions to be asked and provide a comparison point for developing generalizations. For example, why are the health claims more readily accepted today? Do pro and anti-smoking groups use similar arguments today? How do the organizational patterns of today's protagonists compare to the past? And what does the eventual triumph of the pro-smoking forces over the anti-smoking crusade suggest for the current controversy?
CHAPTER VI

INTRODUCING STRAIN: THE HEALTH CONNECTION

As the discussion in the previous chapter notes, anti-cigarette forces have often claimed that smoking is harmful to health. These allegations do not appear to have been convincing for several reasons. Although not as important as it would be today, the charges were often made by persons lacking medical credentials. Furthermore, some of the health allegations, such as Lucy Page Gaston's identification of "cigarette face," hardly qualify as serious maladies. Another factor lessening the impact of such charges was the fact that since the Europeans began using it, physicians have been among those denying the harm of tobacco (Corti, 1931).

This situation began to change in the 1930s when a new group, medical researchers, began claiming that there was an association between smoking and illness. The number of such studies was not large and the results may not initially have been known by the general population. However, the medical literature was carrying reports of studies such as those by German scientists suggesting a link between cigarette smoking and lung cancer. As the number of such reports grew over the years, anti-smoking arguments came to focus on the discrepancy between pro-tobacco policies, smoking habits, and medical evidence—in other words, strain as it has been defined here.

Today most commentators explain anti-smoking attitudes and actions by citing the medical research claims, yet there have been
few attempts to investigate the connection systematically. This chapter will report an effort to do just that. Specifically, the research question here is: What has been the role of anti-smoking health reports in the redefinition of cigarette smoking as deviant behavior?

In an attempt to answer this question, this chapter discusses the relationship between the designation of smoking as deviant and the appearance of reports by medical authorities that smoking is harmful in Index Medicus, the New York Times, and the Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature. After this some additional public opinion data on the health issue are presented drawing attention to its connection with the definition of smoking as deviant. The chapter concludes with a summary of the findings and a discussion of some of the missing links in the data.

Findings

The first set of data examined will be those for Index Medicus since this appears to be the best measure of the medical community's discussion of smoking and health. Furthermore, the New York Times and Reader's Guide entries were often items reporting statements and findings first published in a source indexed by Index Medicus.

Figure 1 shows the number of Index Medicus items on the smoking-health link from 1930 to 1978 along with the data on the definition of cigarette smoking as deviant behavior. The slope clearly shows a relatively steady number of items in Index Medicus from 1930 to
the early 1950s, then a sharp increase, with minor year to year
fluctuations, for the remaining years. Not only was there a sharp
increase in the number of items but the nature of the items also
underwent a dramatic change in the 1950s, although cigarette
smoking had been linked to cancer in German publications as early
as 1930 (Mertens, 1930). American journals were publishing ar-
ticles such as "Comparison of erythrocyte count, total hemoglobin
and corpuscular hemoglobin in smokers and nonsmokers" (Walters,
1934) which appeared in the Journal of the American Medical Associa-
tion. The nature of the items changed dramatically in the 1950s with
smoking being linked to the more serious diseases. In 1957, for
example, 34 out of 88 items specifically mentioned the relationship
between smoking and cancer. This pattern continues through 1978 as
the indexed items link smoking to many other health problems.

Insert Figure 1 about here

In examining Figure 1, it is clear that the slope for the
number of Index Medicus items and the slope of those agreeing that
it is annoying to be near someone who is smoking, this study's
measure of the public's definition of smoking as deviant, are very
similar. It is quite clear that both rise sharply during the 1960s
and 1970s. In other words, as strain increases, so does the public
definition of smoking as deviant. Furthermore, when the Index
Medicus slope is compared to the official definitions of smoking as
undesirable, (official definitions are indicated by the solid lines
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Figure 1

Index Medicus Items and the Definition of Cigarette Smoking as Deviant

Code: 1=Cigarette Labeling Act; 2=FCC Equal Time Ruling; 3=New Cigarette Labeling Act; 4=Segregation in Transportation; 5=Califano Anti-Smoking Program.
and their respective numbers) it is clear that the official definition occurred after a substantial increase in strain.

Figure 1 and the above discussion imply very strongly that the claims made in medical journal articles have a close relationship to public and official definitions of smoking as deviant. However, the above does not demonstrate that the general public was aware of this medical literature; it only shows that the smoking-health link was extensively discussed in medical publications.

An examination of the New York Times Annual Index and the Reader's Guide should give an indication of whether the medical literature was disseminated to a wider audience. Figure 2 presents the data from the New York Times Annual Index. To begin with, the slope of the items linking cigarette smoking to health problems is characterized by a number of peaks and valleys. More specifically, there were very few such items from 1930 to 1952, then a sharp increase from 1954 to 1959, a decrease in 1960 and 1961, a generally high level from 1962 to 1968, and a general leveling off since then.

In trying to understand this peak and valley pattern, some insights can be gained by examining the nature of the items in the Times. From 1930 to 1952, the items linking cigarette smoking to health problems often did not warrant separate headlines or articles. To illustrate, on October 15, 1931, the fourth paragraph of an article entitled "Anesthetist Hopes For a New Gas Soon" mentioned
New York Times Items and the Definition of Cigarette Smoking as Deviant
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that tests indicated that "with each puff of a cigarette a tiny bit of carbon monoxide, a deadly poison, enters the blood through the lungs" (New York Times, October 15, 1931:17). Furthermore, as the above example illustrates, cigarette smoking was seldom linked to a major health problem although on October 26, 1940, the Times carried an article entitled "Lung Cancer Rise Laid to Cigarettes." However, there was no follow-up to this and articles in subsequent years talked about blood pressure, constriction of blood vessels, and other less dramatic effects. By the late 1940s, there were articles suggesting a link between cigarette smoking, lung cancer and heart disease with 9 out of 15 items in 1953 discussing smoking as a cause of lung cancer. The slope reaches its high point in 1954 as additional reports linking smoking to lung cancer were highlighted by the Times. Most notable this year was an American Cancer Society report strongly supporting the claim that there was a lung cancer-smoking connection. The resulting controversy and additional studies explain the slopes' generally high level from 1954 to 1959.

The second general peak on the slope, 1962 to 1968, encompasses the period of the first Surgeon General's Report on Smoking and Health. The process of setting up the advisory panel received a great deal of news coverage by the Times which explains why the slope rises in 1962 even though the report was not issued until 1964.36 In examining the items, it was found that more scientific studies and statements by medical authorities received coverage in the Times during these years than any other time period.37

After 1968, the Times does carry items on the cigarette smoking
cancer link but not as many as before. Instead, many of the items on cigarette smoking concern attempts to restrict smoking in public. When the slope of the New York Times items is compared to the slope of the annoying question in Figure 2, it is clear that since 1967, the two slopes have moved in opposite directions. In other words, even though exposure to strain (as measured by items in the Times) has been decreasing, the proportion of the public defining smoking as deviant has been increasing. Much the same is true for official definitions. Although the first two official actions designating smoking as undesirable occurred during a high level of Times coverage, the other three actions came when the coverage had flattened out at a substantially lower level. Therefore it does not appear that strain, as measured by the Times, is responsible for the official and public definitions of smoking as deviant.

The data from Reader's Guide reflect a very similar pattern. The slope for Reader's Guide items, presented in Figure 3, also shows two major peaks with a leveling off after 1965. More specifically, as with the New York Times' slope, there were relatively few items from 1930 to 1952. The first high peak comes from 1953 to 1957 with a low from 1958 to 1961. The second peak is very brief lasting only from 1962 to 1964. While there are yearly fluctuations between 1965 and 1978, the general pattern is that there were relatively few articles compared to the peak years.

Insert Figure 3 about here
Figure 3

Reader's Guide Items and the Definition of Cigarette Smoking as Deviant
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When the specific items listed in Reader's Guide are examined, the nature of the items is very similar to what was discussed for the New York Times. That is the early items discuss relatively minor health problems but by the 1950s, cancer is the focus of most articles. And as in the Times, by 1978 most of the items deal with smoking restrictions or stop-smoking programs.

When the slope of the Reader's Guide items is compared to the slope of the annoying question, it is clear that the slopes generally do not move in the same direction. Even though strain, as introduced by Reader's Guide items remained relatively low, a larger proportion of the public was coming to see smoking as undesirable.

Much the same can be said with regard to official actions. In fact, none of the official actions occurred while strain was at its highest level. In other words, the official definition of smoking as deviant occurred during a time when there were relatively few reports, compared to previous number, in the popular periodicals concerning the smoking-health link.

Figure 4 presents the slopes for all three measures of strain together to facilitate comparison. In examining these slopes, the first point of importance is that the slopes for the three indicators of strain are quite similar from 1930 to 1964. After this, however, the Index Medicus slope keeps rising while the New York Times and Reader's Guide slopes decrease dramatically leveling out at a relatively low level after 1970. At the same time this is the period, after 1965, when public attitudes and official actions are becoming more anti-cigarette.
The data do not provide a complete explanation for this divergence but an observation made during the research is suggestive. In examining the New York Times Annual Index, it was observed that there were frequent references to the federal government and the Council for Tobacco Research allocating money for additional studies. The 1964 Surgeon General's Report called for more research and Congress has regularly appropriated funds, even adding new research programs. In addition, since 1954 the Council for Tobacco Research has granted over $80 million to some 387 scientists for studies on the relationship between tobacco and health resulting in the publication of more than 2000 scientific papers (Tobacco Institute, 1979b). In other words, the suggestion is that since money was available for research on the cigarette smoking health link, that is what is being studied.

Whatever the explanation for the increasing number of items in Index Medicus on smoking and health, it is clear that most of these studies are not being reported in the New York Times or the popular periodicals. Furthermore, it seems that the New York Times and Reader's Guide are the best indicators of strain as conceptualized here since these measures indicate that a discrepancy between behavior and the well-being of society's members was brought to the public's attention. In view of this point, it becomes even more difficult to attribute the anti-cigarette smoking attitudes and
Figure 4
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actions to an increase in strain.

One final observation is that the slopes for the *New York Times* and the *Reader's Guide* are strikingly similar. This raises the possibility that the two indicators are measuring the same thing.

Some Further Considerations

The findings reported above indicate that since 1964 an increasingly larger proportion of the public has come to view smoking as undesirable. At the same time, a greater proportion of the public has come to agree that smoking has deleterious health consequences. In 1949, for example, in a Gallup survey 52 percent of the smokers and 66 percent of nonsmokers responded affirmatively to the question "Do you think cigarette smoking is harmful to health?" (Gallup, 1978). In other words, a belief accepted by a slight majority in 1949 was subscribed to by an overwhelming majority by 1978.

To say that cigarette smoking is harmful to health, however, is a very general statement indicating little about the nature of the harm. Evidence that cigarette smoking is indeed seen as harmful is provided by additional Gallup public opinion poll data. Figure 5 adds the data on the proportion of the public responding yes to the question "Do you think cigarette smoking causes lung cancer?" to the data on strain and definitions of smoking as deviant. It is clear that, although a larger proportion of the public agrees that cigarette smoking causes lung cancer than find it annoying to be near someone who is smoking, the slopes are very similar. This clearly suggests that the public's definition of smoking as deviant might be

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
related to its belief that cigarette smoking is the cause of a major health problem.

Insert Figure 5 about here

The importance of health beliefs, specifically about cancer, are also apparent when we examine the official designation of smoking as undesirable. When the date of the first official action, the Cigarette Labeling Act of 1965, which required a health warning on cigarette packages, is located on the slope of the proportion of the public agreeing that cigarettes caused cancer, the intersect is at approximately 60 percent. At that time, slightly less than half of the public found it annoying to be near a smoker. The same pattern holds for the 1967 official action, the Federal Communications Commission equal time decision, and the 1970 Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act. All three of these actions, while certainly having symbolic components indicating undesirability, are clearly related to the health issue. The point is that these actions occurred after a majority of the public came to believe that cigarette smoking caused major health problems but before a majority of the public defined smoking as deviant.

The official definitions of the mid and late 1970s, however, are less overtly related to the health issue. The actions segregating smokers and nonsmokers on public transportation clearly represent a social stigmatization through separation. Furthermore, the official actions taken in the mid and late 1970s are actions against individ-
Figure 5
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uals whereas previous actions were against the product. It becomes the person, not the product, that is relegated to the rear of the conveyance and told that they are committing "slow-motion suicide" (Califano, 1978). In examining the slopes, it is noteworthy that the latter types of official actions appear to have occurred only after a clear majority of the public came to view smoking as undesirable.

Discussion

This chapter began with the question What has been the role of anti-smoking health reports in the redefinition of cigarette smoking as deviant behavior? In formulating an answer to this question, the evidence reviewed above can be summarized in several statements:

1. Medical research and authorities' claims that cigarette smoking is harmful to health have increased substantially since the early 1950s.

2. The public has come to believe that cigarette smoking is harmful to health.

3. Acceptance of this belief apparently preceded the public's definition of cigarette smoking as deviant.

4. Official actions against cigarettes appear to have occurred only after a majority of the public accepted the health claims.

5. Official actions against smokers appear to have occurred only after a majority of the public defined smoking as undesirable.

At first glance it seems that these statements clearly establish the crucial role of strain and present the steps by which cigarette smoking has come to be seen as deviant, both by the public and of-
ficially. However, caution is in order because there are still some very important links missing in this chain of events.

The first link not demonstrated is that the public is aware of the increasing number of studies alleging a cigarette smoking–bad health link. When the data were examined, it was shown that the number of items appearing in the New York Times and indexed in Reader's Guide actually decreased during the late 1960s and held steady through the seventies. So while there are an increasing number of claims being made by medical authorities, there has not been an increase in the number of items reporting these claims to the public, at least not by the New York Times and periodicals indexed in Reader's Guide.

How do we then explain the increasing proportion of the public accepting the idea that cigarette smoking is associated with deleterious health consequences? There seem to be two possible answers. First, even though the number of items has not increased, the New York Times and the periodicals indexed by Reader's Guide have continued to carry some reports. The New York Times, for example, has carried an average of 16 items per year from 1969 to 1978 while an average of 14 items per year (from 1965 to 1978) have been indexed in Reader's Guide. Certainly the claim that cigarette smoking causes harm to health has been kept in the public arena.

A second possible explanation for the increasing proportion of the public accepting the cigarette smoking–bad health link has to do with the age characteristics of people accepting the claim. To illustrate, in a 1969 Gallup public opinion survey, 71 percent of the
respondents said that they thought cigarette smoking caused cancer. When the respondents were broken down into age categories, it was found that while 81 percent of those aged 21 to 29 endorsed the cigarette smoking-cancer connection, only 65 percent of those aged 50 and over did (Gallup, 1972:2213). The point is that the natural process of aging and dying eliminates a disproportionate number of those who do not accept the cancer and cigarette smoking link. This interpretation receives some support from 1977 Gallup opinion survey results which show that 75 percent of those 50 years of age and over believe that cigarette smoking is a cause of lung cancer (Gallup, 1978)⁴³

Another link that is not clearly specified in the summary statements is how public opinion and definition is translated into official actions. There are few persons who would naively claim that political processes and actions are a direct response to public sentiment. What is needed is an analysis of the connections, if there are any, between public sentiment and official definitions of cigarette smoking as deviant behavior. That is the focus of the next chapter.

In conclusion, what this chapter has demonstrated is that reports that cigarette smoking is harmful to health and the public's acceptance of those claims appear to have been prior to definitions of smoking as undesirable. In the terminology employed here, strain preceded the definition of smoking as deviant. However, the evidence does not demonstrate that strain specifically caused the change in definitions, especially official definitions. There are many
missing links. What has been shown is that strain was a necessary, or at least appears to have been a necessary condition. It has not been demonstrated that it is a sufficient condition for the re-definition of cigarette smoking. The next chapter attempts to identify the sufficient conditions.
CHAPTER VII

CREATING EVIL: THE ANTI-SMOKING MOVEMENT.

Today, there can be no doubt that smoking is truly slow-motion suicide. Joseph A. Califano (former Secretary of HEW)

Sue the Bastards! (Motto on office wall of John Banzhaf, executive director of Action on Smoking and Health).

The central question this dissertation tries to answer is Why and how has cigarette smoking come to be defined as deviant behavior? The data presented in the previous chapter demonstrate that the reports linking smoking to deleterious health consequences have played a very important and, perhaps, a necessary role. Yet by themselves they do not provide a sufficient explanation. Specifically the previous chapter noted that a number of the links between the research reports and the definition of cigarette smoking were missing. This chapter will attempt to provide data on those missing links by focusing on the groups promoting and using these research claims in working for changes in attitudes and sanctions toward cigarette smoking.

In attempting to explain such social change sociologists often focus on the crucial role played by social movements (Lauer, 1976). Social movements are organized volitional attempts to effect some change in a part of the culture or social structure. The anti-smoking movement, then, consists of all those groups which have been
involved in defining smoking as undesirable behavior.

One of the problems in social movement analysis has been explaining why some collectivities are successful while others fail. As noted in the theory chapter, several scholars (Oberschall, 1973; McCarthy and Zald, 1973, 1977) have recently suggested that this problem can be overcome by focusing on how groups use resources. This chapter attempts to determine if this approach will contribute to a more complete explanation of the public and official stigmatization of smoking. The general research question is: Have the anti-smoking groups used their resources to have smoking defined as deviant behavior? This chapter tries to answer this question by examining the role of health groups, the government, and private interest groups in the emergence of the new definition of smoking. The chapter concludes with a summary of the findings suggesting the sufficient conditions for the redefinition of smoking.

Antismoking Groups

Markle and Troyer (1979) have identified voluntary associations, private entrepreneurs, and government as the three components of the anti-smoking movement. This chapter will focus on two types of voluntary associations and government ignoring private entrepreneurs since the latter have not been active in securing new definitions of smoking.

Health Organizations

While there are literally hundreds of voluntary associations
concerned with health, the American Cancer Society (ACS), the American Heart Association (AHA), and the American Lung Association (ALA) have been most frequently associated with the anti-smoking movement. Other groups have occasionally made anti-cigarette statements but have not been actively involved in the anti-smoking campaign since the 1950s nor command the resources of the three major groups. In terms of making statements to the press (as reflected by the New York Times), the American Cancer Society has been the most active by far. Consequently, much of the analysis below will focus on this organization.

One way to determine whether the public health organizations have used their resources to have smoking defined as deviant is to examine the statements these groups have made to the public on the subject of cigarette smoking. The New York Times Annual Index provides one record of such claims-making. A survey of the index entries reveals that from 1954 to 1978, the health groups were active in claiming that cigarette smoking causes disease. Table 4 presents the tabulation of these claims by five year periods.

\[\text{Insert Table 4 about here}\]

Table 4 clearly shows that ACS was the most active claims-making group making twice as many statements as all the other groups combined. This difference was not quite as pronounced during the first decade with the difference being only three in the 1954 to 1958 time period but after 1964, the differences are proportionately much
Table 4

Health Organization Claims that Cigarette Smoking Causes Disease, 1954-1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>ACS</th>
<th>Total ACS</th>
<th>Health Claims</th>
<th>Other Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1954-58</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959-63</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964-68</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-73</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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greater.

The other interesting pattern in Table 4 is the dramatic decline in reported statements that smoking causes disease after 1968. In fact no claims were reported for any health group after 1973. The groups either stopped making claims or the New York Times stopped reporting the statements.

Not only were these groups making health claims against cigarettes, there is evidence to indicate the public heard these claims. Table 5 lists public opinion poll data showing that by as early as 1957, 73 percent of the public was aware of the ACS statement. It is important to note that a substantially smaller proportion of the public was aware that the National Tuberculosis Association had made similar claims. Unfortunately there are no data on other health group statements.

Suggestive as the above data may be, they do not show that the public was persuaded by these claims. What is needed to measure the impact of these claims is a before and after measure but there is no before measure. The closest approximation is a Gallup poll conducted from June 12 to 17 in 1954 asking whether or not the respondents thought cigarette smoking caused lung cancer. At this time, several European scholars and a few scientists in the United States had made such claims but no health organization had endorsed such a position although ACS had stated in March of 1954 that it "suspected" a
Table 5

Public Perception of Health Claims Against Cigarettes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source &amp; Date</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Percent Agreeing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gallup, 1957</td>
<td>Did you happen to hear or read about the recent report of the ACS reporting the results of a study on the effects of cigarette smoking?</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEW Survey, 1964</td>
<td>Have any of the following told the public that cigarette smoking is harmful to health? The American Cancer Society</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>same question</td>
<td>79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>same question - National Tuberculosis Association</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>same question - National Tuberculosis Association</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
smoking-cancer link (New York Times, March 18, 1954:28). The Gallup poll (1972:1247) reported that 41 percent of the sample agreed that cigarette smoking was one of the causes of lung cancer. On June 19, 1954, two days after the Gallup poll, ACS announced that a two and one-half year study clearly showed a link between smoking and lung cancer. As Table 4 shows, over the next few years, ACS released other reports and issued statements supporting the smoking-lung cancer connection. In June of 1957, the Gallup poll asked the same question as it had in 1954. This time 50 percent of the respondents, an increase of nine percent, said they thought cigarette smoking caused lung cancer.

This nine percent increase is very small and might even be due to sampling error although it is clear that the proportion of the public expressing such a sentiment has steadily increased from 41 percent in 1954 to 81 percent in 1977 (Gallup, 1978). It is also important to note that the data do not demonstrate that the nine percent increase can be entirely attributed to ACS claims. Other groups were also making claims and a scientist at the National Cancer Institute indicated that he thought there might be a smoking-lung cancer link. However, it also seems clear that the ACS claims, along with the claims by other groups, had some impact upon the public belief that smoking caused cancer.

The point of the above discussion is that the health groups were using their resources to make health claims about cigarette smoking. While there appears to be some evidence that this use of resources had some effect in convincing the public that cigarette smoking...
smoking caused cancer, these kinds of claims cannot be considered as specifically labeling the behavior deviant. In order to be classified as attempting to have smoking defined as deviant, the health organizations would have to engage in activities designed to stigmatize the behavior and impose sanctions on the smoker. Did these health organizations use their resources in such activities?

While there is no record available to indicate exactly what the health groups did, there is a record of their announcements of proposed actions. Table 6 presents a tabulation of the proposed actions categorizing them as either coercive or assimilative. This distinction comes from Gusfield's (1963) work with assimilative approaches being those that attempt to persuade the individual (smoker) to change his habit. Education about the dangers of smoking typifies this approach while coercive activity involves compulsion instead of persuasion. Coercion is illustrated by prohibitory regulations and laws and comes closest to the idea of officially designating some behavior as deviant.

---

Insert Table 6 about here

---

Table 6 shows that except for the 1974 to 1978 period, the health groups have stressed the educative approach twice as often as coercive actions. This is most pronounced during the first decade when no coercive actions were proposed. Furthermore, the 1964 to 1973 period saw only three coercive proposals. However, the 1974 to 1978 period sees a complete reversal of this pattern with coercive
Table 6

Actions Proposed by Health Groups on Smoking and Cigarettes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Proposed Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assimilative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954-58</td>
<td>3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959-63</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964-68</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-73</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-78</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*During 1954 two nonhealth groups, the Women's Christian Temperance Union and the National Education Association, did call for action against cigarettes and smoking (New York Times, October 32 and July 13).

**Another nonhealth group, Consumer's Union, called for government to regulate cigarette ads (New York Times, July 17, 1963)
action proposals outnumbering assimilative approaches 10 to 1. In other words, before 1974, the health groups claimed they were spending their resources to educate the public about the health dangers associated with smoking. Beginning in 1974, it appears the resources were shifted to coercive approaches.

To illustrate and examine these patterns more closely, we will examine some of the efforts by ACS since this organization had the most resources and did more than the others. Initially, it appears ACS limited itself to warning the public of the health problems associated with smoking. In October, 1954, after release of its first major report linking cigarette smoking to lung cancer, ACS Board of Directors approved a resolution to warn the public of the smoking-cancer link (New York Times, October 23, 1954:17). Four years later, ACS Board of Directors voted to intensify their program among teenagers announcing "a total educational effort toward modification of the smoking habit in the community" (New York Times, June 5, 1958:25). During the 1960s, ACS produced films, television and radio advertisements, and other materials all designed to prevent persons from acquiring the habit or quit smoking.

The question is what impact did these activities have on the public definition of smoking as deviant? The data available do not provide direct evidence for an answer to this question. What we know is that, according to the public opinion results cited in Chapter VI, that it was approximately 1967 before a majority of the public developed such a definition. We also know that the health groups were focusing their claims and actions on the health issue. There-
fore, the evidence presented here does not permit the conclusion that the health groups were responsible for the public definition of cigarette smoking as deviant.

What about official definitions, especially the five official actions identified in this study as labeling smoking as deviant? Before answering this question we need to note that the five official actions are quite coercive representing compulsion of behavior rather than attempting persuasive compliance. As Table 6 shows, the health groups endorsed coercive actions in the late 1960s and 1970s, the very time frame when the five official actions were taken. It appears at first glance that the health groups' calls for coercive actions are related to the official definitions.

Further examination reveals, however, that the health groups have not used their resources to secure official definitions. Instead, their endorsement of such actions has been weak. To illustrate, during 1964 hearings before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce concerning bills regulating the labeling and advertising of cigarettes, the ACS president offered the following testimony:

To conclude: We believe in the freedom of the individual in the matter of cigarette smoking. We are opposed to legislation that would prohibit the smoking of cigarettes. ... To achieve our goal we rely on persuasion and public and professional education... (H.R. Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 1964:294)

The ACS president did note that the Society supported the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) proposal for a health warning on cigarette packages but there is no record of further efforts to support that
proposal. At the same hearings, no other health group testified although the National Tuberculosis Association sent a letter urging the committee to take "firm actions."

Another example of the reluctance of the health groups to support coercive action is provided by the response to the 1967 Federal Communications Commission (FCC) decision requiring the broadcast of anti-smoking commercials, one of the five official definitions this study considers crucial. The FCC decision came in response to a petition filed by a New York lawyer named John Banzhaf. The tobacco companies appealed the decision whereupon Mr. Banzhaf asked various health groups to provide legal aid for the defense. Even though ACS had sent a letter to the FCC congratulating them on their decision, it and every other health group said no. Perhaps typical was the American Heart Association comment that "its 'proper responsibility' involved testimony on the health hazards of smoking, not legal action..." (New York Times, September 14, 1967:39).

Similarly when one examines the other coercive actions, it is quite clear the official decisions did not occur because of pressure from health groups. None of them was involved in the decisions segregating smokers on public transportation or pushed for the Califano anti-smoking program. Instead the health groups employed their resources in efforts to persuade the individual smoker to kick the habit.

Much the same is true for the other health groups' calls for coercive actions identified in Table 6. On closer examination, it becomes apparent that these calls did not lead to the official
definitions. A 1966 call for coercive action, for example, was a National Tuberculosis Association statement asking for legislation cutting or barring cigarette advertisements (New York Times, November 11, 1966:27). A 1968 entry simply reflects the ACS announcement that it backed the 1967 FCC decision (New York Times, March 10, 1968:78) and a 1970 item represents a statement by the ACS chairman that the Society favored a ban of all cigarette advertising (New York Times, November 7, 1970:82). However, there is no evidence to indicate that these organizations took actions to realize the proposals they had endorsed.

The health groups did endorse more coercive actions from 1974 to 1978. For example, as Markle and Troyer (1979) have noted, ACS called for an end to cigarette advertising in 1974 (Brody, 1974), an end to the tobacco subsidy program (New York Times, January 15, 1977:A8), state and local restriction of smoking in public places, and strict enforcement of the ban on cigarette sales to minors (Brody, 1978). Yet as the National Commission on Smoking and Public Policy, a body created by ACS, concluded, the health organizations have not effectively used their resources to support such proposals. In the words of the commission's report:

The three major national voluntary agencies concerned with cigarette-related problems, the American Cancer Society, the American Heart Association, and the American Lung Association, have combined annual incomes in excess of $230 million. The Commission's best estimate is that only a very small amount of those funds have been devoted to the smoking problem.

Even that effort is a fragmented one -- with little coordination or cooperation among the agencies. Although each agency has been actively
engaged in public information and public and professional education with regard to smoking, none has expended substantial sums in this area in relation to the size and scope of the problem.

The American Lung Association has used some of its volunteers to campaign for state legislation restricting smoking in specified public areas; however, neither the American Heart Association nor ACS have participated in this activity to any substantial degree. State legislators have testified before this Commission that they rarely hear from either organization when legislation is introduced or when hearings on bills are held. (National Commission on Smoking and Public Policy, 1978:71).

In view of the evidence presented above it is clear that official definitions cannot be attributed to the actions of health groups. The resources the groups utilized, use of media, education programs, and printed materials were largely aimed at persuading individuals that smoking was dangerous to health or get people to stop smoking. As such, the health groups may have influenced the public definition of smoking as undesirable but there is little evidence that they affected official definitions.

Governmental Bodies

In examining anti-smoking forces, it quickly becomes apparent that government has been an active agent in shaping definitions of smoking. It is quite clear that at the federal level, agencies and departments have taken actions on their own initiative while other agencies, departments, and Congress have resisted those actions. Consequently the traditional image of the government as an arbiter of interest group disputes or the perspective of government as a monolithic instrument of elites seem inappropriate. Instead, with
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regard to the definition of smoking, it appears that various government agencies and officials often acted independently.

One indicator of the government's efforts is the statements made to the public about the cigarette smoking issue. As was true for the health groups, most of the initial statements dealt with the health controversy. Table 7 presents a summary of the health claims made to the public through the New York Times.

Table 7 clearly shows that government officials were not very active claims-makers before 1964, that is before the first Surgeon General's Report. The New York Times reports three statements by officials before 1964, none of which could be characterized as forceful endorsement of the health claims. The first was a report by two National Cancer Institute research scientists saying that smokers were subject to a higher lung cancer risk (New York Times, June 17, 1956:38). One year later the United States Surgeon General said that increasingly the evidence was indicating that excessive cigarette smoking was a causitive factor in lung cancer (New York Times, July 13, 1957:1). And finally, in 1962 a Veteran's Administration doctor said that smoking might be a cause of lung cancer (New York Times, June 25, 1962:10).

As Table 7 clearly shows, before 1964 the health organizations were the most active claims-makers with 35 statements on the smoking-health link compared to three by the government. This changes
Table 7

Claims That Cigarette Smoking is the Cause of Disease, 1954–1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>ACS</th>
<th>Group Making Claim Other Health Groups</th>
<th>Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1954–63</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964–78</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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dramatically after 1964 with two more government claims than health group claims. This change reflects the 1964 Surgeon General's report and its aftermath.

As a claims-making act, the 1964 Surgeon General's Report was very significant. Surgeon General Luther Terry employed a substantial number of the government's resources that resulted in the report having maximal impact. First, he selected an advisory panel of eminent medical authorities who had not taken a position on smoking. Second, the advisory committee took more than a year to review the evidence on the smoking-health link summarizing findings in a document almost 400 pages long. Third, Terry managed the process in such a way as to gain substantial press coverage. Utmost secrecy about the advisory committee's work prevented premature leaks to the press. Upon completion, the report was released to the press at a carefully staged news conference. The result was headline coverage in virtually all the media.

Unfortunately there was no public opinion poll data indicating the precise impact of the report on public attitudes toward smoking. One very crude indication can be gained by comparing a July, 1958 Gallup poll which found that 44 percent of the American public thought cigarette smoking caused lung cancer (Gallup, 1972:1564) to a 1966 HEW sponsored survey which found 59.5 percent of the public responding yes to a similar question (HEW, 1969:690). While this is a substantial change, the Surgeon General's Report was not the only news item discussing the issue so caution is in order. Another indicator of the report's effect is that per capita cigarette consumption dropped
in 1964 (Markle and Troyer, 1979). However, this effect was short-
lived and cigarette consumption rose steadily during the rest of the
1960s. In sum, this evidence seems to indicate that the public
accepted the government health claims. The extent that this in-
fluenced the public definition of smoking as deviant is not clear
since we have no before measure of the public defining smoking as
annoying.

Even after the report, most of HEW's activities continued to
focus on the health issue as money was spent on additional research
and efforts to convince the public that smoking was harmful. With
congressional authorization, the National Clearinghouse on Smoking
and Health was set up in the Public Health Service. This agency's
actions involved gathering technical information and producing anti-
smoking materials aimed primarily at school children. The Clearing-
house did not propose or advocate any coercive measures against
smokers.

With regard to influencing official definitions, it seems quite
clear that on several occasions other agencies or officials have
acted on their own to label smoking as inappropriate. Specifically,
with reference to the five major official definitions of smoking as
deviant this study focuses on, the 1965 Cigarette Labeling Act\textsuperscript{52} and
the 1978 Califano anti-smoking program represent government initiated
designations. On both occasions, officials initiated actions without
pressure from interest groups to do so.

The first action was initiated by the Federal Trade Commission.
One week after the release of the first Surgeon General's Report, FTC
proposed rules requiring health warnings on all cigarette packages
(Federal Register, January 22, 1964:530-532), held hearings in March,
and promulgated its rule in July (Federal Register, July 2, 1964:8325).
Tobacco interests appealed to Congress and hearings were held on the
FTC action. The result was the Cigarette Labeling and Advertising
Act of 1965 which not only modified the proposed health warning but
prohibited the FTC from taking further action.

Even though Congress enacted this measure instead of the FTC, it
is clear that the official action was the result of the FTC initiative. The reason for the FTC initiative is not clear although
Fritschler (1975) has speculated that it grew out of the frustration
of trying to regulate cigarette advertising claims. Whatever the
reason, this is clearly a case where an agency initiative was
responsible for a label being attached to a product by using its
resources in a forceful manner.

Another example of an official marshalling resources for an anti-
smoking initiative is provided by former Secretary of HEW, Joseph
Califano. In a speech on January 11, 1978 Califano declared that
"cigarette smoking is public health enemy number one" (Califano,
1978) and announced a program of education and regulation designed to
discourage the habit. The expanded education program included re-
quests to broadcast networks for more anti-smoking messages, increased
informational materials for children, teenagers, women on the pill,
and high risk industrial employees, and a request that public schools
develop health education programs dealing with the dangers of smoking.
Regulatory proposals included banning of smoking in many parts of HEW
buildings, asking the General Services Administration to establish more restrictive rules in government owned buildings, asking the Civil Aeronautics Board to ban all smoking on commercial aircraft, and proposing higher excise taxes on cigarettes. Califano also asked business leaders to set up smoking guidelines and suggested insurance companies give premium discounts to nonsmokers (Califano, 1978).

As Secretary of HEW, Califano was able to use his power to implement some of these proposals. One primary example of this was the National Clearinghouse on Smoking and Health. During the Nixon administration this office had its budget cut and was moved to Atlanta. Califano moved the agency to Washington, changed its name to Office on Smoking and Health, persuaded Congress to increase its budget to approximately $6 million, and increased its staff from three to fifteen positions (Sussman, 1980). In addition, Califano ordered a new Surgeon General's Report to be released on the 15th anniversary of the first report. This 1979 report also received much media attention upon release.

Impressive as the above achievements may be, Califano was not able to utilize enough resources to implement most of his regulatory proposals. While the General Services Administration did issue new smoking regulations, neither the Civil Aeronautics Board or Federal Trade Commission responded favorably. In addition, the business community largely ignored Califano's requests and the broadcast media resisted airing more anti-smoking messages (Kneeland, 1979). Furthermore, many tobacco producing state congressmen reacted negatively. While not the only reason, this kind of reaction certainly was a
factor in Califano being dismissed as Secretary of HEW in 1979.

With Califano gone, some of the efforts he initiated continue. Most notably the Office on Smoking and Health continues to operate although it has defined its goal or purpose as one of providing the public with information. To quote Carol Sussman of the Office:

The basic focus of our program is to give people the information they need to know about smoking to make an informed choice. We're not out to ban smoking... (We) ... don't get into that process... recommending legislation. (Sussman, 1980)

It seems clear that this agency will not be pushing for any more official designations of smoking as deviant. Instead it will be pursuing a program designed to influence individual decisions and opinions on smoking.

Legal Action Groups

It has been reported that there are more than 1,000 local anti-smoking groups (Blair, 1979) many of which have demanded legal strictures on smoking. These groups emphasize the "rights" of the non-smoker describing smoking as "a privilege which can and should be limited where the exercise of that privilege begins to interfere with those around him" (Banzhaf at National Town meeting, 1979). On the basis of this ideology, these groups have been active in pressuring government bodies for rules and legislation regulating behavior, that is coercing rather than persuading the individual smoker to give up the habit.

While there are many local anti-smoking groups, few national organizations coordinate and organize these activities. The
Encyclopedia of Associations, for example, lists only two national groups: The Group Against Smokers' Pollution (GASP) and Action on Smoking and Health (ASH). According to this source, GASP has 10,000 members in 100 local chapters. This looks impressive but strong and effective national organization appears to be lacking since there is no national headquarters that sets policy or collects donations. Banzhaf's (1980) description of GASP as "a very loose affiliation of individual chapters all of whom have adopted a common name" appears to be accurate since the organization has never testified before Congress or appeared before a regulatory commission to support or propose an anti-smoking measure.

ASH is the only anti-smoking group that focuses specifically on action at the national level. In fact, ASH is the only legal action group to testify before congressional committees, petition federal regulatory agencies, and file law suits in federal courts. Since this study is focusing on actions at the national level, most of the discussion and analysis will deal with ASH and its activities.

ASH was founded in 1967 by John Banzhaf. Earlier he had filed the petition with the Federal Communications Commission that resulted in the decision requiring media to broadcast anti-smoking commercials. When the major health organizations (ACS, ALA, AHA) refused to help in defending the decision, Banzhaf and some supporters formed ASH with the specific goal being "the defense and enforcement of the FCC decision" (ASH, 1968:3). In 1971, "ASH undertook a major campaign to protect the rights of non-smokers" (Encyclopedia of Associations, 1973:840).
Today Banzhaf still serves as director of the organization which occupies three small rooms in a building on the edge of the Georgetown University campus in Washington, D.C. With a staff of six, including two full time attorneys, the organization had a 1979 income of almost $366,000 from a donor list of 58,000 persons. ASH continues to publish its bimonthly newsletters which carry announcements of the organization's legal activities, articles on current smoking issues, smoking related news items from the United States and other countries, usually a message from Banzhaf, and some items on smoking and health.

When ASH undertook the campaign to protect the rights of non-smokers, Banzhaf voiced the underlying philosophy of the organization with the statement "Power doesn't grow out of the barrel of a gun, or from illegal confrontations; in a democracy, it comes from the influence and support of concerned citizens" (ASH, 1971:8). To make ASH an effective voice for the anti-smoking view, Banzhaf indicated that the organization would take legal action on the "problem of smoking and the rights of non-smokers," produce "anti-smoking messages aimed at protecting the nonsmoker," publish a bimonthly newsletter to keep supporters informed, produce special reports on smoking problems, and make available special products and services such as bumper stickers and so forth (ASH, 1971:8).

In an attempt to measure how the organization has emphasized these goals, an analysis of the major items in the ASH Newsletters was conducted.\(^56\)
Table 857 clearly shows that in the communications with its supporters, ASH has definitely emphasized the political component of the anti-smoking movement. Slightly over two-thirds (67.9 percent) of all the major items in the newsletter concerned political matters compared to only 9.9 percent discussing health issues. Furthermore, although there are year to year fluctuations, the emphasis has remained the same with a majority of the items focusing on political matters each year. In other words, the organization is directing its members' attention more to the official definition of smoking than to the public definition of the habit.

Insert Table 8 about here

The above reflects the image ASH wishes to present to its constituency. The next question is what kinds of resources does ASH command and how has the organization employed these resources? Table 9 presents a summary of ASH financial resources and provides a rough indication of how those resources have been mobilized.

Insert Table 9 about here

Table 9 shows that ASH's financial resources have increased substantially during its existence with the 1979 income of $365,821 being almost three and one-half times the revenue for 1968. Note, however, that income growth has not been steady with income decreases in 1970 and 1973. 1970 was the year before the organization broadened its emphasis to the rights of non-smokers and began is-
Table 8

Subject of Major Items in ASH Newsletters by Year, 1971-79

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Health no.</th>
<th>Health percent</th>
<th>Subject Political Action no.</th>
<th>Subject Political Action percent</th>
<th>Other* no.</th>
<th>Other* percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This category includes items about other nations, organizational matters, tobacco consumption patterns, and so forth. In other words, all items that did not focus on the political or health issues in the United States.
### Table 9

ASH Financial Resources and Expenditures, 1968–1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year*</th>
<th>Number on donor list**</th>
<th>Total Income***</th>
<th>Total Expend.</th>
<th>Information &amp; Education Expend.</th>
<th>Legal Action Expend.</th>
<th>Admin. &amp; fund raising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td></td>
<td>$78,718</td>
<td>$51,027</td>
<td>$25,322</td>
<td>$21,484</td>
<td>$4,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>90,227</td>
<td>70,443</td>
<td>40,452</td>
<td>21,901</td>
<td>8,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>58,381</td>
<td>91,555</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>89,939</td>
<td>75,895</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>186,095</td>
<td>112,208</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>115,434</td>
<td>137,170</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>148,477</td>
<td>161,984</td>
<td>45,248</td>
<td>42,175</td>
<td>79,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>170,938</td>
<td>191,411</td>
<td>95,139</td>
<td>51,785</td>
<td>45,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>213,069</td>
<td>190,935</td>
<td>84,788</td>
<td>45,423</td>
<td>60,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>281,686</td>
<td>224,152</td>
<td>111,535</td>
<td>48,578</td>
<td>64,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>293,530</td>
<td>295,135</td>
<td>140,444</td>
<td>73,030</td>
<td>81,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>58,000</td>
<td>365,821</td>
<td>357,183</td>
<td>167,835</td>
<td>86,966</td>
<td>102,382</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The time period here is a fiscal year beginning November 1 and ending October 31. Therefore, for 1968, the period covered in this row refers to November 1, 1967 to October 31, 1968.

**This column must not be seen as representing the number of persons who contributed during that year but apparently represents the total number of donors over the years. In 1979, for example, approximately 32,000 persons made contributions to ASH.

***From 1972 to 1979 a very small proportion of the income came from interest.

Source: ASH Annual Financial Reports

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

In general, the organization spends most of the contributions it receives although not necessarily in the same year. For example, in 1974 and 1975, the organization spent more than it received in contributions but this was possible because of a 1972 surplus. In recent years, income has largely covered expenditures and left the organization in good shape. The 1979 audit report indicates that ASH had approximately $90,000 in cash on hand.

When we examine the expenditure categories, it appears that substantial funds are being spent on educational activities, that is the same kinds of things the health groups and Office on Smoking and Health stress. However when one reviews the expenditures listed under the information and education category, it is clear that they are definitely related to the political actions of the organization. To cite a few examples, the cost of the newsletter, printing and handling of materials, and salaries are the largest entries in the information and education category. As Table 8 indicated, the newsletter is primarily concerned with the political side of the controversy. In other words, education for ASH refers to informing the constituency about the legal issues. The legal action category, then, refers to the direct cost of legal action and does not reflect the total amount of financial resources employed in the political arena.

Perhaps a more accurate reflection of the resources used in the political arena would be gained by combining the two categories, especially since many of the information and education expenditures
are designed to elicit support for legal actions. Table 10 provides some evidence of this. Especially note that on at least nine occasions, the ASH Newsletter asked readers to write letters in support of an ASH legal petition.

---

Insert Table 10 about here

---

Even though the frequency of ASH's activities listed in Table 10 is probably understated, the table does show that the organization's resources have been utilized in an attempt to influence official definitions. Note that those resources have been used most frequently in actions before regulatory commissions with ASH having filed more than 150 complaints as well as initiated 45 other actions. A majority of the complaints have been over the enforcement of the smoking rules on commercial airlines while the other actions usually involved requests for regulations restricting smoking.

Activities with other units of government have been less frequent but the judicial, legislative, and executive branches have not been ignored. Court actions involved suits, usually on behalf of an aggrieved non-smoker, while legislative activities were limited to occasional testimony. Executive branch activities primarily consisted of letters written to Department Secretaries asking for smoking restrictions.

ASH appears to have been very successful in gaining favorable decisions. An ASH publication, "History of the War Against Smoking" (1978) identifies 32 successes. While this list includes some rela-
Table 10

ASH Activities, 1967-1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Activity</th>
<th>Estimated Number*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filing complaints with regulatory agencies</td>
<td>150+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other actions before regulatory agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(petitions, letters, testimony, briefs)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Actions</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative-Executive branch contacts</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged letter writing campaigns</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearances in public forums (radio, TV, etc.)</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All of these numbers are estimates based on systematic analysis of ASH newsletters, New York Times, Tobacco Institute materials, Congressional hearings, and other articles. As Banzhaf (1980) indicated in an interview, however, the newsletter and other sources do not report all activities.

†The numbers reported here represent the precise number that could be documented. In both cases it is clear that there were more but it was not possible to get any detailed information on them.
tively minor events, it also includes three of the five major official definitions of central concern here. Most notably, ASH and its director appear to be responsible for the 1967 FCC decision, the three public transportation decisions in the 1970s, and were involved in the 1970 Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act. Most recently, ASH initiated the action which led the Food and Drug Administration to include a health warning with all birth control packages.

Considering the fact that the opposing side has far more financial resources (see next chapter), how can we explain the success of ASH in influencing the official definition process? One element of the answer lies in ASH's careful strategy and tactics. Basically, ASH has been successful because it has carefully selected the arena for the conflict. Banzhaf (1980) explains the strategy and success this way:

... this (strategy) goes beyond the issue of smoking. It's the general philosophy of what we call legal activism, which is a generic term for using the laws as a means of changing social policy. We pretty much start out with the axiom in legal activism, that we are outgunned and outclassed. That we are almost always facing a bigger, stronger opponent with more money, more clout, and more words. Therefore, one of the key axioms is that we want to go into proceedings where we have what we call the maximum amount of legal leverage. Where we have to put in the least and get the most out. So we tend to avoid those areas where the other side is going to have an advantage by way of its size, or its clout, or its political connections. ... What we like to do therefore, are to pick very carefully areas where they (tobacco interests) cannot use their muscle, more precisely where the outcome doesn't depend solely on muscle. Where
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we have the law, some kind of particular advantage. I think the initial decision getting the anti-cigarette commercials on the air, is a good example, or some of our decisions getting no smoking sections mandated by law are another. The industry could have thrown in endless numbers of dollars, and in the long run I don't think it would have changed the result ....

In view of this statement, remember that Table 10 indicates that most of ASH's activities involved regulatory commissions. In these settings, the tobacco industry's financial resources are of much less consequence. Instead, the legal expertise of ASH combined with the accepted scientific claims of the government and health groups, gives the organization an advantage.

Evidence supporting this interpretation comes from the outcome of conflicts in other arenas. In Congress, for example, even though many anti-smoking bills have been introduced and ASH has testified in favor of the measures, not one has passed since the 1970 Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act. Another example is noted by Markle and Troyer (1979) who report that the tobacco industry used its financial resources to defeat the anti-smoking referendum in California in 1978.

Conclusion

In trying to explain the redefinition of cigarette smoking, the previous chapter examined the role of reports that smoking was dangerous to health and concluded that by themselves these reports were not a sufficient explanation although they may be a necessary condition. By focusing on the role played by several groups in the redefinition process, this chapter suggests some of the sufficient
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conditions for the new definition to emerge.

The following generalizations summarize this chapter's findings.

1. The health groups' endorsement of the claim that smoking had deleterious health consequences gave the health argument credibility.

The claim that smoking is harmful to health at least goes back to James I in 1604 and was the basic argument employed by the first anti-cigarette movement in the United States. Yet at no time did this claim win the overwhelming public acceptance that it has today. How can we explain this difference?

Several factors appear to be significant. First, there is a difference between the persons making the claims at the turn of the century and those in recent times. In the earlier crusade, many nonmedical persons, such as Lucy Page Gaston, made health allegations against cigarettes but during the current anti-cigarette movement, scientific researchers first made the claims. In other words, the credentials of the claims-makers made the recent claims more credible.

A second major difference is that during the earlier anti-cigarette movement, medical opinion was sharply divided. This changes dramatically with the modern anti-cigarette movement when the major health organizations officially endorse the health claims. This lends a credibility to the charge that was not present in the first anti-cigarette crusade. Support for this assessment is provided by the fact that tobacco consumption declined and tobacco stocks dropped in value immediately after the 1954 ACS report supporting the health claims. Clearly, the health groups' endorsement
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had a dramatic impact on the general public.

2. The Surgeon General's Report gave the health claims legitimacy.

With the health groups endorsing claims against cigarettes, the tobacco industry began waging a campaign asserting that the charges against cigarette smoking were unproved (see next chapter). During the late 1950s and early 1960s the health organizations and the tobacco industry carried on a debate in public about the legitimacy of the claims. Through careful managing by Luther Terry, successfully marshalling the resources of the scientific community and the media, the Surgeon General's Report appeared to settle the controversy. The government said the health claims were correct. The health claims gained official legitimacy while the tobacco industry and product lost.

3. The actions and programs pursued by the government have tried to persuade the public that smoking was harmful.

As was noted above, most of the actions endorsed by the health groups and programs pursued by the National Clearinghouse on Smoking and Health as well as the Office on Smoking and Health have focused on convincing the public that smoking is a bad habit. Whether through anti-smoking commercials or stop smoking clinics, these groups focused on persuading citizens, not coercing them. There was no action against the product or against the smoker himself since these groups defined smoking as a medical problem for the smoker, not others. Only the FTC move to require a label on the cigarette package represents a coercive act but here again the assumption seems to be that the purchaser of the package needs to be educated about the
health danger.

4. Official definitions, especially coercive attacks on the smoker, are the product of private pressure group initiatives.

None of the rules, laws, or regulations coercing the smoker came into being until Action on Smoking and Health began its campaign. This organization defined the problem as one of nonsmokers' rights, not just a health problem for the smoker himself. Consequently, this group tried to gain measures restricting the smoking behavior of others. ASH was successful for several reasons. First, it was able to use the health claims as a background and basis for its arguments. Those health claims were accepted because the health groups and government had endorsed them. Therefore they provided a starting point, an initial advantage. Second, as the above discussion illustrates, ASH chose the arena of conflict where it had an advantage. It selected a setting where the vast resources of the tobacco industry had little influence. This efficient use of resources led to a number of official definitions of smoking as deviant.

In conclusion, it is clear that the reports that smoking was harmful to health were not the catalysts for the official actions coercing smokers. These official actions were a direct response to pressure group activities. However, it also appears that the pressure group tactics were successful, in part, because they were able to use the health evidence. Therefore, it seems that the research reports that smoking is bad for health were a necessary condition with interest group activities the sufficient condition for the coercive definitions to emerge.
CHAPTER VIII

MAINTAINING RESPECTABILITY: THE PRO-SMOKING FORCES

The efforts to deny the right to pursue the satisfaction of smoking add up to nothing less than tyranny by a minority of anti-smokers.

(Tobacco Institute statement, December, 1978)

The previous chapters have attempted to answer the question Why and how has cigarette smoking come to be seen as deviant behavior? Basically the answer is that health groups have been able to get their claims about the health consequences of smoking accepted with the government and especially one private interest group then using that claim as a basis for coercive actions against not only the product but against the individual smoker.

In one sense it appears that cigarette smoking has clearly come to be seen as deviant behavior. In many social settings, the smoker is separated from others and he/she has been told that they are committing "slow-motion suicide." Yet at the same time, it would be difficult to find a product that has been as persistently connected with health problems as cigarettes yet is as freely sold in the United States. Recent years have witnessed the banning of products with less scientific evidence (cyclamates, red dye no. 2, and so forth). How can we explain the continued free commerce in cigarettes?

For an answer to this question, it is necessary to examine the nature and activities of a well established vested interest. Specifically, the tobacco industry has long been a significant force in
American economic and political life. By drawing on its vast resources, the industry has been able to blunt many of the anti-smoking proposals. This chapter begins by identifying some of the key elements of that industry and then discusses the ways the industry has employed its resources against the anti-smoking movement. The chapter concludes by identifying and discussing four generalizations summarizing the findings.

The Setting: A Powerful Industry

Farmers

Tobacco is an important crop in the American farm economy. Some 600,000 families are involved in growing and harvesting tobacco on approximately 276,000 farms (Tobacco Institute, 1979a) which yielded $2.5 billion in cash receipts in 1978 (USDA, 1979:17). Tobacco is the sixth largest cash crop in the United States representing 2.3 percent of all farm income but much more important in North Carolina, Kentucky, South Carolina, Virginia, and Tennessee where it is the source of better than 10 percent of all farm cash receipts (USDA, 1979:17).

Besides the cash value of the crop, a tobacco allotment adds substantially to the value of a farmer's land. Shuffett and Hoskins (1969) estimate that $6,000 is added to an acre with a burley tobacco allotment while Mann (1975) puts the figure closer to $10,000 an acre.

Despite what these figures suggest, tobacco farmers are not a
Comparing commercial tobacco farms with other types of commercial farms, we find that tobacco farms are smaller in size (128 acres vs 530) and have a lower value of land and buildings ($36,000 vs $104,000) and lower value of farm products sold ($10,470 vs $25,680).

In fact some writers have argued that most tobacco farmers could not survive without the high return from the crop and that the allotment program should be considered as "an important social welfare program in the traditionally poor south" (Bradford and Infanger, 1978).

Similarly, Billy Yeargin of the Tobacco Growers Information Committee argues that tobacco has "been the mainstay of the family farmer for four hundred years" and any official actions decreasing tobacco consumption will "gradually bring about a change in farm structure from the small family farm to the corporate farm" (Yeargin, 1980:20).

Tobacco farmers have not been well organized as an interest group. The Tobacco Growers Information Committee, a coalition of 27 burley and flue-cured trade groups, and officers from state agricultural departments often represent farmer interests at legislative hearings. Beyond, this, however, farmers as a group have not actively tried to challenge the anti-smoking movement.

Manufacturers

There are six companies that manufacture cigarettes in the United States. Table 11 presents a summary of the revenue five of these companies have gained from the sale of tobacco products for the 1974 to 1978 time period. For three of the companies, American
Brands, Philip Morris, and R. J. Reynolds, 1978 revenues exceeded the billion dollar figure with Loews corporation not far from that mark. Furthermore, except for Liggett, each of the companies substantially increased its tobacco products revenue from 1974 to 1978.

Clearly these companies have substantial financial resources which give them some influence. One example of this influence is the impact the cigarette advertising expenditures have. To illustrate, during 1977 and 1978, the six companies spent $404 million and $478 million respectively to advertise the 20 best selling brands (Harper, 1979:3). Most of these ads are placed in newspapers and magazines and appear to influence the content of the magazines. In a survey of the leading national magazines that have accepted this cigarette advertising, Smith (1978) was unable to find a single major article over the past seven years covering the extent and nature of the medical claims against cigarettes. Only those magazines not accepting cigarette advertising money had published such features.

While this is impressive, these cigarette manufacturers have been more effective in getting their viewpoint heard by funding the Tobacco Institute. This organization, discussed below, has presented the tobacco interests' claims in an aggressive and forceful manner.

Other Tobacco Related Businesses

Some 2626 wholesalers distribute tobacco products including
Table 11

Cigarette Manufacturers' Revenue From the Sale of Tobacco Products, 1974-78, in millions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Brands</td>
<td>995.8</td>
<td>1,051.5</td>
<td>1,069.0</td>
<td>1,067.6</td>
<td>1,079.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loews</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>586.4</td>
<td>627.4</td>
<td>735.7</td>
<td>813.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liggett</td>
<td>306.3</td>
<td>316.7</td>
<td>307.3</td>
<td>302.3</td>
<td>312.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Morris</td>
<td>2,326.0</td>
<td>2,704.3</td>
<td>2,987.5</td>
<td>3,493.4</td>
<td>4,230.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.J. Reynolds</td>
<td>2,090.1</td>
<td>2,361.1</td>
<td>2,565.8</td>
<td>2,759.0</td>
<td>2,944.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Securities and Exchange Commission, Form 10-K, Annual Reports.
$11.3 billion in cigarettes to an estimated 1.4 million retail outlets (Tobacco Institute, 1979a). Included in this group are warehouse operators, vending machine companies, grocery stores, and other retail outlets. In other words, cigarettes are a vital part of the economic livelihood for a large number of Americans.

While cigarettes are important for these business persons, they have not been extensively involved in resisting the anti-smoking movement. By and large, they have remained on the sidelines and let the major cigarette companies and the Tobacco Institute engage the anti-smoking forces.

**Government**

It is also important to note that the federal government supports and benefits from tobacco. The most obvious benefit is the money collected from cigarette taxes. In 1978, for example, the federal government received over $2.4 billion in cigarette excise taxes (USDA, 1979:25). Furthermore, some $1.4 billion dollars of tobacco was exported (USDA, 1979:30) making a positive contribution to the foreign trade balance of payments situation.

Another major component of the federal government’s involvement with tobacco is the Agriculture Department’s price support program. Established in 1933, this program stabilizes prices by having the government purchase the tobacco from the farmer if it cannot be sold above the minimum price established by the Agriculture Department. The importance and impact of this program is indicated by its size: as of March, 1978, 621 million pounds of flue-cured tobacco, valued at
$629 million, were held under guaranteed government loan (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1978).

The influence of tobacco congressmen is a major reason for the federal government's support for tobacco interests. Tobacco congressmen have often been able to control legislation affecting tobacco products. According to Mann (1975:46), in the early 1960s a third of the House committees and a fourth of the Senate committees were chaired by members from the six major tobacco states. This influence decreased somewhat by 1973 when only five committee chairmen came from these six states (Mann, 1975:47). Even though diminished, tobacco influence is still quite strong. As a National Cancer Institute report notes, "More than 150 bills affecting the cigarette industry have been introduced since 1966, but none has been passed by Congress since 1970" (HEW, 1977:78).

In sum, the tobacco industry is a well established political and economic force in American society. The extent of the industry's economic importance is shown by a recent Wharton Applied Research Center report that tobacco contributed $48.6 billion to the United States economy in 1977 (1979). This study concluded that the industry accounted for 2.3 percent of national employment and 2.6 percent of America's gross national product in 1977. Certainly, there appear to be many potential resources for challenging the anti-smoking movement.

The Industry Responds to the Challenge

Council for Tobacco Research
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The tobacco industry was largely unprepared to respond effectively when medical researchers began asserting that cigarette smoking was related to deleterious health consequences. Occasionally a cigarette company official had an opportunity to comment publicly but the industry did not pursue a position aggressively in the media. As the research reports became more frequent, the companies decided to act. Early in 1954 they announced the formation of the Tobacco Industry Research Committee. Proclaiming that they were concerned with the health effects of tobacco but asserting that research had not established a causal link, the founders indicated that the Committee's purpose was to handle industry sponsored research on tobacco use and health (New York Times, January 4, 1954:1).

The Council for Tobacco Research (the name was changed to this in 1964) does not conduct any research of its own but funds projects proposed by independent scientists. According to the Tobacco Institute, "As of June, 1979, the Council of Tobacco Research had awarded grants to 387 scientists in 250 medical schools, hospitals and institutions... (1979b:2). Included are such well-known institutions as Harvard Medical School (received $4.8 million), UCLA School of Medicine (received $2.75 million), and Washington University in St. Louis (received $4.4 million). Altogether the Council has granted over $82 million for research whose findings have resulted in the publication of more than 200 scientific papers (Tobacco Institute, 1979b).

This image of a research organization interested only in the pursuit of knowledge about tobacco use and health appears to be a more accurate characterization of recent Council activities than its
initial endeavors. In the early years, the Council was quite active in proclaiming that there was no proof of a direct link between smoking and cancer attacking scientists and medical authorities making such claims. Table 12 presents a tabular summary of such Council statements appearing in the New York Times from 1954 to 1978.

Insert Table 12 about here

Table 12 shows that in the first ten years of its existence, the Council was able to have the industry's position heard in the New York Times 47 times, the majority of these events occurring from 1954 to 1958. During this period the Council clearly was actively representing the industry's claims to the public. Since 1964, the Council's position has been reported only four times. However, note that in only one third of these instances did the Council initiate the statement. In 34 out of 51 times, the Council was in the defensive position of responding to some study or comment alleging a tobacco health link.

Just getting a claim presented in public does not mean that it is accepted. While there is no information on the explicit impact of the Council's claims, there are two pieces of evidence suggesting a sizeable portion of the public heard and accepted them. First, a 1966 HEW survey on tobacco use and attitudes in the United States asked respondents their opinion about the following statement:

"The connection between smoking and disease is not yet proved because it is only based on statistics" (HEW, 1969:743). This state-
Table 12

Council for Tobacco Research's Claims in the New York Times,
1954-78

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Claims Presented</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initiated*</td>
<td>Reacted**</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954-58</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959-63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964-68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 17 34 51

*Initiated claims refers to announcements and statements by Council personnel when not commenting in response to a specific study.

**Reacted refers to statements made with reference to some announcement or published finding adverse to the tobacco industry position.
ment, almost the exact comment of the tobacco companies when they
founded the Council for Tobacco Research, was agreed to by 48 percent
of the respondents (HEW, 1969:743). Second, in spite of statements
by health groups (ASC, ALA, AHA) and the government, per capita
consumption of cigarettes continued to rise except for brief down-

Tobacco Institute

The establishment of the Council for Tobacco Research was the
industry's initial response to the health claims but that organiza-
tion was not designed to meet the increasing governmental challenges
to the tobacco companies. In the mid 1950s the Federal Trade Com-
mission began examining cigarette advertising often issuing decisions
against the cigarette manufacturers. Other agencies (e.g. the Public
Health Service) and individual members of Congress were also begin-
nning to express an interest in measures affecting the tobacco in-
dustry.

Consequently, in 1958 manufacturers of cigarettes, smoking and
chewing tobacco, and snuff set up the Tobacco Institute in Washington,
D.C. The purpose of this industrial trade organization is to
promote "public understanding of the smoking and health controversy
and ... knowledge of the historic role of tobacco and its place in
the national economy" (Tobacco Institute, undated). The Institute
compiles and reports information on tobacco as well as represents
the tobacco manufacturers' viewpoints to the public, news media, and
governmental bodies. In other words, it engages in lobbying.
As Mann (1975:94) has noted, initially the industry's primary defense strategy was to ensure that all key tobacco public policy decisions were made by Congress where sympathetic members wielded substantial power. To coordinate this strategy, the company representatives selected persons with extensive government experience to head the Tobacco Institute. Of the four Institute presidents to date, three served in Congress and one was director of the United States Information Agency before joining the Tobacco Institute. In addition, the Tobacco Institute employs several lobbyists with extensive political experience. Senator Kennedy is quoted as claiming that: "hour for hour and dollar for dollar, they're probably the most effective lobby on Capitol Hill" (Jensen, 1978).

In its early years the Tobacco Institute largely limited itself to pursuing the congressional strategy and functioning as a trade association. One indication of this strategy is the manner in which claims were being made to the general public. Table 13 presents the Tobacco Institute claims reported in the New York Times from 1958 to 1978. Altogether the Institute has represented the industry's position 62 times in the Times. Especially noteworthy is the fact that from 1959 to 1968 most of the Tobacco Institute statements came in response to some event—an attack on tobacco, a research report, or an anti-smoking proposal. Before 1969, the Institute initiated only .6 of 31 statements but from 1969 on, 22 out of 31 were Institute initiated. In other words, in its early years, the Institute's claims to the public were being made from a defensive position but in later years it began assuming an offensive position.
Another indication of the Institute's early trade association emphasis comes from an examination of its publications, Tobacco News and Tobacco and Health. The Tobacco News was a quarterly published from 1959 to 1964 and, as Table 14 shows, emphasized stories related to the product rather than the political and health controversies. General interest stories on tobacco or news about the manufacturing process comprised 154 out of 186 items. This is very much in line with Tobacco Institute President Richards' statement in the first issue:

The Institute and this publication believe that the American people want and are entitled to accurate, factual, interesting information about this business which is so important in the economic bloodstream of the nation and such a tranquilizer in our personal lives. (Tobacco News 1, 1959:2)

In other words, the emphasis was not on the political nature of the tobacco controversy. The only exception to this is the 22 items on tobacco taxes but their number is quite small compared to other themes in the publication and their frequency decreased over the years. Note that the health issue was seldom mentioned.

It is unclear what the intended audience was or how wide a circulation the Tobacco News had but the Institute's other publication was directed to a medical audience (Kloepfer, 1980). Altogether 24 issues of Tobacco and Health were published from October, 1957 to Winter,
Table 13

Tobacco Institute Claims in the New York Times, 1958-78

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Claims Presented</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initiated</td>
<td>Reacted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954-58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959-63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964-68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-73</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-78</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 14

Subject of Items in the Tobacco News, 1959-64

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Health Issue</th>
<th>Manufacturing/Industry</th>
<th>General Interest*</th>
<th>Tobacco Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This category includes references to tobacco in history, items on individuals (such as tobacco farmers), making of pipes, tobacco auctions, and so forth.

**There were two additional items on the political nature of the attack on tobacco in 1959.

***Only three issues were published in 1963.
1967-68. This publication carried reports of research that were seen as supportive of the tobacco industry position on health and smoking claiming that:

There is a diversity of opinion regarding tobacco use and health, charges against tobacco are widely publicized, but less attention is given to materials which indicate that differing opinions exist. This publication reports some of these materials. (Tobacco and Health, Winter, 1967-68:1).

The Tobacco News was not published after 1964 and Tobacco and Health was not issued after the Winter, 1967-68 edition. Whatever the reasons for this development, the tobacco industry's use of its resources was not producing many victories. The strategy of focusing on Congress, combatting medical claims, and disseminating information about the industry was largely unsuccessful in preventing both public and official definition of smoking as undesirable behavior.

With regard to public definitions, by 1970 almost 58 percent of the public found it annoying to be near a smoker (see Chapter VI). Officially, by the end of 1970, cigarette commercials were banned from radio and television and cigarette packages were required to carry a warning label. As Fritschler (1975) notes, the industry did have enough influence in Congress to modify these official definitions somewhat but in the larger sense, the product had been officially labeled inappropriate.

Although the Tobacco Institute was beginning to change strategy, it lost some key decisions in the early 1970s. For example, in the transportation area, actions by regulatory commissions segregated smokers on airlines (1973), buses (1974), and railroads (1976).
But by the end of 1976, the Tobacco Institute was ready to fight back.

In this new campaign, the Tobacco Institute employed additional resources and changed its strategy. First, with regard to new resources, the Institute expanded its staff, as Table 15 shows, from 29 in 1970 to over 100 by 1980. Especially significant is that among these new personnel was a public relations department. This is another indication of a shift in strategy. (The 1979 organization of TAN will be discussed below.)

\[\text{Insert Table 15 about here}\]

With this growth in staff, the Institute needed more space. In 1979 it moved into a new building leasing an entire floor of offices. This spacious facility is tastefully furnished, fully carpeted, and has the latest office equipment.

With this additional staff, the Tobacco Institute has launched a new campaign focused on the "freedom of choice" theme emphasizing the old strategy of attacking the health claims against cigarettes much less. The Institute spokespersons still insist that it has not been proved that cigarette smoking is a cause of disease but they place more emphasis on the individual's right to make decisions without government interference.

One of the new programs illustrating this campaign is the Tobacco Institute's speaker service. As Table 15 notes, two speakers were hired in 1975 and two more in 1976. These persons travel around the country presenting the tobacco viewpoint. As of October, 1979, the four speakers had "travelled 3/4 million miles, addressed more
Table 15

Tobacco Institute Staffing at Five Year Intervals, 1960-80

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Staff Number</th>
<th>Further Specifics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1967 Public relations director hired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1969 Public relations staff hired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Two public speakers hired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1976 Two more public speakers hired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1979 TAN staff hired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>100+ (64 in Washington-others around the country)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
than 1,000 civic, business, professional and social clubs, and have appeared on and been interviewed by 4000 TV, radio, and print news persons" (Tobacco Observer, October, 1979:3). While the interviews with the media usually focus on the cigarette disease link, speeches, especially those to civic and business organizations, develop the freedom of choice theme. According to Merryman (1980), one of the speakers, a strong defense of the tobacco industry's view on the health issue "produces a lot of hostility." Consequently, many of the speeches attack big government, enemies of business, praise free enterprise, and contain complaints about over-regulation. These speakers continue to be very much in demand all across the country (Merryman, 1980).

Another area where the Tobacco Institute has employed new media skills is publications. Besides producing and mailing many pamphlets and papers presenting the industry's position, the Institute began publishing a newspaper, The Tobacco Observer, in 1976 and has been issuing bimonthly editions since 1978. Beginning with an initial press run of 21,500, circulation had increased to 87,153 for the December, 1979 issue (Tobacco Observer, February, 1980). Copies of the Tobacco Observer are sent to industry employees, approximately 3000 people in the media, and anyone else who requests it (Kloepfer, 1980). Clearly, the tabloid is getting a wide circulation.

An examination of the contents of the Tobacco Observer also serves to illustrate the Tobacco Institute's change in emphasis. Although the editors of the Tobacco Observer claim that its "aim is to aid full, free and informed discussion in the public interest,
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in the conviction that the smoking and health controversy must be resolved by scientific research" (Tobacco Observer, December, 1979: 11) the content of the tabloid has moved away from a discussion of science and the health issue. Table 16 clearly shows that political issues have come to dominate the news items. In every year except 1976, more than 60 percent of the items concerned a political issue. Obviously the audience is being warned that the action is in the political arena, not the health forum.

Insert Table 16 about here

One indication of this increased sensitivity to the political nature of the controversy is a request that readers write letters to the Civil Aeronautics Board (Tobacco Observer, June, 1978:5). While this is a tactic often used by the anti-smoking forces, this was the first such tactic by the pro-tobacco forces. Earlier, in what the Tobacco Observer claimed to be "an unprecedented action by an industry for its consumers" (February, 1977:1), the Tobacco Institute collected and delivered petitions signed by 132,330 persons to the CAB. Again, this represents a new tactic in an arena where the industry lost a number of battles in the early 1970s.

Besides creating their own publication the Tobacco Institute has also developed a new strategy for using the existing media. Perhaps most noteworthy is a series of advertisements that present the industry's position. One set of ads, emphasizing the key role tobacco plays in the United States economy and farm life, was run
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Table 16

Subject Content of Tobacco Observer Items, 1976-79

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Health no.</th>
<th>Health percent</th>
<th>Political no.</th>
<th>Political percent</th>
<th>Controversy no.</th>
<th>Controversy percent</th>
<th>Other no.</th>
<th>Other percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in news magazines, Sunday newspaper supplements and trade journals in the southeastern United States. A second set of ads, to be discussed below, distinguished between nonsmokers and anti-smokers and appeared in Newsweek, Time, U.S. News and World Report, and Sunday newspaper magazine supplements throughout the country. A third type of ad appeared in Broadcasting (June 5, 1978:51) after Califano had announced that he hoped stations would run more anti-smoking spots. The ad encouraged broadcasters to contact the Tobacco Institute for another view. The final type of ad appeared in various newspapers just before the 1979 Surgeon General's Report was released. Referring to the soon to be released report as a "one-sided debate," the Tobacco Institute invited readers to call a toll free number for the other side.

The impact of such advertisements is difficult to assess although Horace Kornegay, President of the Tobacco Institute, has described the response as "tremendously favorable" (Kornegay, 1979:52). He goes on to claim that the ads have made "friends" more willing to stand up and speak out.

In the same context, Kornegay claims that "we are demanding, and it is encouraging to note that we are getting, a larger share of the informational arena" (Kornegay, 1979:39 & 52). Besides the ads, he mentions the Institute's letter writing campaign. This activity involves Institute spokesmen writing lengthy letters to editors of various newspapers around the country which Kornegay claims "have generally been well received" (Kornegay, 1979:52).
Tobacco Institute personnel have also published in business journals. Writing in *Business Horizons* (June, 1978), William Dwyer presented the industry position in a five page article. Attempting to relate the tobacco industry's fate to the survival of the free enterprise system, he concluded with the statement that one of the key planks of the tobacco industry's platform is "The freedom of choice of the industry's customers must be preserved" (Dwyer, 1978: 56). Clearly, this is not only an attempt to present the tobacco industry's position but an attempt to identify its fate to that of a larger powerful interest group, business in general.

The above represents the new approaches to the media but one of the themes present in several of these approaches has not been discussed. In a number of contexts, the Tobacco Institute has launched an attack on the anti-smokers. Perhaps this attack is best illustrated by the ad, mentioned above, which distinguishes between anti-smokers and nonsmokers describing anti-smokers as "intolerant" and "a tiny minority" (Tobacco Observer, February, 1979). Another ad (Tobacco Observer, August, 1979) accuses the anti-smokers of trying to build a wall between smokers and nonsmokers. Perhaps the most common accusation leveled at the anti-smokers is that they are prohibitionists. To quote a Tobacco Institute spokesman at a National Town Meeting:

> The antismokers are a small but vocal corps—I have to say it—of neo-prohibitionists, they are reformers, they are those people essentially a joyless tribe ... who want to manage everyone else's life perhaps because they have been incapable of managing their own. (William Dwyer on National Public Radio's National Town Meeting, August 23, 1979).
The anti-smokers are also accused of wanting to deny the smoker his "freedom of choice." In emphasizing this theme the tobacco spokespersons argue that there is no scientific evidence that the exposure of nonsmokers to tobacco smoke is a health hazard. It is only the "extreme" anti-smokers who make such unsupported assertions. Instead of a health issue,

the issue is one of personal rights. Both smokers and nonsmokers have a right to an open airing of the facts, not the monolithic mindset purveyed by the anti-smoker agencies. And they have a right to decide for themselves. (Tobacco Institute, 1978:25)

Government has no right to interfere with its' subjects pursuit of happiness. Consequently,

The efforts to deny the right to pursue the satisfactions of smoking add up to nothing less than tyranny by a minority of anti-smokers. (Tobacco Institute, 1978:25)

In another expansion of its activities the Tobacco Institute has recently set up the Tobacco Action Network (TAN). Designed to deal primarily with challenges to tobacco at the state and local level, TAN is an organization of volunteers "consisting of those earning their livelihood from tobacco and other interested individuals" (Tobacco Observer, December, 1979:3). With headquarters in Washington, TAN is run by four public affairs managers each responsible for activities in a number of states. In addition, 18 states have their own directors (Tobacco Observer, December, 1979:3). Tobacco Institute vice-president Mozingo claims the program will identify, inform, organize, and mobilize those individuals who are pro-tobacco and help defeat restrictive anti-smoking legislation
(Tobacco Observer, April, 1980:7). It is noteworthy that this program is trying to recruit retailers and other business persons as members which means broadening its support base.

What has been the result of tobacco industry's increased mobilization of resources? Although it is still too soon to make a definitive assessment, there are signs that the industry is gaining more favorable rulings. For example, during the past year and a half, Joseph Califano was fired as Secretary of HEW, the CAB refused to ban all cigar and pipe smoking on airplanes and is considering changes in current smoking rules, and anti-smoking referenda were defeated in California and Florida as a result of tobacco industry campaigns. Whether this trend will continue or not is hazardous to predict but it seems clear that the Tobacco Institute is willing and capable of employing vast resources.

**Conclusion**

This chapter began by noting that many products with fewer health claims against them than cigarettes have been banned. The above discussion shows that the tobacco industry has used its resources to avoid more stringent restrictions. Yet it is also quite clear that the industry has lost some key battles and the product and smoking behavior have been publicly and officially defined as undesirable in many ways.

The material presented above can be summarized by the following statements:

1. There is a strong vested interest with vast resources wil-
ling to mobilize those resources in opposing the definition of smoking as deviant.

While the cigarette manufacturers may possess the largest portion of these resources, many other elements of the American economy are tied to the product. This $48 billion share of the American economy gives the tobacco industry a tremendous financial advantage over the anti-smoking movement.

2. The industry's strategy challenging the health claims against cigarettes has been largely unsuccessful.

Although the 1966 HEW survey reported that 48 percent of the respondents agreed with the assertion that the relationship between cigarette smoking and disease is merely statistical (HEW, 1969), recent Gallup polls have reported that over 90 percent of the respondents believe that cigarettes are harmful and almost 80 percent have accepted the idea that cigarette smoking is a cause of lung cancer. Clearly the industry's claim that there is no scientific proof that cigarette smoking is harmful to health is rejected by a vast majority of the public.

3. The tobacco interests' early strategy attempting to limit the scope of the conflict over official definitions of smoking resulted in some key losses.

While the Tobacco Institute and the industry initially used most of their resources in Congress, the anti-smoking forces used their resources in other settings, notably regulatory commissions and courts. Even though the industry was able to exercise its congressional influence in getting some of the regulatory agency actions modified, this proved to be unsuccessful in preventing all
actions and a rather cumbersome process in the long run.

4. The industry's current strategy of mobilizing its resources to expand the conflict over official definitions appears to be having some success.

The industry's attempt to relate the official definitions of cigarettes and smoking to broader political issues (freedom of choice) and to the general interests of wider audiences (business community) seems to be creating a climate unfavorable to further restrictions of the habit. This assessment may be premature and prove incorrect since it is based only on a few events. The questions for the future are What will be the impact of the tobacco industry's increased mobilization of resources? Will they be able to reverse some of the decisions won by the anti-smoking movement or will the pro-tobacco forces content themselves with fighting additional restrictions?
CHAPTER IX

CONCLUSION

The final chapter begins by briefly summarizing this study's major findings and then points out the implications for a collective definition of deviance theory. Next, the limitations of the study and the cautions that must be kept in mind in evaluating the findings are discussed. A final section attempts to relate the research to the larger paradigm disputes within sociology.

Summary of Findings

This study has explored the general sociology of deviance problem of explaining how and why certain kinds of behavior get defined as deviant. The specific example investigated here was the redefinition of cigarette smoking from an acceptable to undesirable habit. The turn of the century and present day anti-smoking movements were examined in attempting to answer the general question How and why has cigarette smoking come to be seen as undesirable behavior?

In pursuing this problem, this study focused on two models derived from more general sociological traditions. One framework has generally formulated explanations emphasizing the crucial role of strain in the emergence of disruptive social phenomena. This approach has generally conceived of strain as being some discrepancy or ambiguity among the elements of the social system. With regard
to cigarette smoking the medical model, that is the idea that smoking has been defined as deviant because medical research has demonstrated that it is dangerous to health, was characterized as fitting within this definition. The other sociological tradition has emphasized that social phenomena are best understood as emergent products of the social interaction process. With regard to the redefinition of cigarette smoking, the Markle and Troyer (1979) argument that status group conflict between smokers and nonsmokers is the best explanation for the designation of smoking as deviant, represents this process approach.

This study has attempted to determine the adequacy of these two approaches. The intent has been to clarify the relationship between the strain and process explanations rather than test one model against the other.

The specific findings for cigarette smoking are capitalized in Figures 6 and 7. Summarizing the findings this way permits a concise chronological presentation as well as allows comparison of the two anti-cigarette smoking movements.

As Figure 6 shows, the initial controversy over the definition of cigarette smoking can be divided into four time frames. In the 1865 to 1894 period, during the introduction of the product and habit, cigarette smoking was not seen as a symbol of success and sophistication but neither the product nor the habit were prohibited.
### Battle Over the Initial Definition of Cigarettes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1865-1894</td>
<td>Cigarette introduced Anti-cigarette crusade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895-1917</td>
<td>Sale to minors prohibited Anti forces have the upper hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>World War I: Cigarettes become part of the war effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-1930</td>
<td>Pro-cigarette forces overcome anti-cigarette crusaders  all laws repealed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Figure 7

**Redefinition of Cigarettes: The Second Anti-Cigarette Movement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Health Issue</strong></td>
<td>Attack the Product</td>
<td>Attack the Smoker</td>
<td>Pro-smoking Forces Mobilize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research reports increasing</td>
<td>health warning required</td>
<td>segregation in transportation and other public facilities</td>
<td>Califano fired anti-smoking referenda lose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health groups making claims</td>
<td>TV and radio ads banned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surgeon General's Report closes debate
Many states did enact statutes prohibiting sale to minors but that was the extent of official action.

By the late 1890s, an anti-cigarette crusade attempting to have the product banned arose. Led by Lucy Page Gaston and other reformers, several organizations pressured state legislators for prohibitory legislation. With support from educators and some businessmen, this anti-cigarette crusade succeeded in having cigarettes legally banned in at least 14 states by 1917. During this period the pro-smoking forces were largely unorganized.

World War I marked a turning point in social attitudes toward the cigarette. The product was identified with the war effort and became associated with ideals of courage and dignity. Yet the soldier who was encouraged to smoke on the battlefield often found his behavior prohibited when he returned home after the war.

In 1919, the anti-cigarette reformers attempted to revive the anti-smoking movement. But this time they met with a much less sympathetic populace and better organized pro-smoking forces. The cigarette manufacturers, merchants, and voluntary associations all organized committees to work for repeal of prohibitory legislation. By 1930, every single prohibitionary law had been repealed.

From 1930 to 1953, cigarettes were an acceptable part of American life. Certainly there were social customs governing the habit; in fact Emily Post wrote an article for Good Housekeeping (September, 1940) entitled "The Etiquette of Smoking." But in no sense were cigarettes or smoking stigmatized and officially prohibited.
This situation began to change after mid-century. Figure 7 highlights the developments leading to the redefinition of cigarettes and cigarette smoking. While there had been a few research reports indicating an association between smoking and disease since the 1930s, the number of such reports increased in the 1950s. Furthermore, led by the American Cancer Society's statement in 1954, the major health groups endorsed these claims. During this period the tobacco companies denied the link but the Surgeon General's Report in 1964 appeared to settle the issue, in terms of public belief, with the declaration that cigarette smoking was indeed a cause of disease.

In the years after the Surgeon General's Report new anti-smoking groups formed. During the 1965 to 1970 period, these groups and government regulatory agencies (Federal Trade Commission and Federal Communication Commission) attacked cigarettes as a product. Not only were cigarette packages required to include a health warning but television and radio advertisement of the product was banned.

The 1971 to 1976 period saw the anti-smoking forces, specifically Action on Smoking and Health (ASH), using resources to gain rulings from regulatory commissions stigmatizing the smoker. Most notably, this period saw the smoker separated from others and segregated, that is relegated to the rear of public conveyances. Clearly, smoking and the smoker were no longer defined as desirable.

By now the pro-smoking forces were ready to fight back. During the 1977 to 1980 time frame, the Tobacco Institute greatly increased the amount of resources devoted to the conflict. It appears this in-
creased mobilization of resources is beginning to have an impact since recent decisions have been more favorable to the tobacco industry's position.

What do these findings mean for the collective definition of deviance models? It seems clear that neither the strain nor the interest group interaction process models are adequate explanations for the redefinition of smoking. It was found that an increase in strain preceded the definition of smoking as deviant behavior. In fact, it seems reasonable to suggest that the movement would not have developed without this increase in strain. However, it was also shown that there were a number of missing links between the emergence of strain and the definition of smoking as deviant. More specifically, the interest group interaction process model helped identify some of the links. The process model, however, is inadequate for explaining the success or failure of specific anti-smoking group activities. By focusing on the resources the groups used in this interaction process, it was possible to better explain the redefinition, especially the official redefinition, of cigarette smoking.

In other words, it is only when all the models are combined that a framework appropriate for the redefinition of cigarette smoking emerges. Figure 8 presents the composite model.

Insert Figure 8 about here
Figure 8

Model Portraying the Redefinition of Cigarette Smoking
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This model begins with the assumption that society is composed of a number of general interests in varying degrees of conflict. The prevailing definition of a behavior as acceptable or unacceptable represents the outcome of previous specific interest group conflict; in other words, the balance of the resources the two sides were able to mobilize. For example, the definition of cigarette smoking as acceptable during the 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s represented the pro-smoking forces winning out over the early anti-cigarette crusaders.

This balance or accommodation becomes vulnerable with the introduction or increase of strain. With cigarettes, the claim was advanced, in both time periods, that they were associated with serious health consequences. This strain can be utilized by one side as a new resource in its attempt to alter the prevailing definition. In the case of cigarette smoking, the anti-cigarette forces were able to use research reports as a new resource in the battle against cigarettes.

Faced with a threat to their interests, the groups benefiting from the prevailing definition respond by marshalling resources of their own. The outcome of this struggle is dependent on the balance of the resources employed. In this study, the anti-cigarette smoking forces were successful before regulatory commissions where they enjoyed a resource advantage. Consequently, they were able to have cigarette smoking defined as deviant behavior and have the smoker stigmatized.

In traditional terminology, the findings suggest that strain is a necessary condition while process (interest group interaction)
provides the sufficient condition.

Implications for Theory

This study has several implications for a theory of the collective definition of deviance. First, it seems clear that strain cannot be dismissed as either irrelevant or conceptualized as a constant. Strain, whether conceptualized in economic or in other terms, is not an unchanging factor in the equation. With regard to cigarette smoking, it seems clear that a change in strain was necessary before other events would occur. At the same time, it is also clear that strain by itself did not produce the new definitions. However, an attempt to explain the new definition without putting it in the context of increased strain would also be an incomplete picture. The point is that scholars cannot, as many have tended to do, dismiss strain from a central place in the analysis.

At the same time, it seems clear that the role of interest groups in securing new definitions of deviance is absolutely crucial. Without interest group activity, the definition of smoking would not have changed. At the same time, it also seems necessary to recognize that opposition groups do exist and new definitions are often the product of the compromises emerging from that conflict. Granted that there are not always well organized powerful opposition groups but there is seldom a case where no dissenting voice is heard. Collective definition of deviance theorists need to take more explicit notice of this fact.
This study also suggests that the images of government embodied in the collective definition of deviance formulations are grossly inadequate. Two of the best known formulations, Davis' (1975) theory and Gusfield's study of prohibition (1963), seem to see government as largely a disinterested arbitrer of interest group conflict. This was definitely not the case with regard to the definition of cigarette smoking. At the same time, the Chambliss and Seidman (1971) or Quinney (1977) view of the state as the instrument of the ruling class in the designation of deviance also does not fit the case that was analyzed here. The more appropriate conception of government would appear to be that of a diverse collection of agencies and officials who may act in their own interests. Clearly regulatory agencies and law enforcement agencies, for example, have different interests than a legislative body. A more adequate theory will need to take account of this.

In addition, the collective definition of deviance theories need to take cognizance that the definition cannot be conceived as one act taken by a body of government. Cognizance needs to be taken of all the efforts by interest groups to influence public definitions as well as official definitions. Furthermore, it is important to recognize that there are many confrontations, disputes, and compromises along the path to the official definition. To focus only on the final outcome means that much of the dynamic will be ignored.

Finally, collective definition of deviance and social problem theorists need to recognize that incorporating the resource mobilization framework will enable them to explain success as well as failure.
Far too little attention has been paid to the situations where groups have not gained public recognition of their problem or succeeded in having their definition accepted. The resource mobilization approach gives the scholar the analytic tools for doing just that. It is time to examine some of these failures if our work is to have more general applicability.

Limitations of the Study

Several limitations of this study spring from the fact that it is a case study. Because of this, its generalizability is unknown. For example, how would these findings and generalizations apply to wife-beating, another behavior once not stigmatized but now certainly defined as deviant. Or would the same generalizations apply to cases such as homosexuality where behavior once labeled deviant appears to be accepted more and more as legitimate? In the latter case, it appears a resource mobilization perspective might be useful but the point in this study of cigarette smoking cannot be generalized or a general model developed until more examples are examined.

Another limitation of a case study is that it is not the best test for theoretical issues. A theory, by definition, is designed to apply to many cases. Examining one case provides an inadequate basis for determining whether the theory is inadequate or the case under investigation merely represents the exception to the general pattern. The remedy for this limitation is more case studies attempting to evaluate the specific theory which, unfortunately, most
case studies have neglected. Another strategy that would make case studies more useful for developing and testing propositions would be the development of a common research protocol (Markle and Petersen, 1979). One of the major advantages of such a protocol would be that comparable data for a large number of definitions and redefinitions would be available.

Some scholars will attack this study for its conceptual framework. Specifically, most scholars have wanted to define strain or consider strain only in economic terms. The measure of strain used here is not in harmony with that tradition but very much in line with Smelser's delineation and discussion of the concept. To conceptualize strain as occurring only on the economic level seems to be rather narrow.

However, in the larger sense, the issue is not any specific conceptualization or measurement. Instead of testing a specific theory or hypothesis, this study was designed to evaluate the relative merit of a kind of explanation. Strain was seen as one general explanatory model often used by sociologists. Therefore, the limitation most relevant here relates to the representativeness of the medical model explanation of the redefinition of cigarette smoking of a more general sociological explanation.

With regard to conceptualization, it must also be noted that the term resources has not been well defined. Oberschall has indicated that resources "can be anything from material resources... to nonmaterial resources" (1973:28). This broad definition has resulted in many things being considered resources. However, it
seems that a more careful specification of the types of resources, perhaps a typology, would lead to the development of a comparable body of findings. This study attempted to delineate and focus on three types of resources (financial, communication skills, and political skills) but this is a somewhat arbitrary delineation. Until resource mobilization scholars develop a typology of more adequate scope, the various studies will not contribute to a refinement of the theory.

The extensive use of documents produced by interest groups for partisan purposes also provides a limitation. To the extent that actual operative practices and goals differ from those embodied in the materials analyzed in this study, the findings reported here may be suspect. An attempt was made to meet this problem by focusing on elites, activities, and verification through other sources but this was not always possible. Consequently, the conclusions reported here must be considered tentative.

Another general limitation is that this study focuses only on the institutional level of analysis. For example, a great deal could be added by focusing on the individual level such as the social psychological work on stigmatization of smokers by nonsmokers in interpersonal relations. Furthermore, an attempt to relate the redefinition of smoking to the structural order, such as structural changes, would also add to the understanding of the phenomenon.

A more specific limitation of this study is that the direct linkages could not always be identified. On a number of occasions,
such as the impact of the 1964 Surgeon General's Report, the argument
had to depend on indirect linkages. With indirect linkages the
potential for other factors producing the change under, discussion
increases greatly. Therefore, caution must be exercised when it
comes to the conclusions arrived at through indirect evidence.

Even though there is a vast amount of data available on the
smoking controversy, there is some data missing that would have
added to the strength of this analysis. Most notably, there is so
little data on the public definition of smoking and attitudes toward
smokers before the health groups began making claims about smoking.
It is just not possible to determine with finality what public
definitions were before this. Another example of missing data con-
cerns the anti-cigarette crusade at the turn of the century. All
this study had were newspaper and periodical accounts of that social
movement. Certainly other records are needed to lend more support
to the suggestive findings reported here.

The above are just two examples of missing data but there cer-
tainly are many more. In addition, some data exists but was not
attainable for this study because of cost and lack of know-how. An
example of the first is the annual corporate reports filed with the
Securities and Exchange Commission. These documents are available
but at a substantial price. Budget constraints simply did not permit
gathering more of these materials. The lack of research know-how
was a handicap with regard to regulatory commissions where research
tactics successful with other government bodies proved relatively
fruitless. These agencies not only levy a charge for copies of
documents but charge a research fee to locate the document. Unless
the researcher knows the specific title and number of the document,
the cost soon becomes prohibitive. Getting these materials and
examining them is one of the next goals for this researcher. The
point is that until that is done, it is hazardous to formulate
generalizations such as the one in this study about Action on Smoking
and Health being successful with regulatory agencies because of the
efficient use of resources.

A Larger Issue:
"Waffling" Between Two Paradigms

The developments in sociological theory the past few decades
have been focused around two divergent perspectives concerning the
proper subject matter for the sociological enterprise. The nature
of this dispute can best be grasped by referring to Ritzer's distinc-
tion between the social factist and social definitionist paradigms.
According to Ritzer (1975) the social factist paradigm, in the
Durkheimian tradition, takes as its basic subject matter the social
fact including such phenomena as groups, societies, social systems,
norms, values, and so forth. This approach treats these "social
facts" as if they were real and external to the individual. These
ideas fit nicely with the scientific method which was and is used by
social factists to discover the causes of things that are assumed
to exist in reality. In studying social problems, for example, the
social factist usually describes the extent and nature of the condi-
tion assumed to exist and then asks "What are the causes of this
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problem?" In recent social problems theory the social factist position has been most eloquently stated by Manis (1976) who defines social problems as conditions detrimental to human well being.

The social definition paradigm, according to Ritzer, begins with the assumption that social reality is not a static set of coercive social facts but that man is an active creator of his own reality. Blumer (1962), for example, writes that "The organization of human society is the framework inside which social action takes place and is not the determinant of that action." These assumptions mean a very different approach to studying the social world. For example, if man is an active creator of his social reality, the focus becomes the process by which that reality is constructed, created, and maintained. In looking at social problems and deviance, the social definitionist examines the processes by which people or a society have come to define a condition as undesirable. Spector and Kitsuse (1977) have emphasized this approach with their definition of social problems as "the activities of individuals or groups making assertions of grievances and claims with respect to some putative conditions."

It seems quite clear, as Ritzer argues, that theory does determine the research question asked and method employed to answer that question. Since the social factist is primarily concerned with the cause of social phenomena, the question asked is a why question. By contrast, since the social definitionist is more concerned with process, the research question is a how question.
The central question for this study has been Why and how has cigarette smoking come to be defined as deviant behavior? The question clearly bridges the two paradigms, a condition which will lead many scholars to fault the effort as theoretically confused. Can such an approach be defended?

It seems to me that three points are relevant here. First, while many scholars have devoted an entire career to working within a particular perspective, there is no paradigm that provides a completely satisfactory explanation of social phenomena. Failure to recognize this has hindered the progress of sociology. Turner (1974:145-46) seems to be correct when he blames the underdeveloped condition of sociological theory on the tendency to devote energy to the construction of "coherent perspectives where assumptions and propositions remain implicit-and hence understable". Turner goes on to note that many have recognized the constraining results of paradigm building and attempted syntheses by proposing resolutions of underlying assumptions. However such proposals inevitably generate philosophical debates instead of promoting scientific work. In effect, Turner argues that we must begin with clearly stated propositions from whatever perspective and test them against social reality. This view seems to agree with Ritzer's (1975:21) assertion that "no aspect of social reality can be adequately explained without drawing on insights from all the paradigms."

Above all else, the goal of this study was to explain the definition of a behavior as inappropriate. Working entirely within one paradigm might have produced a theoretically more consistent work
but not a more complete explanation.

The second point that must be raised is a question: Are the differences between the social factist and social definitionist paradigms insurmountable? The standard answer is to point to very different underlying assumptions; most specifically the underlying assumption on the nature of social reality. However, as Turner notes, such underlying assumptions are difficult to test and the consequent debate is usually a philosophical exercise without resolution of the issue. But if we ask the question, what is it that the perspectives are trying to explain? perhaps a way around the philosophical impasses can be found. Both perspectives are attempting to account for social reality, that is explain how society is possible. Furthermore, according to Turner (1974:195), both begin with the "same analytic frame of reference: Actors oriented to objects in given situations." Where they diverge is over strategy with social factists "focusing on emergent structures and the various patterns of interaction among them" while the social definitionists argue that the "most understanding comes from the study of interpretive and definitional processes of individual actors" (Turner, 1974:205-206). What is at issue here is "the amount of variation in social life which can be accounted for by emergent stabilized patterns of interaction" (Turner, 1974:206).

Frankly, this seems to be an empirical issue. That is exactly the empirical issue this dissertation has tried to address. Furthermore, it is clear that in the case of cigarette smoking, neither paradigm provides a complete explanation. Focusing on the emergent reality, strain, does not explain the entire phenomenon of smoking.
being defined as deviant. At the same time, without the emergence of strain, the construction activities of the anti-smoking groups probably would have failed. In other words, this study suggests that by approaching a question from both paradigms, a greater understanding will be achieved.

This leads to the final point on bridging two paradigms. Is it not the ultimate goal of sociology to understand and explain social reality? Too often it seems this goal is forgotten in the effort to defend and proclaim the power of a chosen perspective. As Turner notes "currently, it appears that a great deal of intellectual effort is wasted in arguing in a research and theoretical vacuum about who is more correct..." (Turner, 1974:207). Instead of reifying paradigms, which after all are primarily constructs useful for understanding the nature of sociology, it seems scholarly effort would be more productive if more attention were paid to the basic question: How is order possible?

It is exactly for these reasons that the resource mobilization approach is intuitively attractive. It appears to focus attention on elements from both the social factist and social definitionist paradigms. With regard to the former, cognizance is taken of emergent properties such as groups, systems, power, strain (although strain appears to be underemphasized) and so forth. At the same time, the dynamic inherent in social definitionism is woven in with focus on how groups employ their resources, reaction by others to that action, and so forth. In other words, the resource mobilization approach has also found a way to examine process.
This should not be interpreted as a claim that resource mobilization provides a synthesis or provides the direction for the future. The approach still has many problems including an inadequate conceptualization of individual motivation, a slighting of ideology, and a too ready assumption that strain is constant. However, the point is that the approach represents a step forward instead of merely encouraging additional studies within one paradigm. Breaking out of that strait-jacket is what is needed in many sociological areas.
FOOTNOTES

1 Tallman (1976) puts even more emphasis on the role of individuals with the suggestion that personal biography of group leaders and members must be considered. Specifically he argues that those persons who become the catalysts and leaders of social problem movements possess a sense of moral indignation gained from parents who were successful problem solvers. This may offer insight into the nature of leaders and those who become involved in the collective definition of deviance. However, this research will not explore Tallman's idea since the primary focus here is the collective process.

2 Galliher and Walker (1977, 1978) have suggested that there are shortcomings with Dickison's explanation of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics' role in the Marihuana Tax Act of 1938. Their criticisms of Dickison's specific case analysis seem to be warranted but that does not necessarily negate the utility of the general approach for the analysis of other definitions of deviance. Chauncey (1979), for example, has shown how a governmental agency invented a social problem.

3 Note the distinction here between the state and the ruling class. Quinney specifically recognizes that the state is a complex entity with its own interests (1977:81).

4 In another discussion Chambliss (1975) points out that "...bureaucracies will use their resources, power, and influence to obtain passage and suppression of laws that represent the interests of the bureaucracies themselves." In other words, Chambliss is saying that bureaucracies must also be seen as self-interested actors in the political process.

5 Since 1960 the index has been called the Cumulated Index Medicus. For three years, 1957 to 1959, Current List of Medical Literature was the title used. Previously it had been titled the Quarterly Cumulative Index Medicus.

6 From 1930 to 1956, the entries were indexed under the "Tobacco" subject heading. Beginning in 1957, the items are listed under smoking.

7 The original intent was to count only the items that referred to scientific studies. However, Index Medicus includes editorials and letters to the editor without identifying them as letters or editorials (at least not until the mid 1970s). Since it would have been impossible to look up every item indexed, I counted all references to the cigarette smoking-health link.
One final note with regard to Index Medicus is in order. Some of the entries, while indexed one year, were published during the latter part of the previous year. In order to be consistent and simplify coding procedures, the items were tallied the year they were indexed.

8My initial goal was to tally only research reports. This proved to be somewhat unrealistic since few newspaper items can be nicely classified as research or nonresearch reports. Most of the articles, for example, included opinion and comment by other doctors as well as tobacco interests spokespersons.

9While this chapter discusses the history of tobacco and cigarette smoking, it is not the kind of essay that historians have traditionally written. The historian is concerned with accuracy, often recounting the minute details, while focusing on atypical as well as the usual. The social scientist, by contrast, is interested in patterns of human behavior and approaches the data with the goal of developing generalizations. This is precisely what this chapter tries to accomplish. The goal is not to recount every detail but identify and illustrate the general social patterns concerning the official and unofficial definitions of cigarette smoking.

The data for this chapter were gathered from a variety of sources. First, all relevant accounts produced by historians were consulted. Since there were few of these, the second step was to go through the New York Times Annual Index checking out all references to cigarettes, smoking, and tobacco. Since it goes back to 1890, the Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature was another valuable source.

These sources do have some very clear limitations. Perhaps most important is the eastern bias, especially in view of the fact that most of the anti-cigarette activity was taking place in the Midwest. It is clear, for example, that the Times did not report all the activities of the anti-cigarette movement. However, the New York Times and The Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature are indexed and the best that is available.

10Best (1979) has argued that the laws prohibiting the smoking of tobacco were repealed because governments discovered that tobacco taxes could provide a much needed revenue. This appears to be an oversimplification. A careful reading of Corti (1931) and others suggests that another major reason for repealing the laws was the difficulty of enforcing them and the hostility such enforcement generated.

11Most states defined minors as children aged 16 and under.
It appears that enforcement of these laws was rather sporadic. For example, on September 3, 1890 (p. 8) the New York Times reported that the first arrests for violation of the minors smoking law. These boys were discharged with a warning. In general, enforcement appears to have been lax since the New York Times carried an item on December 12, 1894 (p. 8) which reported that the Brooklyn School Board had passed a resolution asking the police to enforce the law against youth smoking. A police spokesman responded by indicating that it was quite difficult to apprehend the offenders since "they are very sly."

This listing of states was compiled from the following references: New York Times (February 7, 1898:1), Harper's Weekly (September 17, 1910:25), Outlook and Independent (February 12, 1930:246), Cigarette Country (Wagner, 1971:44), and Tobacco (Gottsegen, 1940:155).

There was a decline in cigarette consumption from 1898 to 1901. The anti-cigarette movement and the resulting legislation probably were factors here but as Gottsegen (1940:26) notes, there was also a change in the classification system. In its reports, the Internal Revenue Service ceased putting cigarettes and small cigars in one category. If consumption is calculated on the basis of 1897 procedures, the decline is much less. In any case, by 1902, cigarette consumption began to rise again.

A good example of this literature is the article "The Cigarette Boy" published in 1907 by the journal Education. Written by a professor at Kansas State Agricultural College, the essay describes a study the author claims illustrates the harmful effects of smoking on young men, particularly students.

The New York Times reports a number of such actions by school boards including asking police to enforce no smoking laws (December 6, 1894:8), threatening expulsion of students for smoking cigarettes (November 7, 1904:1), and so forth.

A number of commentators have characterized the anti-cigarette movement as merely a part of the Temperance crusade (Sinclair, 1962). While there are connections between the two movements (which will be discussed below), such an assessment appears to be an oversimplification. Note especially that the Temperance Movement did not endorse prohibition of cigarettes.

Only one other reference to Edward Gaston was found. The New York Times (July 4, 1906:2) reported that he testified before the Select Committee of The House of Lords in London suggesting that the cigarette was "worse than Chicago tinned meat."
Speaking to the Colony Club whose membership comprised New York's socially elite, Miss Gaston proclaimed that "American womanhood and childhood must be rescued from the cigarette peril." Among youth her efforts focused on signing a pledge not to smoke (New York Times, September 12, 1907:2).

There certainly may have been others but none was mentioned by other authors or discovered by this researcher.

While the directors came from many parts of the nation, activities appear to have been limited to New York.

The New York Times was not opposed to all the anti-cigarette movement's endeavors. For example, efforts to restrict the use of tobacco in public places seem to have been supported. A July 18, 1911 (p. 8) comment suggested that such efforts "will receive the approval of everybody whose approval is worth having."

For example, Dr. Clarence True Wilson, head of the Methodist Temperance and Moral Board, charged that the "tobacco trust" had played on American patriotism to put dope into cigarettes so that the dough boys would become addicted (Wagner, 1971:44-45).

Even though Kansas still had a law in 1924, it apparently was not enforced. The New York Times (January 2, 1924:16) chided William Allen White for criticizing New York for its lax enforcement of alcohol prohibition when Kansas was not enforcing its cigarette laws.

Recall that the city of New York briefly had an ordinance prohibiting women from smoking in public in 1908 and one woman was arrested for smoking on the street (New York Times, January 23, 1908:1) before the mayor vetoed the measure.

At committee hearings, only one woman supported the bill (House Hearings, Committee on the District of Columbia, July 27, 1921).

The official charge was disorderly conduct since there was no law against women smoking.

The National Anti-Cigarette League was not much of a force in the anti-smoking movement after 1920. The League did try to organize a "National Clean Life Week" in Washington in 1922 (New York Times, March 25, 1922:6) but there is no evidence that this effort was a success.

Pro-tobacco people feared that the Temperance Movement would attempt to have tobacco prohibited once the 18th Amendment went into
effect. Such was not to be the case. One of the major liquor prohibitionist organizations, the Anti-Saloon League refused to take part in any anti-tobacco program.

30 L. Ames Brown (1920) charged that the W.C.T.U. was involved in activities that would lead to the prohibition of tobacco. I found no evidence to support this statement.

31 The Methodists issued a statement later denying that they would support a constitutional ban on smoking.

32 There are a number of church groups, such as the Seventh Day Adventists and Mennonites, who have taken positions against smoking as part of their official doctrine. Positions, statements, and activities of these groups were not reported in the New York Times or the Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature.

33 My knowledge of this group is limited. It appears they were most interested in fighting alcohol prohibition but this is a guess, not established fact.

34 In the historical accounts by Corti (1931) and Apperson (1914) opponents of tobacco are often quoted as employing the nickname "stinking weed."

35 There were a number of articles in foreign medical journals, especially the German ones, discussing the smoking-cancer link during the 1930s. Why this issue was not similarly discussed in the American medical literature is a question my data cannot answer.

36 The reader may wonder why news items on setting up the advisory panel to the Surgeon General were included in the tally. The reason is that the Times articles, in discussing the panel, consistently reviewed some of the research reports on the cigarette smoking health link.

37 The reader might note that 1967, which has a high peak, was the year of the Federal Communication Commission's equal time decision. However, the count here is not of items related specifically to that decision but items concerning the smoking health link.

38 It is noteworthy that the Reader's Digest appears to have carried more anti-smoking articles than any other magazine. Of course, the Reader's Digest items are reprints of articles appearing elsewhere but the point is the editors found and reprinted them giving a much wider circulation to the items.
Note that Index Medicus, New York Times, and Reader's Guide items have been grouped into five year blocks. This smooths out the slopes and presents a clearer image.

As recently as 1978, congress set up two new research programs on smoking and health (see Table 2 in the methods chapter).

There is no public opinion data on the cigarette smoking cancer link for 1965. Certainly it is doubtful that public opinion would have registered at exactly 60 percent. But it is clear that by 1969, over 70 percent of those surveyed by Gallup held such a view. Therefore, the slope does not seem to be an unreasonable approximation or estimate of public opinion in 1965.

The data do not establish the precise connection or exact time order of these events. The term apparently is used because, while the relationship seems reasonable, it cannot be precisely specified on the basis of the data.

In this poll, 87 percent of those under 30 years of age, six percent more than in 1969 accepted the claim. The point is that the aging process explains part of the increase.

This does not mean there is one well organized voluntary association comprising a social movement. In fact, there are usually several organized groups with the same general goal. To illustrate, while there is a Women's Liberation Movement, there are a number of organizations such as NOW (National Organization of Women), Women's Political Caucus, Boston Women's Health Collective, Daughters of Sarah, and so forth, comprising the movement.

Even the American Medical Association has been less active than ACS, ALA, and AHA. To illustrate, in 1965, the AMA House of Delegates is reported to have refused to endorse the 1964 Surgeon General's Report (New York Times, June 24, 1965:46). By this time, ACS had been alleging a cigarette smoking-lung cancer link for ten years.

In order to be counted as a claim, the organization's name had to be associated with the statement. For example, "ACS president says..." or "researcher of ALA says ..."

This time frame was selected because, while individual researchers were making such statements, organizations did not endorse the position that smoking causes disease before 1954.
Keep in mind that what is of central concern here is what was reported to the public, not what actually happened. There may have been statements or claims made by other officials but they can hardly impact on general public opinion if they are not reported to the public.

The Surgeon General allowed the Tobacco Institute to veto any committee selection the industry found objectionable.

The advisory committee did not produce any new evidence. This committee only reviewed the existing studies.

Reporters were assembled in a large auditorium and the doors were locked. Then the report was distributed and the reporters were allowed to ask questions. After approximately one hour, the press conference ended and the doors were unlocked. Furthermore, all this occurred on Saturday, usually a slow news day. Note that this timing made the report the big news item for Sunday morning newspapers.

In one sense, the 1970 Cigarette Labeling Act is an outgrowth of the 1965 Act but it does not qualify as being initiated entirely by government officials. Between 1965 and 1969, a number of groups began exerting pressure on regulatory agencies and Congress to act. The 1970 Act, therefore, is largely the result of pressure group influence.

As a result of other information encountered in my research, it seems reasonable to suspect that these numbers are somewhat inflated.

GASP chapters have been very active at the local and state level. Recently GASP chapters in California and Dade County, Florida succeeded in getting smoking referenda on the ballot.

The Encyclopedia of Associations (1980) indicates ASH has a staff of 10. However, my visit found that there were only six full-time persons.

It must be recognized, of course, that ASH personnel have an interest in conveying a certain image of the organization. However, there are two reasons for using the data in this table. First, this is the best measure we have of the organization's operation since there are almost no other records. Second, the focus here is on the nature of the item. Consequently bias or constructions within the item does not influence the tabulation.
The researcher has all the ASH newsletter from 1971 to 1979. Items tabulated here were major articles, either written by ASH editors or reprints of items appearing elsewhere. Excluded were items of only a few lines reporting some smoking related event.

ASH does print and make available reports on the deleterious consequences of smoking. However, this appears to be a very small part of total expenditures.

It is not clear how many letters such requests initiated. ASH newsletters often claimed that "many" letters had been written but it is not clear what that means in terms of numbers.

ASH petitions always rely on and extensively cite governmental reports on the deleterious consequences of smoking.

I was unable to get the corresponding figures for Brown and Williamson Tobacco Company. This company is owned by a large conglomerate (B-A-T Industries) which means that detailed information about Brown and Williamson is not contained in the usual financial reports.

Blair (1979:40) has claimed that TV Guide accepts $20 million worth of cigarette advertising a year while the figures for Time and Playboy are $15 and $12 million respectively.

States collected an additional $3.6 billion in taxes.

The Council's information brochure says that scientists "are assured of complete scientific freedom in conducting their research" (Council for Tobacco Research, undated:3). Such appears to be the case since many of these studies have reported findings contrary to the industry's position. At the same time it needs to be noted that other funded studies have reported results consistent with the industry argument. Although beyond the scope of this study, an investigation of whether funding source is related to research outcome in the tobacco controversy would be an interesting project.

This table was compiled by analyzing the New York Times Index from 1954 to 1978. An entry was counted only when some reference was made to the Council for Tobacco Research (or Tobacco Industry Research Committee) making a statement about the smoking health link.

There were other occasions when the Research Council got its name into the New York Times, often in a favorable light. Between 1954 and 1958, for example, the Council announced the funding of eight research projects on the smoking health link. The 1959 to 1963 period
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saw five such announcements. At the very least, such items convey the impression of an industry seriously concerned and doing something about the health charges against cigarettes.

67Certainly it is not correct to imply that all of these persons formed their opinion on the basis of the Council's statements. Yet it seems reasonable to assume the Council's announcements did have some impact.

68While the Council for Tobacco Research and the Tobacco Institute are both sponsored by the tobacco industry, they are separate organizations. The other connection between the two is that the Tobacco Institute publicizes the Research Council's activities.

69The Institute maintains an extensive library on tobacco in its Washington offices. With four full time staff members, this library houses newspaper and magazine clippings, monographs, government documents, and Tobacco Institute records.

70The four presidents have been James P. Richards (former congressman from South Carolina), George V. Allen (former United States Information Agency Director), Earl C. Clements (former senator from Kentucky), and Horace Kornegay (former congressman from North Carolina).

71Table 13 was constructed using the same procedures employed for Table 12.

72Table 14 was constructed by analyzing all issues of the Tobacco News and skimming each item to determine the nature of its content.

73I was unsuccessful in gaining much information about the circulation of this publication. The current staff at the Tobacco Institute were not around when this quarterly was published so no one could answer circulation and intended audience questions.

74Tobacco and Health was published by the Tobacco Information Committee in 1957. After its establishment in 1958, the Tobacco Institute took over the publishing responsibility.

75The standard interpretation of the Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Acts is that the cigarette companies won enough modifications to make the measures acceptable. That may be true but such an interpretation ignores the larger implication; namely that the government has symbolically designated the product and behavior as inappropriate.
The industry did score some victories in congress when the Consumer Product Safety Commission was prohibited from regulating tobacco and a tax amendment proposing that cigarettes be taxed on the basis of their tar and nicotine content was defeated.

By 1980, the Tobacco Institute's Public Relations staff had grown to 19 persons (Kloepfer, 1980).

This table was compiled from information obtained from several volumes of the Encyclopedia of Associations and interview data.

Adding new personnel and acquiring the new offices certainly requires a substantial financial outlay. The Tobacco Institute's budget is a closely guarded secret although John Banzhaf of ASH claims that it is close to $4.5 million (ASH Newsletter, November-December, 1978:1).

On August 17, 1979 Gerald Markle and I heard one of these speeches given to the Grand Rapids Rotary Club. Tobacco and the smoking controversy were mentioned only once or twice during the pro-business speech. The Rotary Club members gave the Tobacco Institute speaker a standing ovation when he finished.

1978 appears to be a slight exception to this trend. However, eight health items this year were reprints of testimony given before a congressional committee. Instead of combining the testimony into one story, the Tobacco Observer editors ran eight separate items.

The table was prepared through reading and classification of each news story in all issues of the Tobacco Observer.

A typical example of such letters is one published in the New York Times on November 9, 1978. In the letter, Michael Craig from the Tobacco Institute attacks Califano's anti-smoking campaign.

Of course anti-smoking people also attack tobacco people. Yet in the ASH literature, one does not find the persistent and vigorous campaign against persons that is characteristic of the pro-tobacco literature.
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