New Anti-genocidal Phase Opens
In Global War Against Smoking

Globally, smoking kills four million people each year – WHO

The next step in the war against tobacco, starting in October, will be an effort to impose uniform, international controls on the manufacture and sale of cigarettes and related products. This effort is being led by WHO (the World Health Organization) — which has been stung by recent revelations that cigarette companies have worked through the years to disarm and discredit it, and nullify its anti-smoking messages (see story, below).

The new WHO project is called the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control. The agency says it is the world’s first public health convention, in the sense that the word means a covenant or a contract. It will be legally binding on all nations that sign the final document.

The first round of negotiations will take place in Geneva, from October 16 to 20. WHO says it hopes to have the document ready for individual nations’ ratification by 2003.

Impetus for WHO’s present aggressivity comes from discovery of the companies’ machinations to maintain and expand their tobacco markets and destroy WHO efforts to curtail them. These discoveries come mainly from archives of the major companies — Philip Morris, R.J. Reynolds, Brown and Williamson, Lorillard, and BAT (British American Tobacco) — made public by the Minnesota tobacco settlement two years ago, and through other, similar, legal actions (PROBE, April, ’99).

Kessler Is on Panel

In preparation for the Convention, WHO’s director-general, Gro Harlem Bruntlandt M.D., of Norway, appointed a four-man international committee to comb the documents and write a report on tobacco companies’ strategies to undermine WHO’s tobacco control activities. One member of the panel is ex-Food and Drug Administration chief David A. Kessler, M.D., now Yale’s medical dean.

“The tobacco companies’ own documents show that they viewed WHO, an international public health agency, as one of their foremost enemies,” the panel says.

The Executive Summary of their report has been released; PROBE has not yet obtained the report’s full text, but we will describe it here when it is in hand. Another new source of information is the August 5 British Medical Journal (BMJ), which published three reports from the companies’ archives documenting their lying to the public, governments, and courts; their continued conniving to create new smokers and sell more cigarettes; and the methods — some unsavory and some simply illegal — they have employed to further their goals.

Documents Continue to Surface

The widening availability of “incriminating internal documents,” meanwhile, has changed the “litigation dynamic,” according to a BMJ commentator, law professor Richard A. Daynard of Northeastern University in Boston. He explains that in the Engle case — the $140 billion civil suit that was recently decided in Florida — “The jurors pointed to these documents to

WHO Targeted

“Attack WHO.”
“Discredit key individuals.”
“Undertake a long-term initiative to counteract WHO’s aggressive global anti-smoking campaign. . . .”

WHO is the World Health Organization and these are just a few of the inceptive directives that a WHO special committee, which included pediatrician David A. Kessler M.D., of Yale, has discovered in tobacco company files that have now been opened to the public.

Pressures Are Cited

The documents also reveal how this was to be done:
Tobacco companies planted spies in WHO positions, which may have “compromised” the agency’s decision-making process.
The companies tried to undermine WHO anti-tobacco programs by “putting pressure” on relevant WHO budgets.
The herb saw palmetto is a urine-producer for men with benign prostatic hypertrophy (BPH) — and it’s a $140 million a year business, says *Consumer Reports* (CR) in its current (Sept.) issue. We’ve reported through the years (for example, PROBE, Dec. ’98) that the Food and Drug Administration’s analysis is that saw palmetto is not safe and not effective.

CR, catering to its upscale yuppie readership, is now evaluating herbal remedies, and they chose saw palmetto as the first. “The evidence points in saw palmetto’s favor,” the magazine says brightly in a headline. But the bottom line is the same as it long has been: CR says the long term safety and efficacy of saw palmetto remain unclear.

Since, as CR reports, there are comparably-priced drugs whose safety and efficacy have been proven, we don’t understand why consumers are rushing to use a non-standardized product that one doctor told CR is “nothing but junk food.” (One product CR tested, “Nature’s Bounty Herbal Sure Extracts Saw Palmetto 1000 mg” contained only 3% of the standard dosage!)

# # #

**On My Honor . . . :** Despite scouting founder Robert Baden-Powell’s homosexual proclivities (PROBE, June), the Boy Scouts of America succeeded in the U.S. Supreme Court in upholding their right to toss out James Dale and other homosexuals. The *New York Times* called it the Court’s worst decision of the year. We agree. Allowing the Scouts to discriminate in this way can’t but encourage others to treat homosexuals as inferior.

In Canada, by contrast, special homosexual scout troops for girls and boys have already been established. Says a spokesman: “It’s our perspective that sexual orientation has no bearing on the ability of a person to participate in or deliver our [Scouting] programs.”

# # #

**TT is KO’d:** Several years ago we reported that therapeutic touch (TT) is a sham: It has no basis in physical or biological science. The benefit, if any, is in the mind. TT is a placebo.

Two of our news sources for these articles, Coloradoans Béla Scheiber and Carla Selby, have now published a definitive — and devastating — assessment of TT. They say it is a quasi-religious mystical belief. Their book is called *Therapeutic Touch*; the publisher is Prometheus Books, of Amherst, N.Y. The cost is $26.

# # #

**Correction:** We miswrote last month. We said genes are strings of amino acid bases. What we should have said is that genes are made up of strings of nucleic acids, not amino acids.
Hooked on Fiber:

Bran Boosters Little Deterred By Negative Cancer Findings

Two major, well-published studies have failed to show that dietary fiber helps prevent cancer.

“Lack of Effect of a High-fiber Cereal Supplement on the Recurrence of Colorectal Adenomas,” reads the heading over one of the studies, in the New England Journal of Medicine (NEJM) on April 20.

“Lack of Effect of a Low-fat, High-fiber Diet . . .” reads the heading for the other study, in the same issue.

“Trials Show No Effect of Low-fat, High-fiber and High-fruit-and-vegetable Diets,” says the National Cancer Institute (NCI) in the headline of its news release on the reports.

“Fiber Studies Find No Benefit for the Colon,” adds the New York Times in a Page 1 report, the same day. Reporter Gina Kolata quotes the leader of one of the studies, internist David S. Alberts, M.D., of the University of Arizona, in Tucson, saying, “I think we’ve definitely disproved the fiber hypothesis for colon cancer” — which is the second leading cause of cancer deaths in the U.S.

Have these findings deep-sixed the efforts by fiber sellers, food scribes, and government agencies to promote fiber, in general, and bran flakes, in particular, to fight cancers and promote health?

Well, you know the answer!

The answer is: No. Not at all! At least, not yet!

Papers Widely Reported

After the NEJM published the papers (see story below), and the news was widely disseminated by the media, PROBE focused on Kellogg, the maker of All-Bran, whose products were, in fact, used in one of the studies that failed to show benefit for the roughage-rich foods. Displayed prominently on a box of the original All-Bran, purchased that same week in April, Kellogg says: “U.S. government health officials concluded long ago that a low fat diet including foods high in fiber — like Kellogg’s® All Bran® cereal — may reduce the risk of certain cancers. . . .”

A box of the competitors’ Post Raisin Bran declared, a bit more mutedly: “Post Raisin Bran is . . . high in fiber . . . and . . . may reduce . . . continued on following page

Negative Findings Were a Surprise

The discouraging findings — that high-fiber diets won’t prevent colon cancer in high-risk individuals — come from two carefully controlled studies that followed several thousand men and women for three years. One study, led by National Cancer Institute (NCI) internist Arthur Schatzkin, M.D., was specifically designed to confirm the “fiber hypothesis” that these diets are protective.

The results, Schatzkin writes, and reiterated by phone, is that they don’t.

Both studies were conducted on patients who already had had polyps, or colonic adenomas as they technically are called, removed. They thus were considered to be at high risk of recurrent polyps and cancers in their colons.

Sensitive Findings Sought

For this reason, the studies were seen as a highly sensitive test of fiber’s specific value in preventing colon cancer, and, by extension, as an indicator of its beneficial effect on preventing tumors at other sites in the body. The study thus was the best surrogate experiment that scientists could come up with, and was strengthened by NCI’s money and manpower, Schatzkin said. But in his study, of 2,100 men and women, and in the second study of 1,400 men and women by University of Arizona internist David S. Alberts, M.D., and his associates, the recurrence rates for polyps were the same for those who were on high fiber and those who were not. About half of all the patients had recurrent polyps in the three-year follow-up period.

In fact, as a NEJM editorialist noted, the findings were particularly “disappointing” because in “both trials the incidence of cancer” — not precancerous polyps — “was slightly higher in the [high-fiber] intervention group than in the [normal diet] control group.”

Summing up the NCI’s findings, Schatzkin writes:

“The straightforward interpretation of our findings is that a diet that is low in fat, and high in fiber, fruits, and vegetables does not reduce the risk of recurrent adenomas, or, by inference, colorectal cancer.”

Disappointment Voiced

In Tucson, Alberts and his associates say: “A dietary supplement of wheat-bran fiber does not protect against colorectal adenomas.”

It is of course still possible that fiber might act at other stages of life or the development of cancer, during adolescence, for example. But this remains to be proved — and seems unlikely. What is more, participants’ compliance with the high-fiber diet had fallen off considerably by the third year in the Arizona study, suggesting that most people will not continue a high-fiber diet indefinitely. Given all these problems, study leader Alberts said:

“I think we’ve definitely disproved the fiber hypothesis for colon cancer.”
WHO...
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They also used other UN agencies, such as the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), where they had greater clout, to stymie and block WHO anti-tobacco initiatives. They used ostensibly “independent” experts and institutions to discredit WHO officials in public forums and in the media.

So-called “independent” experts and institutions also were used to undermine WHO’s credibility, and question its mission and mandate, particularly to divert them from tobacco control to other health needs.

Lawyer Is Named

The WHO analysts identify one key individual in these efforts, a U.S. lawyer named Paul Dietrich. They say he has “long-term ties” to tobacco firms:

Dietrich wrote articles and editorials attacking WHO’s priorities, which were published in major media outlets and widely disseminated by tobacco company officials. He also traveled around the world for tobacco companies, giving presentations to journalists and government officials on WHO’s inappropriate spending and priorities. No mention was ever made in his articles and presentations that he received significant tobacco company funding.

The WHO analysts add that Dietrich “denies that he ever knowingly participated in any tobacco industry event or project, or that he was ever paid by the tobacco industry for his work.”

Ten years ago, Dietrich was appointed to a development panel of the Pan-American Health Organization (PAHO), which is a WHO affiliate in the Western Hemisphere. The documents suggest, the analysts say, that Dietrich used his position there to try to redirect PAHO’s priorities away from tobacco. During part of this period, Dietrich also was receiving consulting fees from BAT, the major British tobacco company, the documents indicate. A year later, a BAT document says:

“Paul has managed to persuade PAHO to take tobacco off their list of priorities for this year.”

The panel sees a serious conflict of interest in Dietrich’s dual role as PAHO advisor and tobacco industry rep. This kind of conflict...

continued on page 8

Conspiracy Pinpointed

“The [1975 meeting of tobacco executives at Shockerwick House, near Bath, in England] would be as discreet as possible, with hopefully no publicity emanating therefrom, with a public affairs statement ready should news of such a meeting leak out. The initial objective of this group was to develop a smoking and health strategy which would include a voluntary agreement that no concessions beyond a certain point would be voluntarily made by the members, and if further concessions were required by respective governments, that these not be agreed to and that governments be forced to legislate. Tony Garrett, Chairman of Imperial Tobacco Limited seemed to be most concerned that companies and countries would be picked off one by one and that the domino theory would impact on all of us.”

—Neil Francey and Simon Chapman,
“‘Operation Berkshire’: The International Tobacco Companies’ Conspiracy,” BMJ, Aug. 5

Bran...
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the risk of some types of cancer . . .”

Well, now that the scientific evidence shows that this may not be so, will the cereal-makers rethink their health claims?

When we phoned Kellogg, in Battle Creek, Mich., our call was referred to a pleasant-spoken company nutritionist, Celeste A. Clark. Would Kellogg’s modify its promotional material in light of the new findings, we asked. No, she said. “We have no plans to change the information being provided on the benefits of dietary fiber!” She continued: “There are numerous other scientific studies that support the benefit of dietary fiber as part of a healthy diet.”

She, and other fibrophiles whom we interviewed thus slipped easily from the major claim, now in question, to other health claims that have been advanced on the basis of preliminary data, but have not yet been confirmed — or denied — in rigorous studies like the two new ones on fiber and colon cancer. Jane Brody, for example, wrote in the New York Times (May 23):

If preventing colon cancer was the only reason to eat fiber, I would say you could safely abandon bran muffins, whole-grain cereals, beans and peas and other fiber-rich fruits and vegetables and return to a pristine diet of pasty white bread. But dietary fiber, as a different new study so graphically showed, has myriad health benefits. The study also shows that people need not resort to a very low-fat diet to reap those benefits, as long as the fat in their diets is also the right kind.

Tellingly, this more recent study, which also was published in the NEJM, covered 13 patients. They were followed for six weeks! The negative findings on colon cancer, by contrast, involved studies of 3500 patients over periods of three years.

This coverage continues on following page ➔
Candy Cigs Are Still Luring Tots Toward Tobacco; Ban Is Sought

You remember them from back in childhood! We do. Thin, suckable sticks of hard white candy (although some were chocolate). They were sold separately at the school store, or in sleekly-wrapped oblong packages carrying grown-up sounding names like “Pell Mell Candy Cigarettes,” “Westernfields,” or “Kool Candy Cigarettes.” These packages looked just like the mom and dad’s cigarette packs.

Do candy cigarettes encourage youngsters to smoke? Pediatrician Jonathan D. Klein, M.D., at the University of Rochester School of Medicine, in New York, has been studying, and found that sixth graders who ate candy cigarettes were twice as likely to have smoked a real, tobacco cigarette than sixth graders who didn’t eat the candy ones.

Kids ‘Play At Smoking’

“Children are using them as smoking toys,” Klein told reporters at a press briefing in Chicago last month. “It allows them to play at smoking.”

Candy cigarette makers fired back with a study of their own. They claim to have found that eating the candies contributes little toward turning kids into smokers.

More recently Klein and a Des Moines, Iowa district attorney, Steve St. Clair, delved into the now-public cigarette company archives to trace the relationship between cigarette makers and look-alike candy makers. Needless to say, it was a symbiotic relationship: The cigarette makers authorized the mimicry of their labels and packaging on the candy packages. And they clearly knew what they were doing.

One candy-maker boasted, we “put out the candy cig packs by the millions.” They are a “tremendous advertising factor” for reaching “coming up cigarette smokers.”

Violations Treated Lightly

Early waves of anti-smoking public education forced the tobacco and candy makers to back away somewhat from each other; they abandoned their contractual agreements. But the candy makers continued to use cigarette-like packaging for their products. This would be copyright violation if the cigarette makers decided to oppose this use. They did oppose it, ever-so-gently, pediatrician Klein and St. Clair write in a report of their findings in the August 5 British Medical Journal.

They note that two U.S. companies, World Candies and New England Confectionery, continue to market the cigarette look-alikes, at remarkably low prices of a dime or 15¢ a package. World Candies has said that these products are consumed mostly by children between four and eight years old.

These candies are not hard to find, the authors say, if you go to school stores and look on the lower shelves where small children can see them. St. Clair discovered three chains, serving 500 sales outlets in Iowa, that stock them.

While TV and radio ads for cigarettes have long been banned in the U.S., the two investigators say that the candy cigarettes serve as ads for cigarettes — and in a very vulnerable market.

Bans against the sale of these candies have been proposed, but few have been passed. None has endured. These products continue to be sold. The researchers say they should be banned.

---

continued from previous page

We tried to find out from Kellogg spokeswoman Clark and public affairs officers in the relevant federal agencies, including NCI and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), where the original endorsement of fiber against cancer originated. What are the studies on which it is based?

**Wider Use Cited**

Clark didn’t know. Responding to questions, she quickly segued from cancer fighting to fiber’s more general health benefits, saying, “As you know, there are numerous other scientific studies that support the benefit of dietary fiber as part of a healthy diet.”

“The information on our package is consistent with FDA-approved claims which show that there is a benefit in consuming grains, fruits, and vegetables,” Clark added.

The NCI, which conducted one and supported the other of the two disappointing colon cancer studies, apparently has no intention of translating these findings into policy. NCI spokesman Mike Miller told PROBE by phone:

“I don’t know . . . of any rethinking here — not to the best of my knowledge.”

FDA is less resistant. While the claim for fiber against cancer was approved by Congress a decade ago, the FDA regulates medicinal claims for food products on an ongoing basis. It insists they must reflect current scientific understanding, agency spokeswoman Ruth Welch told PROBE late in the spring. So:

“We are re-evaluating a health claim for fiber and colorectal cancer,” she said.

But, contacted again last month, four months later, Welch pointed out that the wheels of progress at FDA grind very slowly.

So, what is the take home message?

If you enjoy the flavor, taste, and crunchy texture of fibrous bran flake cereals, then carry on with them. If, however, you’re swallowing bran to protect yourself from cancer, then stop. It’s not likely to help. Stop smoking, or take a brisk walk instead; they’re undoubtedly better for your health.
On the Environmental Front:
South African Quarriers Destroying Natural Site in Northern Vermont

The rescue, albeit not the full recovery, of the peregrine falcon is good news, as we recently reported. But we — and many others — continue to worry that the larger effort to save and restore the natural environment in the U.S. and elsewhere is failing.

We’ve been very involved in one such battle over the last year — which is why, we say, apologetically, we’ve missed some PROBE deadlines — and we’re worried that our side and the environment are going to lose. If this were a single, isolated case, it wouldn’t much matter. But all over the globe, businesses are destroying both pristine and already-threatened natural resources. Huge diamond mines, for example, are being hacked out of the wilderness rock in northern Canada; De Beers is buying a mine there; and Yellowknife, north of the Great Slave Lake, has become a boom town for diamond merchants!

The stone we’ve been concerned about, in Northern Vermont, is much more prosaic: granite. Particularly gray granite, of a relatively inferior — but still commercially viable — sort. Granite is mined to be carved into tombstones, curbstones, and building blocks, particularly for institutional buildings.

Old Quarry Is Reopened

What has happened is this: A tiny, horse-and-wagon granite quarry opened, briefly, in the 1920s, and closed soon after in a far corner of Sheffield, Vt. This is a village in the remote, poor, Northeast Kingdom of Vermont, where, as it happens, we own a home that we use for R&R and hope to see much more of when we retire.

This is not the Vermont of Stowe, ski, or après ski entertainment. Sheffield has no ski slope, no restaurant, no cocktail lounge — not even a general store. Fewer than a thousand residents are spread out over its 100 square miles, which are mostly second growth forest, meadow, and hay fields and corn fields tied to dairy farms. (The Canadians, nearby, drove out the potato farms a decade ago; Canadian spuds sell there for 10¢ a pound.)

Several years ago, a South African-financed granite company came to Sheffield, with plans to open one of the largest granite mines in the state. Why did they come? For profit, of course. And apparently, though this has not been confirmed, because they wished to move some of their profits out of post-apartheid South Africa: Overseas investment was, legally, the best way to do it.

These resources have enabled the South Africans to far outspend — by about 20 to 1 — their opponents in fees for lawyers and expert consultants. These experts have helped them wend and win their way through the bureaucratic and legal processes needed to win approval for their quarrying permit. By some estimates, the South Africans have invested $2 million in their Sheffield project.

Their U.S. company is called Barre Granite Quarries, LLC (BGQ); it is a limited partnership chartered in Delaware. The name, however, is a misnomer: Barre is Vermont’s granite capital; but the South African company has its headquarters elsewhere (in South Burlington). Barre, Vt., is headquarters for the state’s largest — and monopolistic — granite company, called Rock of Ages.

Lower Prices Sought

One reason the South Africans have been well received around Barre is that the several hundred stone carvers there want to break Rock of Ages’ monopoly, and so pay less for their raw material.

Vermont is the self-proclaimed environmental state. But the governor, Howard Dean (Dem.), appears to be supporting the South Africans and the stone carvers against Rock of Ages — and against the now-shattered quietude of the Sheffield countryside. One pundit says the governor made a deal with Central Vermont legislators: If they would support his plan to turn paper companies’ huge timber tracts near the Canadian border into protected public lands, which they did, he would support their — and their voters’ — efforts to create price-lowering competition in the granite industry.

Tiny Sheffield, a Republican village, with no clout, was caught in the middle.

Through buyouts and pay-offs, BGQ has obtained mineral rights for a 25-acre quarry, and has begun to blast and haul away granite. Vermont’s Environmental Board (EB), set up to do it.

Where To Learn More

Details of the granite quarry quarrel in Vermont reveal the forces at work and the costs of this kind of extractive development. The South Africans, who became rich using indentured black workers in their mines in Southern Africa, have long and ignoble civil rights and environmental records.

Our small contribution to the resistance against them has been to write a report, dealing with their human rights and environmental depredations in Africa, and their cavalier treatment of American citizens at their first U.S. quarry venture, near the Gettysburg National Military Park in Western Pennsylvania. That effort, fortunately, collapsed, when the gray granite that they sought there was found to contain a green streak — which fatally diminished its value.

We will post our full “Report from Sheffield” on our website www.PROBENEWSLETTER.com on Sept. 10. — D.R.Z.
several decades ago to protect the state’s natural resources, has largely gone along with the project, and has issued a temporary permit.

Violations Charged
A local opposition group, Residents for Northeast Kingdom Preservation (RNKP), of which we are a member, has fought BGQ for three years. RNKP charges that the mine violates key provisions of the state’s environmental protection law (Act 250). RNKP is led by the former Vermont State Poet, Galway Kinnell—a Pulitzer-prize winner—who lives near the quarry, and by a farmer and businessman, James Perkins, and includes a Native American woman, Nova Kim, and her husband; they maintain a religious sanctuary on land near the quarry site.

The present situation has been summed up, poignantly, by Sheffieldian Tina Yohon Benson, who lives near the quarry. In a letter to a nearby daily newspaper, she wrote:

One thing that is clear and yet saddens me the most is the influence that BGQ had had in this town. More than a barking dog, or a tool not returned, BGQ has undeniably been the most divisive subject among neighbors in this town. Whether they stay for 25 days or 25 years, BGQ has scarred the land and the people of Sheffield for generations to come.

Adds a neighbor, Edwin E. Huling, Jr., “If the quarry continues in operation, it will persist in being the focus of conflict and resentment in the community for as long as people live in the area.”

General sentiment in the village — which threw out its zoning ordinance several decades ago — is, however, that owners have an absolute right to use their property as they please; they can lease or sell their mineral rights if they wish.

The Sheffield town fathers, and an apparent majority of the villagers, favor the quarry, based on a contract in which BGQ will pay the village a 20-cent a cubic foot royalty, for tombstone-quality granite extracted from the quarry. Thus far, it has paid out less than $1,000.

The quarry has deeply divided the village. Quarry opponents are labeled with that peculiarly Vermonter epithet, flatlanders, albeit Kinnell and other opponents have lived in the village for 35 years or so — longer than many of the quarry supporters, who, like a growing majority of all Vermonters, were born outside the state.

Pols Help Company
BGQ won the whole-hearted support of the village’s officials (select board), who have gone out of their way to help move the mine along.

Supporters claim the quarry will bring jobs to the hard-pressed village, and in fact two or three local workers have been hired. But for the next several years, at least, the work force will be fewer than a dozen men, working part time (since the area can’t be worked in winter).

Opponents say the economic benefits do not justify the eco-damage to the countryside — which the quarriers are not obligated to repair. Their permit does not require them to back fill the quarry hole with the dirt, rubble and broken stone, which could be half or more of the volume of material removed from the pit. This pit eventually will be 100 feet deep, over more than a dozen acres. The slag will be piled in heaps around the hole; it will be allowed to fill with water, and hence will become a permanent hazard to local children.

The last rounds of appeals have now been filed with the Vermont EB. Their verdict — which could mean a yes or a no for the quarry project — is expected at any moment.

Our view, and that of other opponents, is that the massive quarry, if it goes forward, will destroy a valuable piece of land — habitat for bear, deer, fisher cats, moose, and an endangered salamander — and the truck traffic and service industries to support it will further degrade the area.

We’re waiting for the State’s decision.
WHO...
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conflict should be stopped, they add.

Tobacco companies, and particularly Philip Morris, launched a wide, costly campaign to discredit a major study on environmental tobacco smoke. One aim was to delay the progress and release of the study. A second was to neutralize the findings.

Companies Showed Foresight

A third was to bowdlerize the conclusions and recommendations; the companies also sought to counteract the study’s findings in the minds of government and business officials and the public.

Though the current WHO report doesn’t say so, the cigarette companies appear to have guessed, in advance, that the study would damage their interest by showing that environmental tobacco smoke is harmful.

"Tobacco companies established contacts with [study’s] investigators, generally through outside scientists, to gather intelligence about the study, and influence the interpretation of the results. Through these contacts, tobacco companies obtained confidential information about the study and its progress."

The panel predicts that the tobacco companies will try to defeat the proposed Framework Convention on Tobacco Control in Geneva, or transform it into a tool for weakening individual nations’ tobacco control laws — tactics similar to their past efforts.

Any such efforts should be resisted by WHO, the analysts add in their report.

Special Subscription Offer for PROBE

You are cordially invited to reserve your subscription to PROBE, the critical, wholly-independent newsletter of science and medicine. PROBE publishes investigative articles and analyses. PROBE interprets developments in science and technology and explores their links to public policy and personal health.
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