



BIG SURPRISE: TOBACCO COMPANY PREVENTION CAMPAIGNS DON'T WORK; MAYBE IT'S BECAUSE THEY ARE NOT SUPPOSED TO

For decades, tobacco companies have launched their own so-called youth prevention campaigns virtually every time they are faced with legislation, regulation, or litigation that they know will reduce smoking. Their latest campaigns aimed at youth and parents are simply the latest incarnation of thinly disguised public relations efforts to influence public opinion and policy makers rather than smoking behavior. The 2012 Surgeon General's Report, *Preventing Tobacco Use Among Youth and Young Adults*, concluded, "The tobacco companies' activities and programs for the prevention of youth smoking have not demonstrated an impact on the initiation or prevalence of smoking among young people."¹

After decades of these efforts, three things are quite clear:

- No tobacco company campaign has **ever** produced any peer-reviewed evidence that it prevents kids from smoking or helps smokers quit. In fact, evidence from several recent studies confirms that these programs are ineffective at best and even work to **encourage** kids to smoke.
- The goals of the industry campaigns are not to reduce smoking, and the targets of the campaigns are not kids or smokers. The tobacco companies' own documents reveal that these campaigns are merely part of their ongoing efforts to convince policymakers not to enact those policies and programs that actually reduce tobacco use.
- While foisting these fake prevention campaigns on the public, the tobacco companies have increased their marketing expenditures that promote smoking, much of it in ways that influence youth to smoke. They spend additional untold millions to oppose tobacco taxes, smoke-free laws, funding for comprehensive tobacco prevention programs, and other tobacco control policies that are proven to reduce smoking among youth and adults and/or protect everyone from the harms of secondhand smoke.

Evidence that Tobacco Industry Funded Prevention Programs are Ineffective at Best, Harmful at Worst

Research studies show that tobacco companies' campaigns don't prevent youth from smoking.

- The 2012 Surgeon General's Report stated, "The tobacco industry's youth smoking prevention activities and programs have not provided evidence that they are effective at reducing youth smoking. Indeed, unpublished internal industry documents available to the public because of litigation, and published academic studies, indicate that they are ineffective or serve to promote smoking among youth."²
- A study published in 2009 found that youth who recalled Philip Morris' "Think. Don't Smoke" advertisements had more favorable beliefs and attitudes towards cigarette companies, and those beliefs increased even after that campaign went off-air. In addition, youth recalling the industry ads were less likely to say that they would not smoke within the next year.³ This newer study reinforced earlier findings that youth exposed to those advertisements had more favorable feelings toward the tobacco industry compared to youth who were not exposed to the ads, further supporting the assertion that the purpose of this campaign was not to prevent youth smoking, but rather to buy respectability and favor among youth.⁴
- A 2006 study published in the *American Journal of Public Health* found that the industry's "prevention" ads targeted at youth were ineffective and did not change smoking outcomes, while industry ads targeted at parents increased the likelihood that kids would smoke. Among 10th and 12th graders, higher exposure to the parent-targeted ads was associated with lower perceived harm of smoking, stronger approval of smoking, stronger intentions to smoke in the future, and a greater likelihood of having smoked in the past 30 days.⁵
- In an exhaustive review of relevant studies, a comprehensive report released in June 2008 by the National Cancer Institute, *The Role of the Media in Promoting and Reducing Tobacco Use*, confirmed that tobacco industry-sponsored youth smoking prevention programs are "generally ineffective" at reducing youth smoking and may have caused some youth to start smoking.⁶

- A systematic review of mass media campaigns on youth smoking published in 2008 found that tobacco industry-funded youth prevention campaigns had minimal impact on youth smoking because they avoided the most powerful anti-tobacco themes of health effects and industry manipulation.⁷ Industry youth prevention media campaigns that positioned smoking as an adult habit or as a “choice” and ignored the consequences of smoking were not effective, and in fact could undermine the effects of aggressive media campaigns.⁸ Industry ads that used a “choice” theme and focused on refusal messages appeared to have no effect on preventing smoking initiation, did not resonate with teens, and did not appear to offer any compelling reason not to smoke.⁹ The 2008 review found that tobacco industry youth prevention campaigns could actually undermine tobacco control efforts because they improved the tobacco industry’s public image.¹⁰
- Lorillard heavily promoted its “youth smoking prevention” campaign, “Tobacco is Whacko...If You’re A Teen,” despite lack of evidence that it has ever had any impact whatsoever on teens. The “Tobacco is Whacko...If You’re A Teen,” slogan framed smoking as an adult activity, which, as tobacco industry documents recognize, is an effective way to appeal to kids and can tempt teens to try smoking.
- Experts expressed serious concerns that the manner in which the “Tobacco is Whacko” campaign was framed encouraged young people to smoke as an act of rebellion rather than discouraging tobacco use.
- A 2000 study by the California Department of Health Services showed that the much publicized “We Card” program, promoted by the tobacco industry as a voluntary means to keep underage kids from purchasing tobacco products, had little or no effect on underage tobacco sales. The California data for 1998 and 1999 demonstrated that the rate of illegal underage sales for stores with “We Card” and other tobacco industry signs was much higher than stores with government signs prohibiting illegal sales to minors; compliance increased only when the tobacco industry signs were coupled with government signs.¹¹
- A 1992 study broke down the elements of the Tobacco Institute’s “Tobacco: Helping Youth Say No” program and concluded, “Given that programs with an emphasis on decision making stimulate tobacco use among children, given that tobacco use is portrayed as a forbidden fruit and badge of maturity, and given that the addictive and lethal properties of tobacco are not honestly presented...the...program will *increase* the likelihood of tobacco use among children who are exposed to it.”¹² [emphasis in original]

U.S. District Court Judge Gladys Kessler’s Final Opinion Reiterates that Tobacco Companies’ Prevention Programs are Ineffective

In her landmark opinion in 2006, finding the tobacco companies guilty of lying to the American people and marketing their deadly and addictive products to our children, Judge Kessler was very specific in finding that industry youth prevention programs had no merit. According to Judge Kessler:

- “Defendants never recommend that parents inform their children that smoking kills more than 400,000 people each year, involves an addiction that most smokers desire to end, and will harm those around the smoker. Nor do Defendants ever suggest that parents, as role models for their children, stop smoking.”¹³
- “Defendants’ ‘youth programs’ and youth smoking prevention efforts are not only minimally funded -- given the vast sums they spend on marketing and promotion to youth -- and understaffed both qualitatively and quantitatively, but no efforts have been made to validate their effectiveness amongst the total population.”¹⁴
- “[B]oth Lorillard’s and Philip Morris’s media campaigns promote the message that smoking is an adult decision. Emphasizing that smoking is an adult activity underscores the desirability of engaging in adult behavior for adolescents who are particularly motivated to appear mature.”¹⁵

Even Advertising Critics See through Tobacco Companies’ Youth Prevention Campaigns

- *ADWEEK* columnist Barbara Lippert wrote: “[T]hese ads are too tepid and generic — they could sell anything from orange juice to toothpaste. . . PM has chosen to create a mellow, sensitive, ‘rely on your good sense, son’ picture. Are they serious? This is advertising covering a life-and-death issue! So where is the big stick? The scare tactics? The hit ‘em over your head with destroying life stuff?”¹⁶

- *USA Today* advertising columnist Bruce Horowitz placed Philip Morris' new campaign on his "Worst Ads of 1998" list. He wrote: "This is Philip Morris' jaded attempt at PR. Three spots with kids who say smoking isn't cool. . . . Philip Morris says it wants kids to stop smoking. Right. Just like Bill Gates wants kids to stop staring at computer screens."¹⁷
- Fred Goldberg, chairman-CEO of Goldberg Moser O'Neill, an advertising agency in San Francisco, wrote in *Advertising Age*: "I call it unmitigated gall and hypocrisy; incredible and disheartening. It is another reflection of the distorted values and warped standards that exist today more than ever."¹⁸

The Real Reason Tobacco Companies Have Youth Prevention Campaigns

Tobacco companies launch youth anti-smoking campaigns as public relations efforts to discourage regulation and public action to reduce smoking, such as litigation or legislation, with the goal to improve their public image and reduce opportunities for opponents to impose restraints on industry practices. Their targets, then, are not youth or parents of youth, but policymakers and the general public. The key motivation has been to discourage Congress and state legislatures from enacting measures such as tobacco taxes, smoke-free laws, funding for tobacco prevention and cessation programs, and other regulations that they know and that science tells us will reduce smoking among both youth and adults.¹⁹

- From Judge Kessler's Final Opinion: "Internal documents suggest that Defendants designed their YSP [youth smoking prevention] programs for public relations rather than efficacy in youth smoking prevention."²⁰
- From the 2012 Surgeon General's Report: "The industry uses these efforts to convey to the public, policymakers, judges, and the members of juries that it is doing something substantial about the issue of youth's tobacco use. In this way, the programs serve to promote positive attitudes about the tobacco industry. Such positive attitudes could help to limit the industry's legal liability and make it easier for its views to be heard on legislative issues."²¹
- Internal tobacco industry documents, such as this 1991 Tobacco Institute discussion paper, highlight this strategy:

"The youth [anti-smoking] program and its individual parts support the Institute's objective of discouraging unfair and counterproductive federal, state, and local restrictions on cigarette advertising, by:

 - Providing on-going and persuasive evidence that the industry is actively discouraging youth smoking and independent verification that the industry's efforts are valid.
 - Reinforcing the belief that peer pressure -- not advertising -- is the cause of youth smoking.
 - Seizing the political center and forcing the anti-smokers to an extreme."²² (emphasis in original)
- In a 1995 draft speech, Philip Morris president and CEO Joseph J. Morgan stated, "The bottom line to all this is, I repeat, if we don't do something fast to project that sense of industry responsibility regarding the youth access issue, we are going to be looking at severe marketing restrictions in a very short time. Those restrictions will pave the way for equally severe legislation or regulation on where adults are allowed to smoke. We need to do something to demonstrate industry agreement, concern and action on the youth-access issue...."²³

The Industry Continues to Market Its Products Aggressively

Tobacco companies continue to spend billions of dollars each year to market their deadly and addictive products. In 2016 (the most recent year for which data are available), tobacco companies spent \$9.5 billion – nearly \$26 million a day – on advertising and promotional expenditures for cigarettes and smokeless tobacco.²⁴ If tobacco companies really wanted to reduce youth smoking, they would stop their aggressive marketing tactics and stop opposing the policies and programs that actually work to reduce smoking.

- Judge Kessler stated, "Philip Morris continues to increase its marketing expenditures in grossly disproportionate amounts to its spending on youth smoking prevention. Philip Morris's 2003 Financial Forecast Budget includes a budget of \$110 million for youth smoking prevention, \$8.9 million greater

than its 2002 spending, 'primarily due to increased spending for adult cessation programs.' In contrast, in that year, Philip Morris spent more than \$7.1 billion on sales incentives and product promotions."²⁵

- According to the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), in 2016, cigarette companies spent over 5,000 times more on product marketing and promotions than on youth prevention advertisements (\$9.5 billion vs. \$1.7 million), which just shows where their priorities are.²⁶
- Even worse, the industry's youth smoking prevention programs could feed into their marketing activities. The 2012 Surgeon General's report stated, "Investment in these programs provides a venue for the industry to conduct research on determinants of smoking among youth for the stated purpose of developing its prevention programs. However, this information could inform the companies' tobacco marketing efforts to youth..."²⁷

Tobacco Companies Continue to Oppose Real Prevention Programs and Other Policies that Reduce Smoking

Tobacco companies continue to spend millions of dollars in each state and at the federal level to lobby legislators against tobacco control policies that have been proven to reduce tobacco use, especially among youth.²⁸ The 2008 NCI report on tobacco use and the media describes the great lengths the tobacco industry will go to influence tobacco control media interventions. They obstruct state anti-tobacco media campaigns by lobbying elected officials to reduce or eliminate funding for these programs, by attempting to weaken the campaign messages or reduce the size of their target audiences and by arguing that state anti-tobacco media campaigns are a waste of taxpayer dollars because they duplicate the industry's own tobacco prevention campaigns – which, as proven above, are ineffective.²⁹

Below are a few examples of major efforts by tobacco companies to thwart tobacco control measures at the ballot.

- In 2017, the R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Company funded a ballot initiative to overturn a local San Francisco ordinance to end the sale of flavored tobacco products, including menthol-flavored cigarettes. Reynolds contributed over \$1.3 million to the campaign committee.³⁰ R.J.Reynolds sells the menthol cigarette Newport, the second most popular cigarette among 12-17 year old smokers.³¹
- In 2016, tobacco companies spent nearly \$100 million opposing ballot initiatives to increase state cigarette taxes, including more than \$70 million in California, more than \$17 million in Colorado, and more than \$3.8 million in North Dakota.³²
- In 2012, tobacco companies spent more than \$45 million in California to oppose a ballot initiative to increase the state cigarette tax.³³
- In 2007, tobacco industries spent \$12 million – or \$24 per vote – to defeat a ballot initiative to raise Oregon's tobacco tax and fund health care for uninsured children.³⁴
- According to state campaign contribution reports, in 2006, Philip Morris, R.J. Reynolds and other tobacco interests spent at least \$70 million in California and Missouri to oppose state ballot initiatives that would use revenues from a tobacco tax increase to fund proven-effective state youth prevention programs. The industry's money bought a barrage of deceptive television ads that misled voters about the impact of these initiatives, going so far as to claim that the initiatives did not provide enough money for tobacco prevention when in fact they would have given California and Missouri two of the best-funded tobacco prevention programs in the country.
- In 2006, tobacco companies launched a major effort to thwart a proposed \$1.00 per pack increase on the state cigarette tax in Texas. Philip Morris and R.J. Reynolds conducted an anti-tax campaign that consisted of radio commercials, newspaper ads and computer-generated phone calls to lawmakers. In addition, according to Texans for Public Justice, which monitors lobby influence in Austin, tobacco companies spent at least \$1.4 million lobbying the state legislature against the tax increase.³⁵
- In 2006, R.J. Reynolds spent more than \$7 million in Arizona to deter voters from supporting a ballot initiative that would make bars smoke-free and another \$5 million towards defeating a similar ballot initiative in Ohio.³⁶ Voters rejected these multi-million dollar campaigns by the tobacco industry and sent a loud and clear message to elected officials at all levels: Reject the special interests of the

tobacco industry and protect the public interest by supporting proven measures to reduce tobacco use and exposure to secondhand smoke.

Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids, April 10, 2018 / Becca Knox

More factsheets on tobacco industry marketing to kids and other “bad acts” are available at http://www.tobaccofreekids.org/facts_issues/fact_sheets/industry/.

¹ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). *Preventing Tobacco Use Among Youth and Young Adults: A Report of the Surgeon General*. Atlanta, GA: HHS, U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health, 2012, p. 602.

² HHS. *Preventing Tobacco Use Among Youth and Young Adults: A Report of the Surgeon General*. Atlanta, GA: HHS, CDC, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health, 2012, p. 563.

³ Farrelly, MC, et al., “Sustaining ‘truth’: changes in youth tobacco attitudes and smoking intentions after 3 years of a national antismoking campaign,” *Health Education Research* 24(1):42-48, 2009.

⁴ American Legacy Foundation, *Getting to the Truth: Assessing Youths’ Reactions to the truthsm and ‘Think. Don’t Smoke’ Tobacco Countermarketing Campaigns*, First Look Report 9, June 2002.

⁵ Wakefield, M, et al., “Effect of Televised, Tobacco Company-Funded Smoking Prevention Advertising on Youth Smoking-Related Beliefs, Intentions, and Behavior,” *American Journal of Public Health* 96(12):2154-2164, December 2006.

⁶ National Cancer Institute (NCI), *The Role of the Media in Promoting and Reducing Tobacco Use*, Smoking and Tobacco Control Monograph No. 19, NIH Pub. No. 07-6242, June 2008, http://cancercontrol.cancer.gov/tcrb/monographs/19/m19_complete.pdf.

⁷ Angus, K, et al., “The Effect of Tobacco Control Mass Media Campaigns, Counter-Advertising, and Other Related Community Interventions on Youth Tobacco Use,” University of Stirling, Institute for Social Marketing, January 2008. See also, Wakefield M, et al, “Youth Responses to Anti-Smoking Advertisements from Tobacco-Control Agencies, Tobacco Companies, and Pharmaceutical Companies,” *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 35(9):1894-1911, 2005; Henriksen L, et al., “Industry sponsored anti-smoking ads and adolescent reactance: test of a boomerang effect,” *Tobacco Control*, 15:13-18, 2006.

⁸ American Legacy Foundation, *Getting to the Truth: Assessing Youths’ Reactions to the truthsm and ‘Think. Don’t Smoke’ Tobacco Countermarketing Campaigns*, First Look Report 9, June 2002. Sly, D & Heald, G, *Florida Anti-Tobacco Media Evaluation (FAME) Follow-up Report*, February 2001. Teenage Research Unlimited, “Counter-Tobacco Advertising Exploratory,” Summary Report, January-March 1999.

⁹ Teenage Research Unlimited, “Counter-Tobacco Advertising Exploratory,” Summary Report, January-March 1999.

¹⁰ Angus, K, et al., “The Effect of Tobacco Control Mass Media Campaigns, Counter-Advertising, and Other Related Community Interventions on Youth Tobacco Use,” University of Stirling, Institute for Social Marketing, January 2008. See also, Wakefield, M, et al, “Youth Responses to Anti-Smoking Advertisements from Tobacco-Control Agencies, Tobacco Companies, and Pharmaceutical Companies,” *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 35(9): 1894-1911, 2005; Henriksen L, et al., “Industry sponsored anti-smoking ads and adolescent reactance: test of a boomerang effect,” *Tobacco Control*, 15:13-18, 2006.

¹¹ Cowling, DC & Robins, DG, “Rate of Illegal Tobacco Sales to Minors Varies by Sign Type in California,” *Research Letters, American Journal of Public Health* 90(11):1792-1793, 2000.

¹² DiFranza, JR & McAfee, T, “The Tobacco Institute: Helping Youth Say ‘Yes’ to Tobacco,” *The Journal of Family Practice* 34(6):694-696, 1992.

¹³ *U.S. V. Philip Morris USA, Inc., et al.*, No. 99-CV-02496GK (U.S. Dist. Ct., D.C.), Final Opinion, August 17, 2006, p. 1171, paragraph 3179, http://www.tobaccofreekids.org/content/what_we_do/industry_watch/doj/FinalOpinion.pdf.

¹⁴ *U.S. V. Philip Morris USA, Inc., et al.*, No. 99-CV-02496GK (U.S. Dist. Ct., D.C.), Final Opinion, August 17, 2006, p. 1164, paragraph 3157, http://www.tobaccofreekids.org/content/what_we_do/industry_watch/doj/FinalOpinion.pdf.

¹⁵ *U.S. V. Philip Morris USA, Inc., et al.*, No. 99-CV-02496GK (U.S. Dist. Ct., D.C.), Final Opinion, August 17, 2006, p. 1168, paragraph 3168, http://www.tobaccofreekids.org/content/what_we_do/industry_watch/doj/FinalOpinion.pdf.

¹⁶ Lippert, B, “Smoke and Mirrors,” *ADWEEK Eastern Edition* 39(50):34, December 14, 1998.

¹⁷ Horovitz, B, “Ad Experts’ Best & Worst of 1998 Bug spots rock; Philip Morris’ ads blow smoke,” *USA Today*, December 21, 1998.

¹⁸ Goldberg, F, “Is PM Blowing Smoke in Anti-Tobacco Ads? Looking Behind Philip Morris’ \$100M Campaign, Ad Agency CEO Sees Hypocrisy,” *Advertising Age*, January 18, 1999.

¹⁹ Landman, A, Ling, PM, & Glantz, SA, “Tobacco Industry Youth Smoking Prevention Programs: Protecting the Industry and Hurting Tobacco Control,” *American Journal of Public Health* 92(6):930, June 2002.

²⁰ *U.S. V. Philip Morris USA, Inc., et al.*, No. 99-CV-02496GK (U.S. Dist. Ct., D.C.), Final Opinion, August 17, 2006, p. 1172, paragraph 3184, http://www.tobaccofreekids.org/content/what_we_do/industry_watch/doj/FinalOpinion.pdf.

²¹ HHS. *Preventing Tobacco Use Among Youth and Young Adults: A Report of the Surgeon General*. Atlanta, GA: HHS, CDC, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health, 2012, p. 563.

²² Tobacco Institute “Discussion Paper,” January 29, 1991, Bates No. TIMN0164422/4424, available at <http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/lyu82f00>.

²³ Philip Morris, “JIM to PM Invitational Importance of Youth Issue,” speech draft, February 10, 1995, Bates No. 2044046017/6022, available at <http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/phy06e00>.

²⁴ U.S. Federal Trade Commission (FTC), Cigarette Report for 2016, 2018, https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/documents/reports/federal-trade-commission-cigarette-report-2016-federal-trade-commission-smokeless-tobacco-report/ftc_cigarette_report_for_2016_0.pdf [data for top 5 manufacturers only].; FTC, *Smokeless Tobacco Report for 2016*, 2018, <https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/documents/reports/federal-trade->

[commission-cigarette-report-2016-federal-trade-commission-smokeless-tobacco-report/ftc_smokeless_tobacco_report_for_2016_0.pdf](#) [Data for top 5 manufacturers only].

²⁵ *U.S. V. Philip Morris USA, Inc., et al.*, No. 99-CV-02496GK (U.S. Dist. Ct., D.C.), Final Opinion, August 17, 2006, p. 1165, paragraph 3160, http://www.tobaccofreekids.org/content/what_we_do/industry_watch/doj/FinalOpinion.pdf.

²⁶ FTC, *Cigarette Report for 2016*, 2018.

²⁷ HHS. *Preventing Tobacco Use Among Youth and Young Adults: A Report of the Surgeon General*. Atlanta, GA: HHS, CDC, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health, 2012, p. 563.

²⁸ See, for instance, Brennan, C & Leach, S, "Smoke signals: Tobacco lobbyists take advantage of legislative discord," *Philadelphia Daily News*, July 11, 2014, http://articles.philly.com/2014-07-11/news/51307929_1_cigarette-tax-corman-sales-tax. Worden, A & Coulombis, A, "Big Tobacco lobbies hard on Philly cigarette tax," *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, July 11, 2014, http://articles.philly.com/2014-07-11/news/51307904_1_cigarette-tax-senate-republicans-big-tobacco. Rosman, D, "Legislators' e-cigarettes votes expose influence of big business," *The Missourian*, July 30, 2014, <http://www.columbiamissourian.com/a/177331/david-rosman-legislators-e-cigarettes-votes-expose-influence-of-big-business/>. Rosenhall, L, "California Democrats accepting more campaign cash from tobacco industry," *The Sacramento Bee*, August 2, 2014, <http://www.sacbee.com/2014/08/02/6601133/california-democrats-accepting.html>.

²⁹ NCI, *The Role of the Media in Promoting and Reducing Tobacco Use*, Smoking and Tobacco Control Monograph No. 19, NIH Pub. No. 07-6242, June 2008, http://cancercontrol.cancer.gov/tcrb/monographs/19/m19_complete.pdf.

³⁰ City and County of San Francisco, Ethics Commission, Campaign Finance, Lobbyist and Campaign Consultant Disclosure, *Let's Be Real, San Francisco. A Coalition of Concerned Citizens Supporting Freedom of Choice, Adult Consumers, Community Leaders, and Neighborhood Small Businesses, with Major Funding by R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Company*, <http://public.netfile.com/pub2/?aid=sfo>.

³¹ HHS, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), Center for Behavioral Health Statistics and Quality, *National Survey on Drug Use and Health, 2014*. ICPSR36361-v1, Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2016-03-22, <http://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR36361.v1>

³² California Secretary of State, Campaign Finance: Campaign Finance: California Citizens Against Special Interests and Wasteful Taxes, No on Prop. 56, <http://cal-access.sos.ca.gov/Campaign/Committees/Detail.aspx?id=1389484&session=2015&view=late1>, accessed November 11, 2018. North Dakota Secretary of State, Campaign Finance: North Dakotans Against the 400% Tax Increase, <https://vip.sos.nd.gov/cf/search/cfsearch.aspx?name=North+Dakotans+Against+the+400%25+Tax+Increase&sc=s2&yr=2016>, accessed November 11, 2016. Colorado Secretary of State, Campaign Finance: No on 72 – No Blank Checks in the Constitution, <http://tracer.sos.colorado.gov/PublicSite/SearchPages/CommitteeDetail.aspx?OrgID=31591>, Accessed November 11, 2016.

³³ Maplight.org; Filings with the CA Secretary of State.

³⁴ "\$24 a vote to defeat 50," *The Oregonian*, November 7, 2007.

³⁵ Stutz, T, "Tobacco Firms launch ads against tax hike," *The Dallas Morning News*, April 8, 2006; Moritz, J, "Lobbyists flexing for tobacco fight," *Star-Telegram*, Fort Worth, TX, May 11, 2006.

³⁶ Fischer, H, "Tobacco puts \$8.5M into 206: R.J. Reynolds pushes allowing smoking in bars; funding lopsided on many props," *Arizona Daily Star*, October 27, 2006. Provance, J, "Tobacco giant pours \$5.4M into relaxed smoking ban," *The Toledo Blade*, October 27, 2006.