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ABSTRACT

This historical dissertation discusses the relationship between cigarette advertising and student publications at colleges and universities across the United States. This study uses The Orange and White at the University of Tennessee as a case study. Cigarette advertisements were printed in student publications from the 1920-1921 academic year to the 1963-1964 academic year and provided a needed source of revenue for student newspapers. This research examines the tactics and strategies that the tobacco industry used to target youth in the absence of federal legislation. This dissertation is divided into five chapters, which explain in detail the relationship between student publications, the tobacco industry, and federal legislators such as the FTC. The chapters also look at the pervasiveness of cigarette advertising in student newspapers on campus.
## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.................................................................................................................. 1  
Purpose of the Study.................................................................................................................. 4  
Current Research on Advertising and Tobacco........................................................................ 5  
History and Mass Communication.......................................................................................... 9  
Text Analysis and Methodology............................................................................................. 14  
Texts Used for this Research................................................................................................... 16  
Organization of this Study..................................................................................................... 21  

II. AN OVERVIEW OF SMOKING AND TOBACCO USE AND PROMOTION .................................................. 25  
Early History of the Cigarette Industry in the U.S. and the Tobacco Opposition................. 26  
The Tobacco Industry and Advertising Regulation............................................................. 45  

III. THE TOBACCO INDUSTRY AND THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY....................................................... 52  
Tobacco and University Life ............................................................................................... 52  
Student Publications........................................................................................................... 58  
What is Expected from the Campus Newspaper?................................................................. 64  
Funding the Campus Newspaper.......................................................................................... 67  
Student Newspapers at The University of Tennessee.......................................................... 75  
Tobacco Experiment Stations at Universities in the Southeast.............................................. 78  

IV. THE FTC’s ROLE IN ENDING TOBACCO ADVERTISING IN STUDENT NEWSPAPERS ON COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES......................................................... 81  
College Newspapers and Cigarette Advertising.................................................................. 82  
The Tobacco Industry, Federal Regulations and the FTC.................................................... 85  
Finally, a Victory for the FTC?............................................................................................ 89  

V. RESULTS FROM THE STUDY OF THE ORANGE AND WHITE......................................................... 121  
Research Models.................................................................................................................. 121  
General Frequency Information for The Orange and White from 1920-1963....................... 127  
Cigarette Advertising in the Orange and White during the 1920s.......................................... 129  
Advertisements Published in the Orange and White during the 1920s..................................... 132  
Cigarette Advertising in the Orange and White during the 1930s......................................... 140  
Advertisements Published in the Orange and White during the 1930s..................................... 142  
Cigarette Advertising in The Orange and White during the 1940s........................................ 150  
Advertisements Published in The Orange and White during the 1940s................................. 152  
Cigarette Advertising in The Orange and White during the 1950s......................................... 157  
Unfiltered Brands Advertised during the 1950s..................................................................... 159  
Filtered Brands Advertised during the 1950s....................................................................... 166
Menthol Brands Advertised during the 1950s.................................................................170
Cigarette Advertising in The Orange and White from 1960 to 1964.................................171
Unfiltered Brands Advertised during the 1960s.................................................................173
Filtered Brands Advertised during the 1960s.................................................................175
Menthol Brands Advertised from 1960-1963.................................................................177

VI. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION ............................................................................180

Popular Cigarette Advertising Themes in The Orange and White.................................180
The Influence of Legislation on Advertising Appeals.......................................................200
Research Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research..........................................205
Conclusion.......................................................................................................................207

VII. REFERENCES...........................................................................................................209

VIII. APPENDIX...........................................................................................................217

IX. VITA.........................................................................................................................350
# LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Figure 1: Taylor’s Strategy Wheel</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Figure 2: Issues Published Each Decade From 1920-1963</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Figure 3: Advertisements by Decade</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Figure 4: Total Number of Cigarette Advertisements by Decade</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Figure 5: Top 12 Cigarette Advertisers 1920s-1960s</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Figure 6: Major Cigarette Advertisers 1920s-1960s (Unfiltered)</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Figure 7: Major Cigarette Advertisers 1920s-1960s (Filtered)</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Figure 8: Creative Strategy – 1920s-1960s</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Figure 9: Number of Cigarette Advertisements 1920-129</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Figure 10: Brands Advertised During the 1920s</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Figure 11: Cigarette Brands by Percent – 1920s</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Figure 12: Creative Strategy During the 1920s</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Figure 13: Creative Strategies by Percent</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Figure 14: Persuasive Appeals and Tactics – 1920s</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Figure 15: Appeals and Tactics by Percent – 1920s</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Figure 16: Men and Women in Advertisements in the 1920s</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Figure 17: Chesterfield 1921</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Figure 18: Chesterfield 1927</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Figure 19: Chesterfield 1928</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Figure 20: Camel 1921</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Figure 21: Camel 1926</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Figure 22: Camel 1927</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Figure 23: Camel 1929</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Figure 24: Fatima 1923</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Figure 25: Pears’ Soap 1911</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Figure 26: Fatima 1924</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Figure 27: Old Gold 1927</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Figure 28: Old Gold 1928</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Figure 29: Old Gold 1929</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Figure 30: Old Gold 1930</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Figure 31: Old Gold 1930</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Figure 32: Old Gold 1930</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Figure 33: Total Cigarette Advertisements by Brand – 1930</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Figure 34: Brands of Cigarettes – 1930s</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Figure 35: Creative Strategy Cigarettes – 1930s</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Figure 36: Creative Strategy by Percent – 1930s</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Figure 37: Advertising Tactics by Year – 1930s</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Figure 38: Advertising Tactics by Percent – 1930s</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Figure 39: Camel 1931</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Figure 40: Camel 1931</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Figure 41: Camel 1932</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Figure 42: Camel 1933</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Figure 43: Camel 1934</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Figure 44: Camel 1935</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Frequency of Advertising for Unfiltered Brands – 1950s</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Primary Advertisers for Filtered Cigarettes – 1950s</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Advertisers for Filtered Cigarette Brands – 1950s</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Creative Strategy by Year – 1950s</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Creative Strategy by Percent – 1950s</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Creative Tactics by Year – 1950s</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Creative Tactics by Percent – 1950s</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Lucky Strike 1952</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Lucky Strike 1954</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Lucky Strike 1954</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Lucky Strike 1954</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Lucky Strike 1956</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Camel 1951</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Camel 1952</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Camel 1954</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Camel 1955</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Camel 1956</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Camel 1958</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Chesterfield 1950</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Chesterfield 1951</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Chesterfield 1952</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Chesterfield 1954</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Chesterfield 1954</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Chesterfield 1958</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Phillip Morris 1951</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Phillip Morris 1952</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Phillip Morris 1956</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Old Gold 1957</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Pall Mall 1959</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Winston 1954</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Winston 1956</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Winston 1958</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>L&amp;M 1954</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>L&amp;M 1955</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>L&amp;M 1958</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Viceroy 1956</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Viceroy 1958</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Tareyton 1955</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Tareyton 1956</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Tareyton 1960</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Marlboro 1956</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Marlboro 1958</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Salem 1957</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Kool 1960</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Comparison of Advertising Across Three Classes of Cigarettes</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Unfiltered Cigarette Advertisements – 1960 to 1963</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Advertisements for Unfiltered Cigarettes – 1960 to 1962</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Advertisements for Filtered Cigarettes – 1960 to 1963</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 141: Advertisers for Filtered Cigarette Brands – 1960s

Figure 142: Creative Strategy by Year – 1960 to 1963

Figure 143: Creative Strategy by Percent – 1960 to 1963

Figure 144: Creative Tactics by Year – 1960 to 1963

Figure 145: Creative Tactics by Percent – 1960 to 1963

Figure 146: Camel 1961

Figure 147: Camel 1961

Figure 148: Chesterfield 1961

Figure 149: Chesterfield 1962

Figure 150: Lucky Strike 1960

Figure 151: Lucky Strike 1961

Figure 152: Lucky Strike 1962

Figure 153: Pall Mall 1962

Figure 154: Pall Mall 1962

Figure 155: Tareyton 1960

Figure 156: Tareyton 1961

Figure 157: Winston 1960

Figure 158: L&M 1960

Figure 159: L&M 1962

Figure 160: Viceroy 1961

Figure 161: Viceroy 1962

Figure 162: Marlboro 1962

Figure 163: Marlboro 1962

Figure 164: Kool 1960

Figure 165: Salem 1962

Figure 166: Camel 1931 Career Advisors

Figure 167: Chesterfield 1933 Career Advisors

Figure 168: Camel 1935 Career Advisors

Figure 169: Chesterfield 1943 Career Advisors

Figure 170: Camel 1943 Career Advisors

Figure 171: Camel 1954 Career Advisors

Figure 172: Camel 1956 Career Advisors

Figure 173: Chesterfield 1958 Career Advisors

Figure 174: Chesterfield 1932 Matchmakers

Figure 175: Lucky Strike 1935 Matchmakers

Figure 176: Winston 1955 Matchmakers

Figure 177: Tareyton 1956 Matchmakers

Figure 178: Camel 1956 Matchmakers

Figure 179: Chesterfield 1955 Matchmakers

Figure 180: Old Gold 1928 Campus Cigarette

Figure 181: Lucky Strike 1954 Campus Cigarette

Figure 182: Chesterfield 1954 Campus Cigarette

Figure 183: Lucky Strike 1957 Campus Cigarette

Figure 184: Chesterfield/L&M/Oasis 1960 Campus Cigarette

Figure 185: Viceroy 1961 Campus Cigarette

Figure 186: Camel 1934 Study Buddies

Figure 187: Old Gold 1928 Smoking and Health

Figure 188: Lucky Strike 1932 Smoking and Health
Figure 189: Lucky Strike 1937 Smoking and Health

Figure 190: Camel 1937 Smoking and Health

Figure 191: Camel 1935 Smoking and Health

Figure 192: Camel 1936 Smoking and Health

Figure 193: Camel 1941 Smoking and Health

Figure 194: Camel 1948 Smoking and Health

Figure 195: Old Gold 1947 Smoking and Health

Figure 196: Chesterfield 1952 Smoking and Health

Figure 197: Chesterfield 1953 Smoking and Health

Figure 198: L&M 1954 Smoking and Health

Figure 199: Viceroy 1958 Smoking and Health

Figure 200: Old Gold 1934 Advertorials/Cartoons

Figure 201: Old Gold 1930 Advertorials/Cartoons

Figure 202: Old Gold 1935 Advertorials/Cartoons

Figure 203: Old Gold 1935 Advertorials/Cartoons

Figure 204: Camel 1933 Advertorials/Cartoons

Figure 205: Camel 1951 Advertorials/Cartoons

Figure 206: Camel 1952 Advertorials/Cartoons

Figure 207: Camel 1958 Advertorials/Cartoons

Figure 208: Winston 1958 Advertorials/Cartoons

Figure 209: Pall Mall 1962 Advertorials/Cartoons

Figure 210: Lucky Strike 1961 Advertorials/Cartoons

Figure 211: Marlboro 1962 Advertorials/Cartoons

Figure 212: Kool 1960 Advertorials/Cartoons

Figure 213: Chesterfield 1932 Promotional Advertising

Figure 214: Chesterfield 1932 Promotional Advertising

Figure 215: Chesterfield 1937 Promotional Advertising

Figure 216: Camel 1935 Promotional Advertising

Figure 217: Camel 1937 Promotional Advertising

Figure 218: Phillip Morris 1947 Promotional Advertising

Figure 219: Chesterfield 1948 Promotional Advertising

Figure 220: Phillip Morris 1952 Promotional Advertising

Figure 221: Lucky Strike 1931 Legislation

Figure 222: Lucky Strike 1937 Legislation
When Thorwald Dockstader — sophomore, epicure, and sportsman — first took up smoking, he did not simply choose the first brand of cigarettes that came to hand. He did what any sophomore, epicure, and sportsman would do: he sampled many brands until he found the very best — a mild, rich, flavorful smoke — an endless source of comfort and satisfaction — a smoke that never palled, never failed to please — a smoke that age could not whither nor custom stale — a filter cigarette with an unfiltered taste — Marlboro of course! Text from a Marlboro Advertisement, The Orange and White, 1963.

Chapter One: Introduction

Recent studies suggest that the ultimate goal of cigarette advertising past and present has been to target college students. A young audience is the natural target for tobacco companies because the majority of smokers start when they are in high school or college.1 In spite of the industry’s public arguments that its advertising efforts were aimed exclusively at brand loyalty and brand switching, their own internal documents contradict these claims.2 This research demonstrates that cigarette manufacturers carefully studied and knowingly implemented marketing campaigns to attract young smokers at colleges and universities from the 1920s-1960s. Support for this research is found in industry documents that show the need and desirability of attaining a large share of the college student market and cigarette advertisements and promotions placed in student newspapers at colleges and universities across the nation, and more specifically The Orange and White at the University of Tennessee.

Before government entities such as the Federal Trade Commission, Food and Drug

1 K M Cummings, C P Morley, J K Horan, C Steger and N-R Leavell “Marketing to America's youth: evidence from Corporate Documents” Tobacco Control, 11 (2002) pp. 5-17
2 K M Cummings, C P Morley, J K Horan, C Steger and N-R Leavell “Marketing to America's youth: evidence from Corporate Documents” Tobacco Control, 11 (2002) pp. 5-17
Administration, and the U.S. Surgeon General began to take an interest in cigarette advertising, the tobacco industry was able to market its product as much as it pleased. Because a young market, that included college students, was the industry’s primary target, it used publications that targeted teenagers and young adults to promote cigarette smoking. The tobacco industry had the complete liberty to market its product without warnings or restraints.

One of the primary vehicles that the tobacco industry used to target students was the college newspaper. Financially strapped and desperate for advertising revenue, student newspapers were eager to accept advertising dollars from the tobacco industry. The campus newspapers’ national sales representatives sold large amounts of advertising space in student publications across the nation to cigarette companies that were eager to attract new college-aged smokers. Both the national advertising representatives and the tobacco industry made handsome profits from the arrangement while some struggling student papers barely earned enough revenue from the advertising sales to print the extra pages that the tobacco industry required for their large advertisements.3

The issue of cigarette marketing is of public concern because cigarette smoking is a major preventable cause of serious chronic disease. Medical research has clearly demonstrated that nicotine is an addictive drug, arguably in the same category as morphine, amphetamines, and cocaine. Although a variety of factors can influence a person’s decision to smoke (e.g., parents who smoke, having friends who smoke, low self-esteem), researchers are beginning to recognize the role that print advertising plays. Studies have recently

---
concluded that frequent exposure to cigarette advertising significantly increases the likelihood of starting a smoking habit.\(^4\)

Very few references in the scholarly literature are made to cigarette advertising and promotion on college campuses. However, from the large number of advertisements found in college newspapers and internal industry documents, it appears that these publications were an important marketing venue for the cigarette industry. Therefore, this research will fill lacunae in the current scholarship on cigarette marketing and promotion.

In addition to filling gaps in the research, the history of tobacco marketing on campus is an important piece of mass communication history. First, this history shows how a powerful advertising force, such as the tobacco industry, can influence a relatively weak collegiate press and undermine its goal of serving the student body’s best interest. Secondly, it serves as a clear demonstration of the tobacco industry’s goal to target young adults. Lastly, the advertisements demonstrate the tobacco industry’s high level of sophistication in creating persuasive messages that appealed to young people and spoke to their needs and concerns.

Therefore, primary focus of the research will be examining the role that cigarette advertisements placed in student newspapers on college campuses played in persuading millions of college students across the nation to start smoking. The advertisements in the campus newspapers are of particular interest because they are a blatant example of how the tobacco industry in the United States was trying to persuade generations of young Americans to start smoking. In addition to being an obvious example of the industry’s interest in the young adult market, the advertisements show the persuasive tactics and strategies that the industry used in the absence of any significant government interference. In addition, this

research will explore the political maneuverings that the tobacco industry engaged in to prevent the FTC from removing or regulating the advertisements and the enactment of an agreement that led to their removal from the student press in 1963.

**Purpose of the Study:**

The topic of cigarette advertising has been a popular subject of research in many fields of study including mass communication, business, political science, and public health. A basic concern has been the role of cigarette advertising in stimulating demand. Cigarette smoking reached the height of its popularity between the 1950s and the 1970s. Given that reaching a youth and young adult market was the industry’s goal, it seems useful to examine the print advertisements that helped to persuade a generation of Americans to smoke.

This research reveals how cigarette companies’ promotional campaigns targeted college students. College and university newspapers were the primary media vehicles for this market. From the 1920s to the early 1960s cigarette companies were lucrative advertising sponsors. Their advertising comprised approximately 40 percent of the national advertising in most campus newspapers. Advertisements played an important role in creating and reinforcing a culture in which smoking was seen as being glamorous and sophisticated, enjoyable and pleasant, rugged and masculine (or chic and feminine), and symbolic of independent thinking or coming of age. This research also demonstrates how cigarette advertisers refined their product’s image to appeal to college students.

In order to examine this problem, the research will use *The Orange and White*, the student newspaper at The University of Tennessee, as a case study. Although there are a variety of factors that make *The Orange and White* unique, the advertisements found in the newspaper are the same as would be found in any major college or university. Tobacco

---

industry media placement records show that the same advertisements were placed in nearly every college and university newspaper in the nation. Tobacco companies were major advertisers in campus student newspapers from the 1920s until 1963 when the FTC forced the tobacco industry to discontinue its tobacco advertising in student publications.

In addition to providing a general introduction to the dissertation, the remainder of this chapter will provide a review of the current research on advertising and tobacco, an overview of the study of history in the field of mass communication, a review of textual analysis methods, and a description of the documents and other texts used for this research.

**Current Research on Advertising and Tobacco:**

The topic of young adults and/or youth and smoking is a popular area of research among marketing, advertising, and mass communication scholars. Smoking is an area of interest because of the public health issues related to tobacco use, the age restrictions, and the limitations placed on tobacco marketing. In addition, cigarettes are among the most heavily advertised products in the United States. Some of the subject areas that have received a significant amount of scholarly attention include: where advertising placement such as magazines, billboards, the retail environment, or product placement in movies; cigarette marketing strategies and branding; the psychology of youth and young adult smoking; smoking regulation; and anti-smoking campaigns. However, very little research takes a historical approach to studying cigarette advertising that targets young people.

Many researchers look at tobacco related advertising in magazines. For instance, a variety of studies examine the frequency of youth exposure to cigarette advertising in

---


magazines. Similar studies investigate whether cigarette brands popular among adolescent smokers are more likely than adult brands to place advertisements in youth-oriented magazines or magazines with high adolescent readerships. Another study examines how adolescents attend to the product warnings found in cigarette advertisements that often run in youth or young adult oriented magazines. In addition, magazine advertising research studies specific kinds of cigarette advertising such as promotional advertising featuring information relating to premiums, retail value added promotions, or coupons. Other studies examine the specific persuasive appeals and images that are used to sell cigarettes in magazine advertisements.

Although the magazine is the most popular medium for scholarly research related to cigarette advertising, scholars have also examined other media. For instance, many advertising researchers look at the impact of billboards. Like magazine advertising, some scholars examine the types of social cues that were used on billboards in an attempt to persuade young people to start smoking. Other research looks at the demographics of the

---

neighborhoods targeted by billboards that advertise cigarettes. For instance, cigarette billboards often target minority and poor neighborhoods.\textsuperscript{10} Because the 1998 Master Settlement Agreement (MSA) prohibits tobacco advertising on billboards, cigarette companies have begun using the environment outside of retail locations to promote their product. For this reason, researchers are now studying the influence of cigarette advertising that is visible from the outside of retail locations and how it has changed due to the MSA.\textsuperscript{11}

In addition to studying advertisements outside retail establishments, tobacco scholars also study promotional efforts that target customers inside the retail environment. Cigarette manufacturers now spend more money on the retail outlet than any other venue. Therefore, tobacco and cigarette research now focuses its attention on point-of-sale items, shelf placement, and other retail strategies that tobacco companies employ. For instance, according to the MSA tobacco items should be placed at least three feet from the floor, should not be found next to candy, and should not feature cartoons. Therefore, researchers study whether current cigarette merchandising complies with the MSA, the relationship between point-of-purchase items and brand preference among underage smokers, and how the cigarette industry targets youth and young adults with the retail locations it selects for the majority of its merchandising efforts.\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{12} Ellen C Feighery, Kurt M Ribisl, Nina Schleicher, Rebecca E Lee and Sonia Halvorson “Cigarette advertising and promotional strategies in retail outlets: results of a statewide survey in California” \textit{Tobacco Control} 10 (2001) pp. 184-188.
Another promotional practice that is popular with cigarette brands is product placement in films. Although the industry claims that it has not made placements since the 1980s the prevalence of smoking in the movies has steadily increased. For instance, several studies have described how smoking is portrayed in movies, others have examined whether product placement in movies influences adolescent smoking behavior, and the research has looked at the gender issues related to smoking in films.¹³

Because of the high rate of smoking initiation among adolescents and young adults and the hazardous health consequences of smoking, discouraging young people from beginning to use tobacco is essential. Therefore, some scholarly research has reviewed interventions and policies aimed at reducing youth and young adult cigarette smoking in the United States such as antismoking campaigns. Other studies have been more specific in their approach. For instance, some researchers have examined how non-profit organizations and government agencies use social marketing to devise advertising that prevents children and youth from initiating smoking.¹⁴ On the other hand, scholars have also explored the

---


Cornelia Pechmann and S. Ratneshwar "The Effects of Antismoking and Cigarette Advertising on Young
increasing problems with youth and tobacco in developing nations.\textsuperscript{15}

In addition to exploring the various media used to help persuade youth and young adults about tobacco use, some research examines the psychology of smoking. For instance, some research explores the relationship between having peers who smoke and becoming a smoker. Other research explores concepts related to adolescent development to explain why youth begin smoking. Some research identifies specific socio-demographic, environmental, behavioral, and personal variables that predispose individuals to start smoking.\textsuperscript{16}

**History and Mass Communication**

The quest for excellent historical research in the field of mass communication is not new. Nearly half a century ago, Allan Nevins, a journalist turned historian, called attention to many of the problems that account for the thin and uneven quality of writing in this branch of history.\textsuperscript{17} Historical research involves both documents and a critical method for their evaluation. Nevins once said that “history was not born – it could not be born – until both these elements came into existence.”\textsuperscript{18} Writing communication history involves knowledge of the media at some point in the past but also a general understanding of the life

\begin{itemize}
  \item Charles W. Warren, Leanne Riley, Samira Asma, Michael P. Eriksen, Lawrence Green, Curtis Blanton, Cliff Loo, Scott Batchelor, & Derek Yach “Tobacco use by youth: a surveillance report from the Global Youth Tobacco Survey project” Bulletin of the World Health Organization vol.78 no.7 Geneva July 2000
\end{itemize}
and thought of that time. The sources used to conduct communication history should reflect these two concerns.  

Mass communication historians today profess a new interest in many things about the past such as advertising, newspaper readership, public opinion, the media and violence, and sensationalism. They are also interested in how people behave in groups and society in general. To proceed in investigating such topics in communication history without investigating what sociologists have said about them would be unwise. The same, of course, can be said of sociologists that explore the same questions, for there is a definite historical component to any sociological explanation. This is not to suggest that sociology should become history or history sociology. Simply, the point is that two disciplines can overlap in terms of subject, and at those points it is logical to expect intellectual interaction to occur.

Advertising and History

Much of the history written about advertising has supported one side or another in the dispute over advertising’s effects on consumers. Whereas much of the early historical work of advertising was produced as a kind of defense of advertising, much of the later work has been active in its opposition to advertising. Those who wrote as insiders tended to commend the process; on the other hand, those on the outside tended to attack advertising as a societal blight.

In the field of advertising history, the compositional structure shows considerable diversity. Early advertising history tended to be broadly descriptive and anecdotal. The majority of advertising’s history was created in bits and pieces by writers and scholars.
interested in the history of advertising only peripherally. The later work has been cultural and social and focuses on American culture and social mores instead of advertising itself.  

Like mass communication research, advertising scholarship falls into several historical schools. The Developmental approach is usually descriptive and seeks answers through an incremental accounting of ever advancing advertising techniques. The Business and Economic historical approach held a similarly favorable view of advertising but was concerned primarily with the dynamics of the advertising industry and the positive part it played in the American economic system. On the other hand, the Cultural school was almost always disparaging. It viewed advertising as being a mirror of society, either being influenced by its surroundings or having an influence on them. Alternatively, Ideological historians viewed advertising in a narrower context. They viewed advertising in the context of socio-political issues. Ideological historians comprise two groups, Progressive historians and Marxist historians. The Progressive school explained advertising as it related to democratic principles and to the clash between the masses and the wealthy class. Lastly, the Marxist school denounces all approaches but its own. Marxists interpreted advertising history as a classic class struggle and efforts aimed at reforming advertising as an exercise in futility.

The Cultural School:

As far as historical approaches in advertising history are concerned, this research fits best within the Cultural school. Using this approach, scholars view the media in general and advertising in particular as mirrors of society. Advertising influences culture and society and is influenced and shaped by those same societal factors.

---

The inspiring force of the Cultural interpretation can be traced back to the work of Robert E. Park, one of the faculty members at the University of Chicago who studied urban sociology. Park argued that the evolution of American journalism resulted from its interaction with the surrounding culture in “The Natural History of the Newspaper,” published in 1925. The press, he asserted, was

…the outcome of a historic process in which many individuals participated without foreseeing what the ultimate product of their labors would be. The newspaper, like the modern city, is not wholly a rational product. No one sought to make it what it is. In spite of all of the efforts of individual men and generations of men to control it and make it something after their own heart, it has continued to grow and change in its own incalculable ways.  

The primary factors in determining the nature of the newspaper, Park stated, were the conditions of the society and the system in which the press operated. 

While some historians in other schools had attempted to explain the media as institutions somewhat separate from society, cultural historians considered the media as part of society and therefore influenced by various factors outside of the media themselves. While most historians had assumed that the media had a major influence on society, cultural historians began to study the opposite effect: the impact of society on the media. This perspective accounted for a major change in historical outlook.

The study of cultural history in mass communication expands beyond journalism to advertising and economics. In People of Plenty: Economic Abundance and the American Character, David Potter expands on advertising’s influence on the development of materialistic values in the United States. He argued that the most distinctive characteristic of American culture

was materialism that resulted from affluence and an abundance of goods produced by its economic system. In such a system, the role of advertising was central.\(^{28}\)

According to Potter, the role of advertising was to stimulate consumers to purchase goods. In achieving this goal, it had been extremely successful. Potter wrote,

> Advertising is not badly needed in an economy of scarcity, because total demand is unusually equal to or in excess of total supply, and every producer can normally sell as much as he produces. It is when potential supply outstrips demand – that is when abundance prevails – that advertising begins to fulfill a really essential economic function.\(^{29}\)

Therefore, in the early 1900s, as the American economy began producing more goods than necessary for the people’s needs, producers used advertising to encourage the public to shift its thinking from needs to desires so that the emphasis was on consumption. That change revised the culture in the United States.\(^{30}\)

Like Potter, Michael Schudson also studied the relationship between advertising and consumption. Schudson argued that advertising helped to shape society in the United States in detrimental ways. Though more interested in modern analysis of advertising than in history, his interpretation of the cultural role of advertising exemplified the approach of historians who emphasized “symbolic meaning” as the essence of mass communication. Schudson wrote that no one has been so crude as to believe advertising created the ‘consumer culture’ alone, but few critics of advertising have looked at what else besides advertising could have created the consumerism that exists today.\(^{31}\)

---


Text Analysis and Methodology:

There is growing interest in the social sciences in the systematic analysis of text. This growing interest is a result of the large amount of human thought and behavior that is recorded in one type of text or another. Two broad traditions in textual analysis exist: the linguistic tradition and the sociological tradition. The linguistic tradition treats the text itself as the object of analysis. On the other hand, the sociological tradition treats text as a window to human experience. Because of the sociological underpinnings of this research, the text analysis will be derived from the sociological tradition.

Those in the sociological tradition view texts as elements of social events that are said to have causal effects because they bring about changes. For instance, texts can bring about immediate changes in our level or knowledge because we can learn from them, our values, our attitudes, and our beliefs. Texts can also have more long-term effects. For instance, one could argue that prolonged experience of advertising and other commercial texts contributes to shaping people’s identities as consumers or even their gender identities. Therefore, texts have causal effects upon, and contribute to, changes in people, social relations, and the material world.32

However, texts do not create a simple mechanical causality. For example, one cannot claim that particular features of texts automatically bring about specific changes in an individual’s knowledge or behavior or specific social or political effects. Likewise, there may be no regular cause or effect pattern that is associated with a particular type of text or particular features of text. However, this lack of regular cause does not mean that there are no causal effects. Texts can have causal effects without their being regular effects because

many other factors in the context determine whether particular texts actually have such effects and can lead to a particular text having a variety of effects.33

Many theories of social constructivism emphasize the role of texts in the construction of the social world. Although individuals may textually represent the social world in particular ways, whether our representations have the effect of changing the social construction depends on contextual factors. These factors include the way social reality already is and who is interpreting it. Therefore, sociologists can accept a moderate version of the claim that the social world is textually constructed but not an extreme version.34

Grounded Theory and Textual Analysis:

Grounded theory is one the methods of textual analysis that is frequently used by scholars in the sociological tradition. Grounded theory is a set of techniques that can be used to provide a rigorous and detailed method for identifying categories and concepts that emerge from the text and it helps the researcher to link concepts into substantive and formal theories.35 Although grounded theory is often used for analyzing interviews, it seems that it could also be used to identify themes that emerge in advertising messages.

The mechanics of grounded theory are deceptively simple: review a sample of text, identify themes that arise, and as analytic categories emerge, identify examples from the categories and compare them considering not only which text belongs in each emerging category but also how the categories are linked together. The relationships among the categories are then used to build theoretical models. These models are constantly being

Andrew Sayer Realism and Social Science (London: Sage, 2000).
checked against the data. Grounded theory is an iterative process by which the analyst becomes increasingly grounded in the data and develops an increasingly rich concept or model of how the phenomenon being studied really works.  

**Texts Used for this Research:**

*Newspapers as Historical Texts:*

> The old proverb “familiarity breeds contempt” can aptly be applied to the newspaper. Its availability becomes, in the eyes of the public, the best reason for disregarding it. Unconsciously, this same idea has been the basis of the procedure of the historian. Historians often give more credence to material that is more difficult to find.

> Historian Lucy Maynard Salmon believes that important historical records are kept in newspaper advertisements. Salmon said that the student of history finds in studying the advertiser an important record of changes in the business management of the press. If the advertiser has unduly influenced the press to suppress news undesirable for special business interests, it has been the press itself that has set the danger signal. If the advertiser has been unfair in its dealings with the public, it has been the press that has led the campaign for honest advertising and that has found its greatest allies among the advertisers themselves.

> The historian uses the newspaper in an effort to reconstruct the past. And, the historian may therefore find both the authoritative and the unauthoritative parts to be valuable. The authoritative parts are necessary in giving an accurate account of past events. The unauthoritative parts may be of value in determining ideals and standards. The historian

---


is not concerned simply with the accounts of material events but also the interpretation of the spirit of a time or locality.\textsuperscript{39}

The historian thus finds in the very processes of newspaper advertising valuable records of the changing business standards of the press. The historian finds in all commercial advertising a perfect record of the conditions out of which it has grown. Advertising presents a record of corporate extravagance and wastefulness, of shortsighted business policy that accepts questionable advertisements, and philanthropic calls for help made through an advertising appeal. The “ad-less newspaper” so often urged as a remedy for all of the evils laid at the door of the press would not only prove as a panacea, but it would deprive society of the most flawless mirror of itself and the historian of the most unimpeachable evidence at his or her command.\textsuperscript{40}

Therefore, newspaper advertisement serves the historian in every part of his effort to reconstruct the past. If the advertisement is true, the facts it states are of value. If the advertisement is not true, that in and of itself is a record of the low moral standards that were tolerated but not acknowledged by the press and the public. Moreover, the advertisement, true or false, is an invaluable record of the normal life in the past. The record is essential because advertisements made a record of the material, intellectual and moral conditions in the past.\textsuperscript{41}

\textit{Master Settlement Agreement and Tobacco Documents:}

The Master Settlement Agreement (MSA) is an agreement that was signed in November 1998 by the tobacco industry and the attorneys general in 46 states and five U.S. territories. The agreement resolved lawsuits filed by the attorneys general against the tobacco

\textsuperscript{39} Lucy Maynard Salmon \textit{The Newspaper and the Historian} (New York: Oxford University Press, 1923) p. xli.
\textsuperscript{40} Lucy Maynard Salmon \textit{The Newspaper and the Historian} (New York: Oxford University Press, 1923) p. 367-374.
\textsuperscript{41} Lucy Maynard Salmon \textit{The Newspaper and the Historian} (New York: Oxford University Press, 1923) p. 375.
industry and provided funds to the states to compensate them for taxpayer money that was
spent on patients and family members with tobacco-related diseases. Among the many other
provisions, the agreement required that tobacco billboard advertising be removed and that
tobacco companies stop using cartoon characters to sell cigarettes. The tobacco companies
also agreed not to target youth in the advertising, marketing and promotion of their
products. The MSA also called for the creation of a foundation -- the American Legacy
Foundation -- to counteract tobacco use.\(^\text{42}\)

In addition to agreeing to limitations on advertising, tobacco companies also
agreed to make many of their internal documents available to the public. The major vehicle
that the tobacco companies use to make their documents available is the Internet. For
instance, the MSA states:

The Original Participating Manufacturers will maintain at their expense their Internet
document websites accessible through "TobaccoResolution.com" or a similar
website until June 30, 2010. The Original Participating Manufacturers will maintain
the documents that currently appear on their respective websites and will add
additional documents to their websites…\(^\text{43}\)

The individual tobacco companies must continue to update the documents until 2010. The
MSA continues by stating:

Unless copies of such documents are already on its website, each Original
Participating Manufacturer and Tobacco-Related Organization will place on its
website copies of documents produced in any production of documents that takes
place on or after the date 30 days before the MSA Execution Date in any federal or
state court civil action concerning smoking and health. Copies of any documents
required to be placed on a website pursuant to this subsection will be placed on such
website within the later of 45 days after the MSA Execution Date or within 45 days
after the production of such documents in any federal or state court action

\(^{42}\) Legacy: The American Legacy Foundation. \url{http://www.americanlegacy.org/82.htm} (Retrieved 6 December, 2006).
\(^{43}\) "Master Settlement Agreement" \textit{Office of the Attorney General: State of California Department of Justice}
\url{http://ag.ca.gov/tobacco/pdf/1msa.pdf?PHPSESSID=c0699bff2494cc2a9b77e884b43c7412} p. 23 (Retrieved
6 December, 2006).
concerning smoking and health. This obligation will continue until June 30, 2010.\footnote{44} However, there are certain documents that the MSA does not require the tobacco industry to post. The MSA states:

(1) it continues to claim to be privileged, a trade secret, confidential or proprietary business information, or that contain other information not appropriate for public disclosure because of personal privacy interests or contractual rights of third parties; or

(2) continue to be subject to any protective order, sealing order or other order or ruling that prevents or limits a litigant from disclosing such documents.\footnote{45}

Internet-Based Tobacco Databases:

As part of the Master Settlement Agreement between the States and the tobacco companies, the industry was required to make the documents used during the various tobacco trials available. The companies posted the documents on their websites, but searching required going to a variety of sites, each with a different interface.

In 1988, Tobacco.org began with Gene Borio's news-posting service on Compuserve, where Borio was a forum leader, Prodigy, and later AOL. An electronic bulletin board service started in 1993, and the website began in 1996. Since 2000, the website has been run by Gene Borio and Michael Tacelosky. Tobacco.org is a free resource center focusing on tobacco and smoking issues. It features tobacco news, information, help for smokers trying to quit, alerts on tobacco control issues, and open consideration of all aspects of the spectrum of issues concerning tobacco, nicotine, cigarettes and cigars.\footnote{46}

The MSA required the industry to submit a snapshot of their sites as of July 1999. Tobacco Documents Online (TDO) spent more than a year creating standard document

\footnote{44} “Master Settlement Agreement” Office of the Attorney General: State of California Department of Justice \url{http://ag.ca.gov/tobacco/pdf/1msa.pdf?PHPSESSID=c0699bff2494cc2a9b77e884b43e7412} p.23 (Retrieved 6 December, 2006).

\footnote{45} “Master Settlement Agreement” Office of the Attorney General: State of California Department of Justice \url{http://ag.ca.gov/tobacco/pdf/1msa.pdf?PHPSESSID=c0699bff2494cc2a9b77e884b43e7412} p.23 (Retrieved 6 December, 2006).

\footnote{46} Tobacco.org: Tobacco News and Information. \url{http://www.tobacco.org/} (Retrieved 6 December, 2006).
descriptions to allow uniform searching, and through the American Legacy Foundation, it obtained tapes of the document images. TDO provides powerful searching across all the companies, access to high-quality images, as well as the ability to collect and annotate documents. These tools were built for document researchers, and are available to anyone with a web browser.\footnote{Tobaccodocuments.org: Tobacco Documents Online http://tobaccodocuments.org/about.php (Retrieved 6 December, 2006).}

The Legacy Tobacco Documents Library (LTDL) contains seven million documents related to advertising, manufacturing, marketing, sales, and scientific research of tobacco products. Visitors can search, view, and download these documents from this website.\footnote{The Legacy Tobacco Documents Library http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/index.html (Retrieved 6 December, 2006).}

The LTDL includes documents posted on tobacco industry web sites as of July 1999 in accordance with the Master Settlement Agreement, additional documents added to those sites since that date, and the Brown & Williamson document collections from the Tobacco Control Archives maintained by the University of California, San Francisco. New documents are added monthly as they are collected from industry websites.\footnote{The Legacy Tobacco Documents Library http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/index.html (Retrieved 6 December, 2006).}

Internal tobacco industry documents comprise the bulk of the Legacy Tobacco Documents Library. The documents were made available through litigation brought by the National Association of Attorneys General (NAAG) that resulted in the Master Settlement Agreement (1998). As a result of the MSA, the collection will continue to be updated as documents become available until June 30th, 2010.\footnote{The Legacy Tobacco Documents Library http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/index.html (Retrieved 6 December, 2006).}
Organization of this Study:

Although scholarly research has examined the history of cigarette advertising, it has not specifically addressed the role of cigarette advertising and promotion on college and university campuses. This study will provide some of the first insights into this important piece of advertising and tobacco industry history. The purpose of this study is to help provide answers to two overriding questions.

R1: How did cigarette advertising and promotion on campus endeavor to persuade students to start smoking from 1920-1963?

R2: What stopped advertisers from promoting cigarettes in campus newspapers in 1963?

This first chapter of the dissertation relates the purpose of the study and the research questions. The chapter discusses the historical perspective used for this research, the methodology that will be used, and the research materials that will be compiled to comprise the majority of the data for the study.

The second chapter of the study comprises a historical review of the topic. In addition to serving as a review of the current histories on tobacco, the chapter will also relate a general history of the tobacco industry, tobacco advertising, and anti-tobacco movements in the United States. The goal of this chapter will be to create a general historical and cultural context for the cigarette promotion that became common on college and university campuses across the United States.

The third chapter in this dissertation discusses the relationship between the tobacco industry and American universities. The history and purpose of the student newspaper on college and university campuses is of particular importance to this research. This chapter also discusses campus newspapers in general and references specific student newspapers that
set important precedents. The chapter also explains the role of the student newspaper on
campus and ethical and legal issues related to the campus or student press. In addition, the
chapter provides a brief history of *The Orange and White*, the student newspaper at the
University of Tennessee. The issue of generating funds from campus activity fees and
advertising will be of particular interest as will be national advertising sales agencies such as
College Newspaper Business Advertising Managers, Inc. (CBAM) and the National
Educational Advertising Service (NEAS). In addition, the chapter will discuss the
university’s role in conducting research relating to tobacco cultivation. The goal of this
chapter is to provide background information relating to student newspapers and the
presence of the tobacco industry on university campuses. The chapter also shows how the
tobacco industry targeted colleges and universities to reach a young audience. Chapter three
also discusses how the national advertising sales agents used student newspapers to make a
handsome profit from selling advertising space in student publications to cigarette
manufacturers.

The fourth chapter discusses the Federal Trade Commission’s involvement in the
issue of tobacco and youth. In addition to addressing the FTC, the chapter will also look at
the Tobacco Institute’s efforts to protect the interests of the tobacco industry and its youth
market. Much of the information for this chapter comes from internal documents released
from the Master Settlement Agreement. This chapter demonstrates the power of the
Tobacco Institute and the difficulties that the FTC faced when trying to regulate tobacco
advertising before the Surgeon General’s Report. The chapter ends by discussing the FTC’s
role in stopping cigarette manufacturers from printing advertisements in youth publications,
which include student newspapers.
The fifth chapter examines the actual newspaper advertisements placed in *The Orange and White*. Cigarette manufacturers became important advertisers in campus newspapers during the 1920s as cigarette smoking became socially acceptable. During the 1920s, as the habit gained acceptance among a female market, cigarette advertisements began to feature women. In addition, an increasing number of brands began to use student publications to promote their cigarettes. After the 1920s, cigarette manufacturers became major advertisers in campus papers and began to use more sophisticated advertising strategies. In addition, cigarette manufacturers began using an integrated promotional strategy that combined print and broadcast media to advertise their brands. During World War II, advertising took on a patriotic tone. The number of advertisements also was greatly reduced during the war years as the young adult population that comprised the college market moved from the college and university campus to the war fronts in Europe and the Pacific. The 1950s marked the start of the regulation of cigarette advertising. In spite of the regulation, the advertisements increased in size and frequency. However, the regulations were not strictly enforced and largely ignored by the cigarette manufacturers. Cigarette advertising remained in the student newspapers until 1963 when the industry removed the advertising because of pressure from the FTC. This chapter’s goal is to study the frequency of cigarette advertising and the strategies and tactics used to attract new smokers.

The sixth chapter discusses the findings of the study and draws meaningful conclusions from the research and demonstrates how the findings apply to the larger fields of advertising and tobacco research. The chapter also identifies specific themes frequently found in cigarette advertisements published in *The Orange and White* and relates these themes to popular marketing strategies and tactics identified in chapter five. The chapter concludes with ideas for further study.
Summary:

The relationship between cigarette addiction and tobacco youth and young adult marketing is an important facet of the smoking and public health issues that faced our society in the 20th century and continue to be a concern in the 21st century. The goal of this research is to explore key issues related to the marketing of tobacco on college campuses from the 1920s-1963. Internal documents made available by the MSA will be used to help explain why the tobacco industry decided to stop advertising in campus publications. Advertisements from a college newspaper will be used to study how the cigarette advertisers targeted the youth and young adult market.
Chapter 2: An Overview of Smoking and Tobacco Use and Promotion

Smoking must be one of the strangest habits among humans – the only creature that takes smoke into the body for pleasure. Purposefully inhaling smoke into the lungs would seem unnatural and contrary to the organs’ purpose. However, the practice is as old as civilization. Ancient Greeks, Indians, and Arabians all practiced the inhalation of various herbs and other substances for medical and ceremonial purposes.\(^{51}\) Although smoking is not new, at the turn of the 20\(^{th}\) century cigar smoking was common, cigarette smoking was seen as somewhat decadent and slightly subversive habit. Smoking was considered a male custom associated with “rough-and-ready boys, dandies, and improper women.”\(^{52}\) However, by the 1950s more than one third of U.S. women smoked.\(^{53}\) Some estimates state that by the 1950s the total population of smokers had reached nearly 70 million.\(^{54}\) This startling shift leads one to question how this habit that was once obscure could have attained such popularity.

Many factors contributed to the prevalence of cigarette smoking. In addition to the addictive nature of tobacco, industrialization and mechanization were key factors. The commercial production of cigarettes had been a cottage industry until 1881 when James A. Bonsack invented a cigarette-making machine. Then, in 1883 James Buchanan Duke, who had inherited his father’s tobacco business in Durham, North Carolina, purchased two cigarette machines. In five years time, Duke’s company was selling nearly a billion cigarettes annually, far more than any other producer.\(^{55}\) Other manufacturers soon followed in Duke’s footsteps. The cigarette industry was rapidly becoming a major force in the U.S. economy.


In addition to mass production, marketing played a key role in the spread of the habit. Until World War I, cigarette production in the United States remained relatively stable. Once the United States entered the conflict in 1917, the National Cigarette Service Committee distributed millions of free cigarettes to the troops in France. The cigarettes became such a morale booster that General Pershing demanded priority for their shipment to the front. The war solidified the habit among the American people. Between 1910 and 1919 cigarette production increased by 633 percent, from less than ten billion annually to nearly 70 billion annually.\textsuperscript{56}

Marketing was essential to the success of the cigarette. Young people were the natural target because virtually all smokers begin smoking when they are teenagers or young adults.\textsuperscript{57} After World War I, tobacco manufacturing had completed its long transition from a laid-back country craft to an aggressive commercial war on a national battlefield. In this fight, advertising was the primary weapon. At the dawn of the 1920s, advertising was repetitious, grating, and emotional. Color advertisements showing movie stars appealing to the audience to try their particular brand promised social approval to youth and young adults. Advertising that made cigarette smoking seem sensible, even healthful, stimulated more sales as medical doctors, athletes, and celebrities gladly signed testimonials. The millions spent on advertising were directed at capturing new smokers, fostering brand loyalty, and increasing brand consciousness. Effectively reaching a young audience was vital to fostering the national smoking habit.\textsuperscript{58}

**Early History of the Cigarette Industry in the U.S. and the Tobacco Opposition:**

*Early History*

The cigarette did not start out as a popular way to consume tobacco. Traditionalists and old-fashioned men smoked pipes. On the other hand, rural men and those who wanted

to be thought of as “tough guys” chewed from the plug. Americans who wanted to imitate the style of European aristocrats used dry snuff. Successful businessmen smoked Cuban cigars while poor workingmen enjoyed penny stogies. Very few American women smoked, or at least admitted to using tobacco. To be seen with a cigar or any other form of tobacco marked a woman as being eccentric, rustic, fast, loose, or advanced. Few women sought these labels a century and a quarter ago.\(^{59}\)

American men enjoyed tobacco. The initial chew, the first homemade pipe, and the cheap cigar lit behind the barn were each considered important rites of passage. Some parents might warn that smoking stunted growth and that it fouled the breath, but few outside of dedicated anti-smoking circles made any significant effort to prevent young men and boys from taking up the habit. The only question that remained was what type of tobacco should be used.\(^{60}\)

Fine artisans still fashioned snuff boxes, but the business was declining along with the use of that product. However, the chewing tobacco market was expanding. The cigar was deemed the cleanest form of leaf because its sole byproduct was ash. Elegant cigar smokers owned silver cutters, pocket cases fashioned of precious metals and leather, and humidors. Further, the ability to enjoy, judge, and collect cigars was considered as much of a social grace as the knowledge of fine wines and their proper maintenance.\(^{61}\)

However, the decade’s biggest tobacco news was the emergence of the cigarette as something more than a novelty but less than a socially acceptable habit in most parts of the nation. There is no way of knowing how many were consumed before the Civil War, since the government did not keep such statistics at the time. In 1880 half a billion cigarettes were sold in the United States, and this figure is for manufactured products alone – the roll-your-owns added approximately one billion to the total.


During the 1860s, when Phillip Morris started rolling its first cigarettes, cigarettes started to become a widely recognized form of tobacco consumption. Tobacco played an important role in the Civil War. Tobacco was supported in the South by tobacco revenues and in the North by a tax. The Civil War was also the first time a government, the Confederacy, issued tobacco rations to its army. The mingling of soldiers from the North and South aided the spread of the cigarette in the U.S. For instance, Confederate soldiers would often trade their cigarettes to Union soldiers for food and supplies.\(^\text{62}\)

By the 1880s the cigarette had a constituency of sorts. In the 1880s, it appeared to be small and marginal. For most of the 19\(^{th}\) Century, tobacco users stuck to chewing tobacco or smoking cigars or pipes. The skill needed to produce cigarettes limited the growth of the industry.\(^\text{63}\) However, those who did smoke cigarettes were mostly the poor, new immigrants, or dandies in the large eastern cities. Cigarette smoking was not acceptable among middle class men. However, some sophisticated upper-class women in large eastern cities occasionally smoked. They primarily smoked Turkish and Russian brands in somewhat the same spirit as middle-aged Americans today might make a deal for a few joints of marijuana. The purchase produced a feeling of guilt and excitement. These women smoked within the privacy of their bedrooms or parlors, often in secrecy.\(^\text{64}\)

After the Civil War, a former Confederate soldier named Washington Duke converted his family farm and turned it into a family pipe-tobacco business. However, competition from other brands, specifically the Bull Durham brands, created the need to search for a new niche. Washington Duke’s oldest son “Buck” Duke saw potential in the

---


cigarette. Though the cigarette market was tiny, the habit was gaining popularity in urban areas in England and New York.\textsuperscript{65}

In 1881 Duke returned to Durham to begin the conversion to cigarettes. He did not relish the change because, like most middle class Southerners, he considered cigarettes to be effeminate and alien. Although they were gaining popularity in the Northeast, tobacco users in the South still preferred cigars and chewing tobacco, or plug.\textsuperscript{66}

Duke believed that there were four facets of the cigarette business: (1) the growing, purchasing, and blending of tobacco, (2) the manufacture and packaging of cigarettes, (3) distribution, and (4) advertising. Duke’s primary contribution to the cigarette industry was revolutionizing how cigarettes were produced and how the product was positioned in the market. Duke had a view of cigarettes that was different from most people in the industry. Most producers thought of cigarettes as small cigars and tried to make them through a cigar-making process. Unlike the other producers, Duke considered cigarettes to be “cheap smoke” that could capture cigar smokers on the basis of price and advertising. Duke believed that cigarettes were an entirely new product, and not simply a paper cigar. Duke used the cigarette producing machine or “Emery machine” created by James Bonsack of Virginia. The machine could produce more than 200 cigarettes a minute. This was more than 40 times the number of cigarettes that the best skilled workers could roll by hand.\textsuperscript{67}

The mechanized cigarette producing process increased the volume and decreased the price of producing the product.\textsuperscript{68} When Duke turned exclusively to machine production in 1885, he quickly saturated the market in the United States because of the sharp increase in the number of cigarettes he could manufacture. Because production was no longer an issue, the primary task was selling the large amount of cigarettes he could produce to the public.\textsuperscript{69}

In addition to revolutionizing the cigarette, Duke showed his understanding of the cigarette market. Duke understood that Americans were upwardly mobile. And, it would be the same with smoking tobacco. Men might begin smoking tobacco with American cigarettes but if they did well they would graduate up to foreign brands and cigars. Therefore, the cheap cigarette had a limited future. The cigarette was destined for the role of the initiator of the young into smoking. And, Duke would keep them as customers as long as they were not wealthy enough to afford cigars. 

Duke’s ultimate goal was to dominate the entire tobacco business. First, he planned to engulf the other cigarette firms and take over all forms of tobacco production. Duke started the process by intensifying his advertising and lowering prices. Eventually, retailers earned 50 percent more profit by selling W. Duke Sons than any other competitor’s brand. Duke bought out the competition and formed the American Tobacco Company on January 31, 1890. However, the tobacco trust was short lived. The first antitrust action was brought against American Tobacco in April of 1890 and the litigation lasted until the Supreme Court dissolved the trust in May of 1911.

Cigarette smoking grew in popularity from 1880 onward. By 1890, the use of cigarette tobacco ran even with snuff. The sales of cigarettes grew into the 1890s. However, cigarette use fell from 1900-1905 and only equaled snuff sales again in 1911. Cigarettes did not reach the same level as any other tobacco form until the start of the 1920s when it surpassed cigars, pipe tobaccos, and chewing tobacco or plug. Cigarettes comprised more than half of all tobacco use by 1935.

Early Opposition to Smoking and Tobacco use:

To many, the Surgeon General’s Report in 1964 represents the beginnings of the tobacco and health controversy. However, issues relating to the side effects of tobacco have virtually always followed the industry. King James I of England actively voiced his concerns

---

about the first tobacco crops being grown in Virginia. He stated that tobacco was
“loathsome to the eye, hateful to the nose, harmful to the brain” and “dangerous to the
lungs.” One of tobacco’s earliest detractors was published in Britain in 1604, *A Counterblast
to Tobacco*. Although originally it was anonymous, the tract now receives considerable
attention because historians believe that it was created by James I, who instituted heavy taxes
on tobacco as part of a campaign against the product. In 1601, the *Calendar of State Papers
(Domestic)* published one of the first records of pathology linked to tobacco use. According to
this paper, surgeons attributed the death of a patient to smoking tobacco.

The first anti-tobacco tract was published in the U.S. in 1798 by Dr. Benjamin Rush, a signer of the
Declaration of Independence. In Rush’s *Observations upon the influence of the
Habitual use of Tobacco upon Health, Morals, and Property*, he objects to the use of tobacco on
grounds that it had disastrous effects on the stomach, the nerves, and the oral cavity. Many
tobacco users including John Quincy Adams, a connoisseur who had made the cigar
respectable, announced that they had shaken the habit with consequent improvement in
health.

During the pre-Civil War period, a group of doctors, educators, clergymen and the
great P.T. Barnum formed an alliance to fight the tobacco habit. Some antismoking literature
also addressed itself to young people. The Reverend George Trask of Boston published a
popular tract in 1852 entitled *Thoughts and Stories for American Lads; or Uncle Toby’s Anti-Tobacco
Advice to his Nephew Billy Bruce*. Likewise, the *Lancet* a British medical journal in 1856-57
featured an article entitled “The Great Tobacco Question” in which fifty doctors expressed

---
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their opinions on the topic. Doctors described nervous paralysis, loss of intellectual capacity, and vision impairment.  

The Civil War increased American cigarette consumption and attracted new smokers in the Midwest and Northeast. In response to the increase in smoking, Midwestern tobacco opponents demanded regulation. Because no major manufacturer of cigarettes existed, and because the government needed money to finance the war, Congress complied by taxing cigarettes arriving from Russia and Turkey. 

As cigarettes gained popularity at the turn of the 20th century, the anti-tobacco sentiments reignited. In 1880, cigarettes constituted one percent of tobacco intake, yet they drew regular criticism that increased in intensity as sales grew. The opposition to cigarette smoking took a variety of forms from verbal criticisms in the form of “epithets associated with death or immortality,” such as “coffin nails,” “gaspers,” and devil’s toothpicks” to more coordinated activities such as attacks from schools, pulpits, and the press. 

One of the most outspoken early tobacco opponents was Lucy Page Gaston. Born in 1860 to parents who were active in reform movements, especially abolition and temperance, Gaston could aptly discuss the evils of alcohol and the rewards of clean living as a child. While working as a teacher, Gaston would see young boys sneaking around to the back of the schoolhouse to puff on cigarettes. Invariably, these were her worst students. Gaston organized her Chicago-based campaign modeled on previous anti-alcohol crusades. Children wore pins and sang songs, carried banners, and paraded. Eventually Gaston formally organized her cause in 1903 forming the National Anti-Cigarette League. Clergymen, educators, and many businessmen applauded her efforts.

---

Gaston’s zeal was rewarded. Her campaign was effective and, as one could have predicted, it did best in the Midwest. Thanks to her hard work most large cities had clinics that smokers could go to for help if they wanted to quit. Likewise, many new products were being marketed to help tobacco users quit. For instance, the National Anti-Cigarette League introduced a mouthwash that was supposed to reduce tobacco cravings.³¹

In addition to Gaston, many other public figures opposed smoking. Boxing champion John L. Sullivan denounced cigarettes as unmanly. Henry Ford and Thomas Edison refused to hire cigarette smokers. A nation-wide “Committee to Study the Tobacco Problem” was established and attracted distinguished men in every field. Anticigarette physicians including Surgeon General Rupert Blue condemned cigarettes. In addition, the New England Life Insurance Company found that after investigating the records of policyholders during a certain period of time that 57 out of 100 nonusers of tobacco died; during the same period, 95 out of 100 cigarette smokers died. By 1909, twelve states and numerous towns created laws restricting tobacco use and/or sale. However, many of these statutes were never enforced.³²

There were some within the tobacco industry that made light of the anti-tobacco efforts. However, tobacco sales dropped significantly during the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century. Buck Duke was said to have mixed feelings about the tobacco controversy. For a while, Lucy Gaston’s crusade might have harmed American Tobacco but it almost completely eliminated its competitors. At the turn of the century, nine out of every ten packs sold carried the Duke label.

_Cigarette Promotion and Advertising 1920s and 1930s:

As soldiers returned victorious from the battlefields in Europe, R. J. Reynolds, a former member of the American Tobacco trust, was creating its first nationally marketed

cigarette, Camel Cigarettes. Just before the war, the cigarette industry developed a slightly acid blend of burley and Turkish tobaccos. This new blend allowed practiced cigarette smokers to inhale without coughing. The brand rapidly attained market dominance with an upscale smoke that delivered a new tobacco taste. In no time, George Washington Hill’s American Tobacco Company created a richer sweeter product, Lucky Strike cigarettes. Hill hired hard-sell expert Albert Lasker of the Lord & Thomas Agency to do whatever was necessary to win the cigarette war. As a result, Lucky Strike broke all previous records. Hill, urged by Lasker, jumped at the chance to reach an untapped audience – women. The Lucky Strike campaign involved several advertising innovations. Hill was concerned that women disliked the green packaging because it clashed with their clothes. To remedy the problem he hired public relations expert, Edward Bernays who promoted the color green at the season’s fashion show. Hill also used Bernays to help with the necessary social engineering that was needed to attempt to persuade women to smoke. They first set out to increase the acceptability of women smoking in public. To this end, Bernays convinced a group of ten debutantes to smoke cigarettes while strolling with their escorts in Fifth Avenue's Easter parade. The stunt was billed by Bernays as women lighting a "torch of freedom" . . . "to combat the silly prejudice that the cigarette . . . is never seen on the sidewalk." Hill also used celebrities from the entertainment world to promote the cigarettes. The new slogan, “Reach for a Lucky instead of a sweet” resonated with the weight conscious female audience.

Although the new Lucky slogan resonated with women, it did not fare as well with the candy industry. The tobacco-candy fight was a rough one. As a result, the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) became deeply entrenched in the conflict. American Tobacco appropriated $12.3 million for the battle. To accommodate the candy industry, Lucky Strike modified the slogan to “Reach for a Lucky Instead,” and ran a “future-shadow” series of advertisements featuring double-chinned and heavy-belted silhouettes behind trim figures. In spite of American Tobacco’s efforts, by 1932 the FTC banned Americans from marketing cigarettes as a weight-reducing device, even by suggestion. By establishing a connection between smoking and a slender figure, George Washington Hill and Albert Lasker, of the Lord & Thomas agency, were able to erase some of the negative stigma from cigarette smoking. In fact, they convinced many women that smoking was good for their image. American Tobacco Company spent more money advertising Lucky Strikes than anyone had ever spent to advertise a single product. Lord & Thomas used this single account to make a place among the major agencies.

As a result of the marketing campaigns targeting women, women became substantial tobacco consumers for the very first time. The new product intersected with women’s liberation. In 1919, Printer’s Ink, ever on guard for advertising offenses, warned of an insidious campaign to create female smokers. Murad and Helmar cigarette advertisements showed Western-looking women in Turkish harem costumes introducing a daring new idea by introducing a daring new exotic setting.

In spite of the success of cigarette marketing to women, the issue of women smokers remained a controversial issue. Women also found themselves unable to smoke on ships, in railroad diners, and in train station smoking rooms. However, by the mid-1920s some

---

colleges had established smoking rooms, while railroads and shipping lines relaxed their regulations.\textsuperscript{89} Advertising further fueled this cultural revolution. In 1926, the Newell-Emmett agency daringly presented a poster showing a woman perched beside a man in a romantic moonlit seaside scene saying, “Blow some my way.” These four words were shocking to many people. Yet Chesterfield persistently continued the campaign, paving the way to the immense women’s market.\textsuperscript{90} From 1920 to 1928, while the production of pipe tobacco fell by 9 percent and that of cigars by 20 percent, cigarette production increased 123 percent to 106 billion units per year.\textsuperscript{91}

During the 1930s, Lucky Strike led cigarette sales and alternated with Camel for the number one spot. During the Depression years, two new players effectively entered the market. Even though hundreds of companies were trying to enter the domestic cigarette market, only Philip Morris, a small independent producer, and Brown & Williamson, a subsidiary of British-American Tobacco Company, were successful.\textsuperscript{92} The tobacco industry was able to maintain profits through the Depression by voluntary health claims and endorsements.

Health claims during the late 1920s and 1930s varied from claims that a particular brand caused less throat irritation and coughing, to aiding digestion and improving concentration and disposition or even as a remedy for the cold and flu.\textsuperscript{93} This time period is unique because of the positive health claims that the cigarette industry made regarding health. This uniqueness is partially due to the competitive nature of the cigarette industry at the time\textsuperscript{94} and the lack of regulation. For instance, No one had ever heard of a “coughless”
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cigarette before Old Gold appeared...No rasping...No coughing...with “not a cough in the carload” and Lucky Strike's appealed to taste and health with their slogan “It’s Toasted – No Throat Irritation.”95 These health-related appeals were ultimately recognized as being far more detrimental to the industry than appeals to taste, texture and mildness because they reminded smokers about their own fears about smoking.96

**Opposition to Smoking in the 1920s and 1930s:**

Because of the popularity of cigarettes spurred by World War I and the tax revenue that cigarette sales were earning, much of the opposition died down in the 1920s and 1930s.97 In fact, throughout the first half of the 20th century doctors largely ignored any negative news about smoking. This is largely because anti-tobacco claims makers usually presented their findings in moral rather than medical terms.98

Lucy Gaston remained active in the anti-tobacco cause until her death in 1924. Her goal was to completely abolish cigarette smoking by 1925. However, the thrust of her antismoking campaigns during the early 1920s centered on preventing women from smoking. Her anti-tobacco campaign slogan was “Save the Girl.” Part of the reason for her change in focus was that she conceded that men would be smokers. The best that she felt that she could do was to help prevent women from taking up the habit.99

The Women’s Christian Temperance Union (WCTU) actively opposed the use of cigarettes among women and children. Their 1921 annual report indicated that Iowa’s anti-cigarette law had been weakened and North Dakota’s had been strengthened. The WCTU lobbied for laws prohibiting smoking at establishments where food was sold. Oregon instituted a law against smoking where food was sold and Minnesota was considering a

---

similar law. By 1927, twenty-one states had laws that prevented smoking where food was being sold. But some legislation was going the other way. In 1927 Kansas repealed a 21-year-old statute by legalizing cigarette sales.  

The Anti-Narcotics Department, a federal agency that continues to fight narcotics, also took a stand against tobacco. By 1927, the Anti-Narcotics Department reported that its chapters sponsored 6,699 anti-smoking programs, distributed 580,223 pages of anti-smoking literature, and nineteen state poster contests. In essay contests, over 27,000 anti-smoking essays were submitted.  

When advertising smoking to women became more prominent, there was a backlash. For instance, beginning in 1928, American Tobacco Company advertised smoking Luckies as an alternative to eating candy. Chocolate manufacturers feared that women were following American Tobacco’s advice and the complaints of the confectioners made news. Both the Cleveland Boy Scouts and the Sioux Falls, SD City Commission objected to billboards that depicted women smoking. Bills to restrict cigarette advertising were introduced in the states of Illinois, Michigan, and Idaho.  

In spite of the growing acceptance of the habit, the consequences of cigarette smoking became evident in the 1920s and 1930s when physicians began to notice cases of a very rare form of cancer, lung cancer, were accumulating at an alarming rate. Dr. John Harvey Kellogg, who gained much of his fame from breakfast cereal, published Tobaccoism, Or How Tobacco Kills in 1923. In this publication Kellogg claimed that nine out of ten smokers suffered from mouth and throat cancers. Another physician named Dr. Alton Ochsner stated in 1936, “All of the afflicted patients were men who smoked heavily and had smoked since World War I…I had the temerity, at that time, to postulate that the probable cause of this new epidemic was cigarette use.”

A 1932 paper in the American Journal of

---

Cancer accurately blamed the tars in cigarettes for the formation of cancer. This was the first major study to make the connection.\(^\text{104}\) In 1936 study, Drs. Aaron Arkin and David Wagner found lung cancer in 90% of their patients that were chronic smokers.\(^\text{105}\)

In January 1930, the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) passed some of its first cigarette advertising regulations. These regulations related to testimonials that Lucky Strike created that included testimonials from celebrities who did not smoke. The FTC ruled that American Tobacco Company must stop running advertising that featured the testimonies of endorsers who had never used their product. Further, American Tobacco Company was forced to identify paid testimonials. And, American Tobacco Company should no longer claim that smoking cigarettes aids in weight control.\(^\text{106}\)

**Cigarette Advertising and Promotion WWII - 1963:**

Like World War I, World War II gave cigarette smoking an enormous boost. Cigarettes were sold at military-post exchanges and ship’s stores tax-free and virtually at cost. They also were distributed free in the forward areas and were packaged in K rations.\(^\text{107}\) Tobacco producers got as much free publicity as they could want during the war. Both Winston Churchill with his cigar and Franklin D. Roosevelt smoking his cigarette helped to advertise tobacco.\(^\text{108}\) Prior to World War II, it had been socially unacceptable for women to smoke heavily. After the war it became much more widely accepted.\(^\text{109}\)

Of any industry, the cigarette business was probably the most eager to invest in television commercials. Tobacco was sponsoring prime time programming such as “Arthur Godfrey and His Friends,” “The Chesterfield Supper Club,” “Stop the Music,” and “Your Lucky Strike Theatre.” Rosser Reeves, the chairman of the Ted Bates agency, which was


responsible for the hardest of the hard sell in cigarette advertising on television during the 1950s, said that selling cigarettes was “just like wiring the slot machine to keep paying out a perpetual jackpot. My boy, it was just like printing money.”

Although cigarette smoking was a popular habit, evidence was rapidly accumulating regarding the potential health risks of smoking during the 1950s. The press reported on various epidemiological studies providing statistical links between smoking and cancer. While some physicians remained among the doubters, medical opinion began to swing toward the opinion it holds today. The sharp decline in sales that resulted panicked the industry. The number of health claims in cigarette advertisements peaked in the 1950s reaching their greatest level of intensity from 1950-55. The negative health claims used to help persuade the public often reinforced consumer fears. While these health claims might benefit the brand, they tended to harm competitors and injure the cigarette industry in general because the “less harmful than…” claim suggests that other brands are more harmful. Therefore, health claims are used primarily by upstart or struggling cigarette brands to gain a market edge on the more prominent brands. Health claims quickly declined after the 1955 FTC guidelines and, later, the 1960 FTC ban on tar and nicotine claims.

The cigarette industry responded to the health claims of the 1950s with the introduction of filtered cigarettes. Since Lorillard introduced its filter, competition in filtering power became a key marketing strategy. The advertisements for Kent’s Micronite filters

---

claimed, “Kent offers the greatest health protection in cigarette history.”116 Micronite was described as “pure, dust-free, completely harmless material that is so safe, so effective, that it is actually used to help filter the air in hospital operating rooms.” However, the Kent advertisements did not mention the fact that Micronite is made from asbestos. The campaign was launched just after researchers had linked asbestos to a host of respiratory ailments.117

Filters appealed to smokers because they appeared to offer a more healthful alternative. The new brands presented their advertising firms with a formidable challenge. Consequently, cigarette advertising embarked on what has become known as the “filter wars.”118 Rosser Reeves called this rivalry “one of the most vicious running advertising dog fights in our advertising history.”119 In response to the challenge, the industry used several approaches to sell filtered cigarettes. One is to discuss tar and nicotine yield and other explicit health matters. Filters are also advertised for what they do not do. For instance they do not impede taste. Finally, one can talk up filter quality without saying exactly what the filter achieves. For example, “Twice as many filters in the Viceroy Tip…”120 The advertisements never mentioned reducing carcinogens because the filters could not effectively eliminate them. Another problem was that when the filters were most effective; they removed a large portion of the nicotine in the smoke. As nicotine is the addictive ingredient in cigarettes, smokers were unsatisfied and left craving more. Other strategies included using stronger tobaccos and loosening the materials inside the filter tip

---
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making it less effective. However, as a result of their successful marketing, filters made up 20 percent of the market by 1955.\footnote{Steve Craig and Terry Moellinger “‘So Rich, Mild, and Fresh’: A Critical Look at TV Cigarette Commercials, 1948-1971.” \textit{Journal of Communication Inquiry} 25 (January 2001): 61.} 

Meanwhile, the non-filtered brands struggled to stop their loss of customers to filters. Their biggest selling point was that by not having filters they continued to deliver “full taste” to their customers. The unfiltered Camels were one of the best selling brands in the pre-filtered days. To avoid losing its prominence, Camel launched a campaign around the question, “Are you smoking more now, but enjoying it less?” But for most other unfiltered brands, including unfiltered Camels, it was a losing battle. Eventually the unfiltered brands had to develop filtered versions.\footnote{Steve Craig and Terry Moellinger “‘So Rich, Mild, and Fresh’: A Critical Look at TV Cigarette Commercials, 1948-1971.” \textit{Journal of Communication Inquiry} 25 (January 2001): 62.}

In addition to health related appeals, many cigarette advertisements used sex appeals. Women’s objections to sex-based advertisements and narrow social roles went largely unrecognized during the 1950s. The advertising image of women as happy homemakers had always worked, and traditionally few women had voiced the aspiration for more from life than this role could offer.\footnote{Juliann Sivulka \textit{Soap, Sex, and Cigarettes: A Cultural History of American Advertising.} (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1998) pp. 254-255.} Many cigarette advertisements reinforced views of women that seem extremely traditional or even sexist to the 21st century reader. Cigarette advertisements also used celebrities to promote their brand of cigarettes. One early advertisement featured Broadway star Patricia Morison introduced as “one whose beauty and talent carried her to stardom.” Morrison, smoking a cigarette, says “There is nothing quite like Camels. They taste so good and they are so mild.”\footnote{Juliann Sivulka \textit{Soap, Sex, and Cigarettes: A Cultural History of American Advertising.} (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1998) pp. 254-255.}

\emph{Opposition to Smoking WWII – 1963:}

Although a few doctors and scientists continued their research, the issue of smoking and health largely disappeared during World War II. The lack of research was a result of a
lack of funding and a feeling that anti-tobaccoism was unpatriotic. However, the research did not end completely. But, it often centered on ways that smokers could continue their habit. For instance, an optimistic study in 1948 found that patients with inactive forms of heart disease could continue to smoke in moderation.\textsuperscript{125} In spite of the warnings, Americans were full of enthusiasm and confidence in their smoking habits during the early 1950s.\textsuperscript{126}

By the early 1950s, however, medical studies began to demonstrate close links between smoking and ill health. Four retrospective studies were published on the smoking habits of lung cancer patients. Research connecting lung cancer with smoking was done by Ernest Wynder and Evart Graham in the Journal of the American Medical Association in 1950, by Richard Doll and Bradford Hill in the British Medical Journal in 1950 and 1952, by Wynder and Graham with Adele Croninger in Cancer Research in 1953, and Alton Ochsner in 1952, 1953, and 1954.\textsuperscript{127} In 1953 investigators at what is now the Sloan-Kettering Institute announced that they had induced cancer in mice by painting their backs with “tars” from cigarette smoke.\textsuperscript{128} This research demonstrated that smoking clearly caused cancer. This incriminating research was a cause for serious concern for the tobacco industry.\textsuperscript{129}

At first, the health research relating tobacco with an increased cancer risk remained in scientific publications. The few articles that did appear in the popular press reassured smokers. For instance, \textit{U.S. News and World Report} ran a two-page spread when Dr. Egon Lorenz of the National Cancer Institute demonstrated that smoking mice lived a normal life span. The article concluded that smoking in moderation would not cause serious health problems.\textsuperscript{130} By July 1954, when an article in \textit{Reader’s Digest} connected general exposure to

the smoking with health concerns, the general public had been made aware of the smoking-and-health issue.\footnote{Robert H. Miles \textit{Coffin Nails and Corporate Strategies.} Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, (1982) 39.}

Initially, the industry responded to the health concerns with denial and buck-passing. In 1952, entertainer and broadcaster Arthur Godfrey reassured his audience by saying, “You hear things all the time that cigarettes are harmful to you... Chesterfields won’t harm your nose, throat or accessory organs.”\footnote{David T. Courtwright ““Carry on Smoking”: Public Relations and Advertising Strategies of American and British Tobacco Companies since 1950” \textit{Business History,} 47 (July 2005) p.423.} A responsible consulting organization had vouched for it. However, industry leaders like American Tobacco Company executive Paul Hahn realized that the every-brand-for-itself campaign was doomed to failure. It would only serve to increase the public awareness of the cancer issues.\footnote{David T. Courtwright ““Carry on Smoking”: Public Relations and Advertising Strategies of American and British Tobacco Companies since 1950” \textit{Business History,} 47 (July 2005) p.423.}

In light of all of the negative publicity, it seems that it would have been difficult for cigarette manufacturers to promote their profitable product. However, because of its virtually unlimited funds, the industry was able to purchase the best publicity that money could buy. And, by doing so, entice millions of Americans to begin or continue smoking.

The tobacco industry, assisted by its public relations consultants, won the first battle of the cancer wars. The doubt raising countered, if not deferred, the health anxieties about cigarette smoking. And, the introduction of filtered cigarettes helped to convince the public that there was a healthful alternative to quitting. The tobacco industry’s efforts matched their needs perfectly. However, the evidence was beginning to mount and the industry could only argue with the research for so long. In the wake of the landmark reports by the Royal College of Physicians in 1962 and the Surgeon General’s Report in 1964, legislation to limit or ban advertising began to take effect. Likewise, counter advertising, public service
announcements, and campaigns by anti-smoking groups began to diminish the consumer base. By the mid-1970s the number of smokers began to plummet.\textsuperscript{134}

**The Tobacco Industry and Advertising Regulation:**

*The Industry and Regulations in the 1950s:*

When it became clear that the anti-smoking crusade was making progress with the public, the cigarette makers used the media to distribute a message of their own. The tobacco industry needed a united front. In December 1953 Hahn and other industry executives met in New York’s Plaza Hotel to create the Tobacco Industry Research Committee (TIRC). The purpose of TIRC was to promote the idea that the case against smoking had not been proven.\textsuperscript{135}

The TIRC was endowed by a self-imposed one cent per 4,000 cigarette tax, plus additional funding as needed. The TIRC hired Hill and Knowlton, a leading public relations firm with headquarters in the Empire State Building, to direct daily operations. It ran full-page advertisements that denied the harms of smoking and made its own statements about tobacco and health to cast doubt upon the harms of smoking.\textsuperscript{136} *Business Week* called Hill and Knowlton’s work “one of PR’s best finger-in-the-dike jobs” ever.\textsuperscript{137}

Both health professionals and the tobacco industry depended on the news media to provide information and opinions about cigarette smoking. The information on cigarettes consisted of two basic messages, “smoking is a health hazard” and “there is conflicting scientific evidence about smoking.” However, the tobacco industry had an advantage in the battle for media coverage because of their expert advertising and public relations.
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practitioners. Although the tobacco industry could not prevent the media coverage of the medical reports about the harms of smoking, they could insist that there were two sides to the story. By insisting that two sides of the tobacco story needed public attention, Hill & Knowlton convinced journalists to include their side of the story in their coverage of tobacco related issues. 

The tobacco industry’s perspectives and interests were also nurtured and protected by the Tobacco Institute, a nonprofit organization created by the tobacco industry and Hill and Knowlton in 1958. Its membership consisted of the major U.S. manufacturers of cigarettes, smoking and chewing tobacco, and snuff: The Bloch Brothers Tobacco Company, Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corporation, Conwood Corporation, G.A. Georgopulo & Company, Helme Products, Larus & Brother Company, Liggett & Myers, Lorillard, Phillip Morris Incorporated, R. J. Reynolds Industries, Scotten-Dillion Company, and United States Tobacco Company. The Institute received financial support from the contributions from the large tobacco firms according to their share of the market. The Institute promoted pro-tobacco medical research, attempted to discredit anti-smoking publicity, published information on the historical role of tobacco, its place in the national economy, the industry itself, and the public’s use of tobacco products.

In 1955, two years after the Sloan-Kettering report linking smoking to cancer, the FTC imposed the first advertising guidelines. In mid-September 1954, the FTC announced its intention to issue a set of Cigarette Advertising Guides and circulated a set of those guides for industry comment. After about one year of comment with the tobacco industry, the FTC formally announced the guides on September 22, 1955. These guides signified the FTC’s intention to seek injunctions against any advertising that:

---


1. made references to “either the presence or absence of any physical effect of smoking”;
2. represented that a cigarette brand “contained less nicotine, tars, acids, resins, or other substances” than other brands unless the claim and its significance could be supported by reputable scientific proof;
3. made references to smoking on the “(a) nose, throat, larynx, or other parts of the respiratory tract, (b) digestive system, (c) nerves, (d) any other part of the body, or (e) energy”; or
4. represented “medical approval of cigarette smoking.”

The Public Health Service’s Surgeon General Leroy F. Barney M.D. issued his first statement on the subject of tobacco in the Journal of the American Medical Association in November of 1959. Then, in June of 1961, the American Heart Association, the American Cancer Society, and the National Tuberculosis and Respiratory Disease Association requested that a commission be created “to consider the responsibilities of government, of business and voluntary agencies relative to the health hazards of cigarette smoking and to recommend a solution to this health problem that would protect the public and would interfere least with the happiness of individuals.”

The 1960s and the Surgeon General’s Report:

On June 7, 1962, U.S. Surgeon General Luther Terry announced the creation of an Advisory Committee on Smoking and Health. With the approval of President John F. Kennedy, the Surgeon General established an “expert committee to undertake a comprehensive review of all data on smoking and health.” The members of the committee were respected scientists who had no previous opinions on the subject of cigarette smoking and health. Each of the members was approved for the appointment by the tobacco

industry, the American Medical Association, and several other national health agencies. Cigarette smokers comprised half of the committee members.¹⁴⁵

Also during June of 1962, the Tobacco Institute released a statement announcing that the tobacco industry had always taken the stance that “smoking is a custom for adults.” Following that position, a number of companies decided to cease advertising in college publications and engaging in other campus endorsements.¹⁴⁶ The cigarette industry had become the biggest single source of revenue for many college newspapers. For years, most companies had been conducting campaigns to convince university students to smoke their specific brands, both by purchasing advertising in college publications and through the activities of paid “campus representatives” who gave away sample packs.¹⁴⁷

The Institute’s declaration that cigarette smoking was “a custom for adults” and, consequently, not one for non-adults, did have one result that applied on a broader basis than just the college level. In the fall of 1963, the American Tobacco Company began an extensive campaign for Lucky Strike cigarettes that contained the statement that “smoking is a pleasure that is meant for adults.” However, the statement was followed by the sentence, “Lucky Strike Separates the Men from the Boys…but not from the Girls.” Advertising creatives, apparently setting out to illustrate the theme that cigarettes are not for boys, achieved the opposite by illustrating that smoking Lucky Strike turns boys into men.¹⁴⁸

Then on January 11, 1964, after 15 months of intensive study, the Advisory Committee to the Surgeon General released its monumental statement that changed the tobacco industry forever. Its two most important findings were that cigarette smoking was a

health hazard of great enough importance to merit immediate action and that cigarette smoking is causally related to lung cancer.\textsuperscript{149} According to the American Cancer Society, “The report produced shock waves, there was an immediate public reaction, and a sharp, albeit short-lived, drop in cigarette sales.”\textsuperscript{150}

The Surgeon General’s Report and the Advertising Industry:

After the Surgeon General’s Report was issued, the New Yorker and other magazines banned cigarette advertising. Advertising executive David Ogilvy, whose brother died of lung cancer after a lifetime of heavy cigarette smoking, and William Bernbach announced that their agencies would no longer accept cigarette accounts. Emerson Foote resigned as chairman of McCann-Erickson in protest against its continued handling of cigarettes. Foote had been active in the American Cancer Society since 1945. CBS told its producers to minimize smoking in network shows, and Frank Stanton, the president of CBS, urged the network to prohibit cigarette commercials.

Because of the public pressure, the tobacco industry made a few concessions. It adopted an advertising code in 1964 that stopped pitches aimed at young people and outlawed claims that smoking would improve health, ease tensions, or enhance sexual success. Simultaneously, the tobacco industry, the third largest advertiser on network television, continued to increase its television advertising budgets, to a total of over $200 million.\textsuperscript{151}

In addition to the large television budgets, the tobacco industry was dispensing millions of dollars for research designed to show the harmlessness of smoking. Tobacco lobbyists and congressmen tried to defeat or cripple any extension of federal regulation. However, the cigarette industry was more skepticism from the advertising industry. In


addition to refusing to take cigarette accounts, many creatives were moonlighting for the American Society and producing anti-smoking materials. However, a few holdouts remained. Mary Wells Lawrence believed that if a product can be legally sold, the company should have the right to advertise it. Her creative work for the Benson & Hedges cigarettes’ advertising campaigns sent her agency flying. She opposed the idea of a broadcasting ban, protesting that it would be un-American.152

The historic findings of the Surgeon General’s Advisory Committee also served as a catalyst for numerous industry guidelines. In 1965, for example, the Trade Regulation Rules on Cigarette Labeling and Advertising became effective, in 1967 the Federal Communications Commission (FTC) entered the smoking-and-health controversy through the application of the “Fairness Doctrine” in broadcasting and radio, and in 1970 the Federal Trade Commission persuaded Congress to pass the Public Health Cigarette Smoking Act that banned cigarette advertising from radio and television and required unequivocal warning labels on cigarette packages. As a result of the 1970 legislation, the tobacco industry volunteered to publish nicotine, tar levels, and health warnings in all advertisements.153

Although it is difficult to measure the influence of advertising and public relations on the public’s beliefs and behaviors related to cigarette smoking directly, many studies suggest a correlation. In 1957, the tobacco industry’s research showed that two thirds of audience believed that the U.S. government had not done a sufficient job of warning the public about the harms of smoking. And, they believed that cigarette manufacturers were not to blame. Among adults, the belief that smoking caused lung cancer rose from 41 percent in 1954 to 50 percent in 1957. However, the numbers decreased to 44 percent by 1958. The year

following the Surgeon General’s Report, the total leaped to 66 percent. Since that time, the number of smokers has generally declined. 154

Summary:

Cigarette producers have long claimed that their marketing and advertising efforts endeavor only to convince smokers to switch brands. However, advertising has proven to be an effective method for replenishing the ranks of smokers. For instance, estimates from the World Health Organization state that nearly 3.5 million people die each year as a result of smoking. In spite of the industry’s claims to the contrary, the cigarette industry’s primary goal was winning new smokers years ago. 155 In fact, Duke set his sights on winning a young from the very beginning. According to a 1950s article in the U.S. Tobacco Journal, “A massive potential exists among women and young adults, cigarette industry leaders agreed, acknowledging that recruitment of these millions of prospective smokers comprises the major objective for the immediate future and on a long term basis as well.” 156

Although the tobacco industry is a very heavily researched industry and a great deal of research relates to tobacco marketing and promotion, no history exists that focuses on the most blatant targeting of youth and young adults in American history. Using college publications to target students is evidence that supports the argument that the tobacco industry considered its product to be a product that appealed to the student market.

Chapter Three: The Tobacco Industry and the American University

Tobacco and University Life:

Tobacco has had a long relationship with the university and intellectualism in general. Both pipes and cigarettes have been associated with the intellectual elite. However, what is less well known is the influence the tobacco industry had on university campuses through the employment of campus representatives, contests, and advertising in student newspapers. In addition to its marketing efforts on campus, university professors and researchers were improving the tobacco crop through the establishment of tobacco research stations. Therefore, the tobacco industry and the university had what some might call a symbiotic relationship. And, the most visible manifestation of this relationship is seen in the prevalence of tobacco advertising on university campuses.

Opposition to Smoking on College and University Campuses:

Smoking on college and university campuses was becoming increasingly prevalent starting in the late 1920s. The idea that men smoked in higher education had been accepted for years. Pipes, specifically, were associated with intellectualism. And, the fact that a growing number of women were smoking was attracting national attention. From the turn of the century to the early 1920s, it was taboo for women to smoke in public places. Smoking on college campuses was an especially hot topic because the majority of women attending college were being trained in the field of education. The public strongly disapproved of the prospect of elementary school teachers who smoked. Therefore, many colleges and universities forbade female students to smoke. However, by the 1930s, the issue had been settled in the minds of most people. Like it or not, women smoked in the institutions of higher learning.\textsuperscript{157}

In 1919 Vassar College, in Poughkeepsie, New York, went on record as being opposed to women smoking. The Students' Association voted: "No Vassar student shall

smoke while under the jurisdiction of the college, this rule to be enforced under the honor system." However, the rule was changed in 1925 "to lay responsibility on the individual permitting her to smoke inconspicuously."158 Smoking was prohibited in dormitories and other college buildings. Burgess Johnson, a professor in the English department and director of publicity, stated, "[The college] voted against the proposition; I am told. I have not heard of the students smoking and the students have never asked permission to smoke."159

In December of 1921 the University of Chicago president Harry Pratt Judson banned smoking in women’s dormitories. Accustomed to making their own rules, the dormitory women suddenly were confronted with a notice from the housemothers against the cigarette. No explanation was officially offered, but rumor had it that the dean of women and others on campus protested against what was thought to be excessive smoking by female students.160

The New York Times also reported on smoking policies at Radcliffe and Smith.161 It was front-page news that M.I.T. allowed young women to smoke at dances. Goucher College prohibited students from smoking both on campus and at public places in Baltimore. A study at Bryn Mar showed that less than half of its female students smoked. Bryn Mar’s self-government association petitioned the college president for a smoking room and the president consented and repealed the previous smoking ban.162 The New York Times editorially endorsed the Bryn Mar decision in condescending tones. The Times said that by allowing cigarettes in certain places, “what once was a feat of defiance becomes rather a bore…”163

163 New York Times, November 24, 1925 p.1 and November 25, 1925 p. 20
By 1925, one third of the women at The Ohio State University said that they smoked at least on occasion. And, in 1924, a student leader at Rhode Island State claimed, “practically all girls smoke.” The student newspaper at the University of Illinois covered the issue of women smoking often in 1924 and made it clear that progressive students felt that it was perfectly acceptable for students to smoke.\(^{164}\)

Late in 1929, George W. Stephens, the Dean at Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri, reiterated a long-standing faculty decision that smoking by female students was not permitted at Washington University. This ruling included all university related social functions. In 1930, a report from Lewisburg, Pennsylvania, stated that 44 out of the 400 women attending Bucknell University were prevented from walking on campus and having dates for the next six months as a result of their admissions that they smoked in their rooms. A self-governing student organization assigned the penalty. Likewise, Charles McKenny, president of Michigan State Normal College in Ypsilanti, told a group of women in 1931 that no woman known to smoke in public places would be allowed to graduate. The reasoning behind McKenny’s statement was that he believed that the people of Michigan would not be likely to hire a schoolteacher who smoked.

However, some schools denied any smoking problems among their female students. James M. Kierman, the president of New York City's Hunter College, maintained that, “Smoking hasn’t much of a grip on our girls yet.” He also continued by mentioning that the school paper was accepting money from tobacco but he didn’t expect that it would influence the female students’ smoking habits. However, the college eventually set up a smoking room for its female students. Many other campuses followed by restricting smoking on campus based on gender.\(^{165}\)

As late as November of 1933, certain schools prohibited cigarette advertising that featured women. For instance, in a letter to the R.J. Reynolds advertising department, the


Arkansas State Teacher’s College Echo, San Jose State Teacher’s College College Times, Drake University Times-Delphic, Holy Cross Tomahawk, and the Tennessee Polytechnic Institute Tech Oracle were listed as schools that could not accept cigarette advertising featuring women.  

Although women were gradually gaining permission to smoke on campus, many were agitated by the idea of women smoking outside. As late as 1937 a market research firm found that 95 percent of male smokers smoked in the street but only 28 percent thought that it was right for women to do likewise. Because women felt conspicuous smoking outside, they started smoking inside in places where men had never smoked. For instance, they smoked inside of railroad diners, retail stores, and art galleries. Because of the taboo, colleges and universities established smoking rooms in dormitories. For instance, Smith College announced that smoking was restricted to two fireproof rooms.

By 1937, bans on smoking on campus were the exception rather than the rule. More and more women smoked in public in the United States in general during this period of time. Between 1918 and 1928, American tobacco sales increased fourfold. In 1900 cigarette consumption, as part of the tobacco industry as a whole, was just two percent. By 1930 cigarettes accounted for 40 percent of tobacco consumption. Much of that increase was due to the dramatic change in the image of the cigarette as more men switched to cigarette smoking from other forms of tobacco use and more women began to smoke.

Opposition to smoking on college campuses disappeared during the 1940s. One reason for this is the fact that the tobacco industry shifted the front lines of its marketing campaign to the armed forces due to the war effort. A second reason is that as an American product, cigarette smoking was considered to be a patriotic habit.

Unlike the 1920s and 1930s, during the 1950s and 1960s cigarettes attained the full acceptance of the college and university community. Young college men and women were both given as much liberty as possible to smoke on campus. And, the tobacco industry was given complete freedom to promote its product.

For instance, among New York State’s many colleges and universities, Cortland State Teachers College was distinguished for its training program for physical education teachers. In 1961 the Cortland Alpha Delta Delta sorority won first-place in a contest sponsored by Phillip Morris. For engineering the consumption of 1,520,000 Phillip Morris cigarettes and redeeming the empty packages, the young women of Alpha Delta Delta were awarded a magnificent high-fidelity phonograph.  

Although winning the Phillip Morris prize was an accomplishment, the personal price for the women of Alpha Delta was high. As the deadline for cigarette package collection drew near, the sorority house was immersed with a crisis psychology. The continued smoking of Phillip Morris brands at a breathless pace became a badge of loyalty. One sorority member was compelled to abandon her relatively mild filtered cigarette for the non-filtered Phillip Morris. The reluctant sorority sister who dared to venture into the open without smoking a Phillip Morris cigarette risked displeasure or even ostracism.

But, the Alpha Delta Delta sorority won its new hi-fidelity phonograph. And, Phillip Morris won the loyalty and gratitude of future physical education teachers whose enthusiasm for teaching the hazards of cigarette smoking might be significantly reduced.

Similarly, a Columbia University student was constructing a replica of the United Nations headquarters from six thousand Marlboro and Parliament boxes. For the collegiate

poets, Liggett and Myers held out the lure of eight British Sprite sports cars to be awarded to the best limerick, plus the bottom panels from five Chesterfield, L&M or Oasis packages. And, to the sports-minded students, Brown and Williamson presented cash prizes to those who successfully predicted the outcome of selected football games. The cash prizes ranged from ten to 100 dollars.\textsuperscript{172}

The prevalence of college contests was a mere symptom of the umbrella spread by the cigarette companies over every conceivable variety of campus activity. Campus newspapers abounded with cigarette advertisements tailored to their collegiate audience. Tobacco companies typically contributed a staggering 40 percent of all national advertising placed in college newspapers. The collegian that developed a taste for the irreverent humor of Max Shulman could find him selling the virtues of Marlboros in nearly every college publication. Meanwhile, American Tobacco Companies copywriters assured undergraduates that the “Important things in college life stay the same. Parties. Girls. Luckies.” Some advertisements were even more obvious in their approach. Some typical slogans included, “Luckies - the cigarette to start with” and “More college students smoke Luckies – than any other regular cigarette.”\textsuperscript{173}

Brown and Williamson had at least seventeen salesmen engaging their energies as Viceroy, Kool and Raleigh Santa Clauses at various colleges. Likewise, Phillip Morris selected worthy students on 166 college campuses as “campus representatives,” paying each $50 a month to spread the good cheer and complimentary Marlboros. No fraternity party, political rally, or tea for international students escaped the presence of the Phillip Morris representatives.\textsuperscript{174}

It is possible that after the contests were won, the samples consumed, and the advertising messages burned into the memory of the nation’s undergraduates, one or another uncooperative student still declined to smoke. But, the imaginative R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company established a program with the collegiate-sounding name “The Line-Backer” system. Reynolds recruited college public information officers to ensure that Camels and other company brands advertised in the football programs at many colleges and universities could be seen, admired and purchased in every possible location at the college. By promoting the Camel brand, the public information officials earned the right to participate in their own contests with foreign cars being the reward for soliciting students.\footnote{Maureen Neuberger Smoke Screen: Tobacco and the Public Welfare (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1963) p. 48.}

\textbf{Student Publications:}

\textit{The Development of the Campus Press in the United States:}

Student publications are a long-established feature of college and university life. Established early, likely because of their close relationship with an academic subject, they have persisted in somewhat changing form until the present. Of all student publications, the school newspaper is the most responsive to students needs and expresses their opinions the most clearly. Although the newspaper is more transitory than the yearbook or the handbook, it normally deals with more important issues. Student newspapers are vital because they contribute to students’ personal development and enhance school life.

In 1799 the first student newspaper was established at Dartmouth College.\footnote{“About The Dartmouth: Past and Present” The Dartmouth Online http://www.thedartmouth.com/aboutus.php [Retrieved November 11, 2006].} \textit{The Dartmouth} was a weekly paper.\footnote{Julius Duscha & Thomas Fischer The Campus Press: Freedom and Responsibility. (Washington D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1973) p. 9.} Established January 28, 1878, the \textit{Yale Daily News} is the nation’s first college daily newspaper. (Usually, a daily student paper is distributed Monday through Friday during the academic year, with no publications during exam or vacation...
weeks). And, it is still a flourishing paper. The News is circulated during the academic year and serves Yale University community in New Haven, CT.\textsuperscript{178} Ten years later, in 1883, the Harvard Crimson, originally founded in 1856 as a weekly paper named The Magenta, also became a daily paper.\textsuperscript{179} Dozens of college newspapers existed by the turn of century in a movement that popularized the college press. These publications filled their four to six pages with “news concerning undergraduates and alumni, furnishing persuasive editorials on local affairs, and giving a truthful bulletin of the day’s doings sensibly and in small space.”\textsuperscript{180}

By the late 19\textsuperscript{th} Century the majority of American universities and colleges had at least a weekly newspaper, and many already had dailies. By 1912 there were 400 campus periodicals listed in advertisers annuals.\textsuperscript{181} However, the majority of schools did not begin to publish newspapers until after World War I. Thirty-one colleges and universities in the United States published daily newspapers in 1923. And, by 1926, newspapers alone numbered 400 and circulations ranged from 500 to 5,000. The Daily Illini was an example of the latter. The newspaper served a community of 30,000 people as the only morning daily. The paper was printed at a university-owned plant valued at $100,000.\textsuperscript{182} In 1929, McNeil stated that there were at least four hundred student papers being published at least twice a week. Of this number, 32 were college dailies ranging in size from four to 32 pages.\textsuperscript{183} School and Society in 1929 summarized the collegiate press as follows:

Today there are thirty-two college daily newspapers in the country, about half of which use the telegraph service of some nationally known news-gathering organization…They range in size from four to thirty-two pages…

\textsuperscript{178}“About the Yale Daily News” YaleDailyNews.com \url{http://www.yaledailynews.com/About.aspx} [Retrieved November 11, 2006].
\textsuperscript{179}“About the Harvard Crimson” The Harvard Crimson: Online Edition \url{http://www.thecrimson.com/info/about.aspx} [Retrieved November 11, 2006].
As was to be expected, the college newspaper has taken the daily newspaper at its model and has written its news stories, its headlines, its editorial, and has adapted its makeup to that of the regular dailies.

In an endeavor to find out to what extent staff members receive compensation, a survey was made and answers received from 230 papers. Academic credit for work on the staff is the exception rather than the rule, according to the reports received for only six dailies, eight semi-weeklies, and forty-eight weeklies reported staff members receiving classroom credit.

When it comes to the question of receiving actual money for work on the staff, either business or editorial, it appears to be the rule that at least the editor-in-chief, while seven divide profits among members of the entire board... The amounts vary from $100 to $800 a year for editors of dailies.\(^{184}\)

The first intercollegiate newspaper was created in 1933 among four institutions, Mt. Holyoke, Amherst, Smith, and Massachusetts State College.\(^{185}\) The first edition included four pages of news and sold for five cents per copy. News was carried in a light style, which was reflected in its headlines, “Smith Has Become Sandwich Conscious” and “Sprinkler System Startles Holyoke.”\(^{186}\) In 1940, *The Minnesota Daily* also achieved a first in the realm of the collegiate press. *The Minnesota Daily* experimented with tabloid journalism much to the dismay of many who complained of the smaller page size. However, the student body voted to keep the unique tabloid format.\(^{187}\)

As the popularity of higher education grew in the United States during the 20\(^{th}\) century so did the number, size, and frequency of issue of campus newspapers. By 1970, there were more than 1200 college and university newspapers, and many of them were published daily.\(^{188}\)


Campus newspapers are a big business. By 1970 more than six million copies were printed every week. Student newspapers are usually partially supported by student-activity fees and distributed to all students. The Intercollegiate Press Association, founded in 1886, was the sole nation-wide trade association for student newspapers until 1963 when U.S. Student Press Association was created. In addition to constituting a large number of newspapers, the campus press also represents an important advertising medium. National advertisers wanting to reach a student audience relied heavily on student newspapers.\(^{189}\)

The first college and university newspapers usually were independent publications that depended on advertising and circulation for revenue. These early papers were small, had small staffs, and as a result did not need much money to survive. As public institutions of higher learning were founded and grew into large enterprises, the funding of student newspapers began to change. The campus publications began to rely more and more on college and university funds and student fees.

Because of the use of university and student funds, colleges and universities created publications boards to oversee the campus papers. Publications boards generally were comprised of both faculty and students. Usually, the student members were drawn from the publication editors. However, faculty and staff held most of the seats on the publication boards. Board duties ranged from picking student editors to trying to mediate disputes between administration and the newspaper.\(^{190}\)

In some cases, the student newspaper has been responsible to student government rather than publications boards. In such situations one problem was the amount of control the student governing board wanted to exert over the student newspapers. Sometimes the


student board directly imposed its political perspective on the newspaper. Sometimes journalism departments or schools administered student newspapers as laboratories or workshops. In this situation, the newspaper was produced under the direct supervision of the faculty.¹⁹¹

By the 1960s, nearly 1200 campus papers were governed at least in part by college or university administration. Most of these student newspapers received funding from student-activity fees or through direct appropriation of university funds. These financial ties with the institution made the colleges or universities the newspaper publishers.¹⁹²

The official recognition and support offered by the various colleges and universities involves at the same time certain obligations. By informing its readers on matters of interest and importance to members of the college community, the student newspaper plays an important role, particularly in creating a sense of “community” within the students and the college as a whole. It is also useful to the faculty and administration as a sounding board of student attitudes.¹⁹³

With such physical and financial arrangements, it was not a surprise that there was disagreement and confusion over the role of the campus newspaper. For instance, there was a great deal of debate about whether the newspaper was a student publication or if it was an official publication of the college or university. And, given the controversy, there was disagreement about who was ultimately responsible for the contents of the paper, the students or the administrators.

¹⁹³ Kenneth Stowe Devol Major Areas of Conflict in the Control of College and University Student Daily Newspapers in the United States (Los Angeles, CA: University of Southern California, 1965) p.47.
Often, the administrators did not elucidate the situation. Administrators either tried to back away from responsibility for the student paper or else they tried to block the appointment of editors that they perceived to be hostile to what administrators believed to be the institution’s best interest.\textsuperscript{194}

In addition, the campus newspaper usually enjoys a monopolistic position on campus. While this alone is not unique in the publishing if a community newspaper, the importance of monopolistic status is the accompanying subsidy that enables the undergraduate publication to publish daily in large institutions.\textsuperscript{195}

\textit{Controversies over the Student Press:}

The student press was involved in numerous controversies during the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. For instance, during the 1930s student newspapers were involved in controversies such as the compulsory Reserve Officer Training (ROTC) programs on campuses and other anti-military and anti-war activities of the time. Another volatile campus issue during the 1930s was the presence of Communist organizations on college campuses. However, during the 1950s the campus press was unusually silent. This silence reflected the general mood of the time. However this silence was shattered by the civil rights movement of the early 1960s and then by student opposition to the Vietnam War.\textsuperscript{196}

However, Vietnam War or the civil rights movement in the 1960s did not cause most of the problems. Instead, the language and the changing mores, including vigorous advocacy and editorial treatment of the news, were at the root of most of the problems. For instance, Pennsylvania State Rep. Russell J. LaMarca said that he would withhold funding for the


\textsuperscript{195} Kenneth Stowe Devol \textit{Major Areas of Conflict in the Control of College and University Student Daily Newspapers in the United States} Los Angeles, CA: University of Southern California: The Graduate School University Press, 1965) p.47.

University of Pittsburgh if any state funds were used to finance the “obscenities and vulgarities” that he found in student publications. He stated, “I don’t feel like sending $36 million to a university that doesn’t know what good taste is and doesn’t have the guts to inform its students what good taste is.”¹⁹⁷ Not only were state legislators discontented with the new boldness of language found in student newspapers; but so were the members of boards of trustees and regents, university presidents, parents, faculty, alumni and editors of general circulation newspapers. However, the language used by college newspapers in the 1960s that caused so much trouble is now common in newspapers and magazines.¹⁹⁸

**What is expected from the Campus Newspaper?**

Almost every educational institution has a newspaper. Newspapers resemble the professional press in that they seek to serve a definite group of people with news, opinions, and entertainment. Some campus papers are barely more than a bulletin while others cover local and national news.¹⁹⁹ Further, a college newspaper is a specific publication whose policies, philosophy, ethics, and articles are distinct from those of any other publication. It is an instrument that has a particular and important place in an educational institution. In many ways, the college paper expresses the policies and purposes of the institution, and reflects the effect of the educational process upon its students.²⁰⁰ In addition to educating students in the newspaper industry, the objectives of the paper also include helping the student and the

---


college or university understand each other and promoting a greater desire to participate in student activities.\textsuperscript{201}

One of the basic problems for the student press during turbulent times, like the 1930s, 1940s, and 1960s, is that its various constituents perceive its role differently. For instance, university administrators and members of the boards of trustees and regents generally believe that the campus paper is an arm of the institution that should reflect the members’ values of society and institution. These administrators want the newspapers to report administrative decisions and policies accurately and fairly. Sometimes this means that the expectation is that the student newspaper will speak favorably about the university administration.\textsuperscript{202} The student editors and reporters tended to view themselves as following in the honorable footsteps of the great journalistic crusaders and trust that reporting the news in such a spirit will not always find the trustees and administrators in the right.\textsuperscript{203}

The students for whom the newspapers are published turned to the paper for a variety of reasons ranging from an interest in campus issues to current events. Likewise, both students and faculty often saw the paper as a bulletin board for events that lists routine but important meetings that relate to campus life. The faculty and staff of a college or university looked to the newspaper for news that might influence their current jobs, future employment, or working conditions. Faculty members in journalism departments often saw the newspaper as a tool for training students for their future careers in the field of

journalism. Critics of the university, both on and off campus believed that the newspaper was a source of information that could help them fuel their attacks on the institution.\footnote{204 Julius Duscha & Thomas Fischer *The Campus Press: Freedom and Responsibility.* (Washington D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1973) p.12.}

**Differences and Similarities Between the General Press and the Campus Press:**

Like the general press, the student paper serves a fairly well defined audience that includes students, faculty, staff and administration as well as the surrounding campus community. A general circulation paper has an established distribution area that usually encompasses a town or metropolitan area. However, some newspapers have a large national or regional audience. Although the audience of the campus press is not as diverse as the general press, it is far from homogeneous. In addition to students, the readers of the student newspapers might also include activists, university sports fans, and editors and reporters for general circulation newspapers. Both general circulation and campus newspapers depend on advertising for a significant portion of their revenue.\footnote{205 Julius Duscha & Thomas Fischer *The Campus Press: Freedom and Responsibility.* (Washington D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1973) p.12.}

However, a number of important differences also exist between campus and general circulation newspapers. The size and circulation of a campus newspaper will never be as large as a general circulation paper in a metropolitan area. Likewise, the student community differs from the general population. While general circulation papers receive the vast majority of their income from advertising, campus papers are financed by advertising and by funds from the college or university that they serve. Another important distinction is that students who are usually much less experienced than the professional journalists that work at a general circulation papers produce college and university newspapers.\footnote{206 Julius Duscha & Thomas Fischer *The Campus Press: Freedom and Responsibility.* (Washington D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1973) p.13.}
Further, the creation of a student newspaper differs from that of a general circulation paper in a variety of ways. The student newspaper differs from the general press because there are longer lapses between the writing and the printing of the paper. During the 1930s, the lapses could be up to 24 hours on a college daily and three to four days on some weekly papers. Another key difference was that students usually held a particular staff position for a year, a semester, or a term. No sooner did one staff become competent than its term ended and another staff took over.²⁰⁷

Because universities were, in effect, requiring every student to subscribe, they assumed some responsibility for the newspaper’s quality. Universities could not force students to purchase daily an inaccurate or inadequate bulletin of essential campus announcements nor should they force students to purchase an advertising handbill or dodger. The editors, seeking financial support, agreed in effect to publish all official announcements in an accurate and timely fashion. They also agreed that there should be a larger amount of reading material than advertising. The students recognized this obligation and concluded that the advertising space should never occupy more than one third of the newspaper’s total area.²⁰⁸

**Funding the Campus Newspaper:**

*Financing of Student Publications:*

During the 1950s and 1960s, some student newspapers were financially secure. For example, *The Cornell University Sun* showed a sizable profit each year. The student newspaper at DePauw was entirely self-supporting, even to owning its own building on campus.

Students are charged with full responsibility for the financial and editorial operations of the paper and it receives no financial support from the school budget.

The financing of student publications presents a perpetual problem. Campus or university papers can be financed by subscription sales, by subsidy, or by advertising. In decades past it was believed that student newspapers should only require subsidies to get started. Eventually, papers need to be self-supporting. However, funding from subscriptions or student fees is seldom enough to fund the newspaper. Therefore, the question of advertising in student newspapers has always been an important one. Often, the business aspect of the newspaper that is necessary to make the publication financially sound runs against its ethical responsibilities to its audience.209

The most remunerative advertisements are normally those that encourage the use of products disapproved by college or university authority. For instance, the stand taken by the Daily Orange at Syracuse University in regard to cigarette advertising is particularly poignant. In the Syracuse situation, the faculty and the staff were willing to accept financial difficulty rather than accept advertising that was contrary to the university’s principles. The Daily Orange was one of the first daily collegiate newspapers not to carry tobacco advertising.210

The Daily Orange had greater freedom than the majority of undergraduate newspapers of the time. When it decided to reject tobacco advertising in 1932, the Daily Orange was thirty years old. In 1921 the student editors and managers of the newspaper found themselves in financial difficulty and appealed to the student body as a whole. In a mass meeting, the student body passed a resolution that every student should be compelled to subscribe to the paper. However, there was no authority behind their action and it was not enforced. A year

later the students appealed to the administration, which agreed to assume financial responsibility for the paper and allotted a student fee that paid for the newspaper.211

Syracuse University’s attitude on tobacco advertising was a logical outcome. The tobacco industry, specifically the cigarette manufacturers, carried on a skillful and vigorous propaganda, which had certain definite characteristics in the eyes of the university administration. Its goal was to create an appetite instead of creating a demand. In addition, the advertisements demanded large spaces for pictorial display as well as letter-press.212

Opening the pages of Syracuse University’s Daily Orange to such tobacco displays would make it possible for the student advertising manager to fill the entire area allotted for advertising with cigarette ads. This would essentially eliminate the local merchants from advertising in the newspaper. If the paper were made larger to accommodate both local businesses and tobacco ads, it would be necessary to change the one-third allotment for advertising space.213

In addition to the Daily Orange, Blair Academy, a private college in Blairstown, New Jersey also did not carry cigarette advertising. The Blair Academy Breeze did not accept any cigarette advertising because of a faculty rule prohibiting such advertising.214

Because of the strong opposition to smoking on some university campuses, the campus newspaper’s tobacco advertising “would be daily saturating the campus with skillfully prepared propaganda in direct opposition to the athletic and physical education departments’ efforts to keep smoking on campus to a minimum.” In addition, Syracuse

University urged women not to smoke by telling them to “keep kissable” and meditate upon “nature in the raw.”\textsuperscript{215} Representatives of the tobacco industry were offended by Syracuse University’s stand against tobacco telling them that they belonged with the “ichthyosaurus,” the “dodo” and the “great auk.”\textsuperscript{216}

University policy was not the only factor preventing cigarette advertising in college and university newspapers. Some cigarette manufacturers chose not to advertise in particular newspapers because of high inch rates. For instance, R.J. Reynolds did not advertise in the following newspapers during the 1930s because of high rates: the Loyola College \textit{Greyhound}, the Millsaps College \textit{Purple \& White}, the Woodberry Forrest \textit{Oracle}, the Lake Forest \textit{Stentor}, the Upsala College \textit{Gazette}, the Union College \textit{Cardinal \& Cream}, the Cumberland University \textit{Collegian}, and the Randolph-Macon \textit{Yellow Jacket}.\textsuperscript{217}

\textit{Advertising and Commercial Speech:}

Although journalism is public business, it is still a private industry. Therefore, the newspaper industry had the rights and privileges under the law pursuant to conducting a private business as it applied from the 1920s-1960s. During this time period, the newspaper could refuse and accept advertising as it saw fit. And, this right to refuse advertising was tested in the courts. Under the law a newspaper retained the right to what it would and would not print. At the same time, the newspaper was legally protected as en entity of public value. The judicial logic behind this principle is as follows: if a newspaper were considered a

\textsuperscript{216} Burges Johnson “Cigarette Advertising and Censorship” \textit{School and Society} 32, (December 31, 1932) pp. 856-856.
“common carrier” and required to print every advertisement that it received it would be equally obligated to print all of the news that it received.\textsuperscript{218}

The courts agreed that college officials as well as student editors of publications in private colleges could reject any and all advertising at any time for any reason whatsoever. And, the publication was not obligated to provide a reason for rejecting the advertising. However, in public colleges, the courts would not allow college officials the authority to deny access to the advertising columns of college publications. But the Courts would uphold the right of student editors, who they said were not legally agents of the state, to reject advertising as they see fit. If the college official rejected the advertisement, it would be an impermissible state action. If the student editor rejected the advertising, it would be constitutionally protected.\textsuperscript{219}

Advertising, or commercial speech, is part of that class of expression that does not enjoy full protection of the First Amendment. However, in more recent years the courts have been expanding the scope of that protection.\textsuperscript{220} When college and student publications accepted advertising, they became responsible for libelous content of that advertising. However, since \textit{New York Times v. Sullivan (1964)},\textsuperscript{221} advertising that advocates ideas, expresses opinions, or is political in nature has enjoyed First Amendment protection. Only product and service advertising was subject to government regulations. And the regulations that apply to the commercial press also apply to the collegiate press.

According to a survey published by James Crimmins in 1968, of the student newspapers stating that they had any restrictions, 52 percent vested this power of decision

on the advertising manager. Almost 20 percent vested the power in a university representative, while the remaining 28 percent gave the responsibility to the editor or publications board. Regarding restrictions, 78 percent had restrictions against specific products. However, the restrictions were not spelled out. The restricted products were what one would expect them to be – 58 per cent had restrictions on liquor advertising, 46 percent had restrictions on tobacco advertising, 8 percent had restrictions on drugs, and 8 percent restricted political advertising. Even though the tobacco industry discontinued its cigarette advertising in 1963, only 46 percent of universities had formal restrictions against tobacco advertisements in 1968.222

*Funding from National Advertising:*

For decades, the college market in the United States has been a lucrative target for advertisers. Competition in the college market has been fierce. Lawsuits, confrontations, and squabbles have resulted from this intense competition.223

Until the late seventies, one company, National Educational Advertising Services (NEAS), sold all of the national advertising that appeared in college newspapers. NEAS was a subsidiary of *Reader’s Digest.*224 However, in 1976 the Supreme Court ruled that NEAS held a monopolistic position and was in violation of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act.225 National Educational Advertising Services sold national advertising space in student newspapers on behalf of the campus papers. NEAS sold space in the newspapers to national advertisers, billed the advertisers or their advertising agencies, deducted a commission for itself, and

---

remitted the remainder to the newspaper.\textsuperscript{226} However, student newspapers did have the right to refuse advertising sold by NEAS.

By 1967 NEAS was selling more than $3,000,000 worth of national advertising for college newspapers every year. A 1968 study by James Crimmins reported national advertising revenues in excess of $250,000 or $6,440 per paper. Daily newspapers received a larger portion of the national advertising but it represented a smaller percentage of their total incomes. For example, the average daily paper received $30,000 from NEAS or 14\% of its total revenue. The average weekly with advertising revenues of $10,000 or less received more than 86 percent of its total advertising revenues from NEAS. The average newspaper received 24\% of its advertising income from NEAS.\textsuperscript{227}

National advertisers had a large say in the campuses they targeted. The bigger, better-known, and more prestigious institutions received the most national advertising. Among the papers that Crimmins studied, 80\% of NEAS advertising went to schools that were among the top 201 in the nation as selected by the Associated College Press.\textsuperscript{228}

The sale of advertising was necessary to the survival of the student newspaper because the college community was seldom, if ever, willing to subsidize the paper sufficiently so that advertising could be eliminated. In spite of the fact that campus newspapers were often under funded, next to intercollegiate athletics, the college paper was the largest financial undertaking on most campuses in 1962. However, unlike athletics, the college newspaper derives financial a large amount support from the campus community and a variety of advertisers. However, it is important to mention that not all of student advertising


revenue comes from national advertisers. Some local or regional advertisers also advertise in campus publications.\textsuperscript{229}

However, the sale of advertising in campus newspapers during the 1950s and 1960s was often rather counterproductive. Sometimes the cost of the advertising that seemed to be borne by the advertisers was actually borne by the students. For instance, in some cases, the printing costs for student papers were paid by student fees. These fees would need to increase if additional pages were printed to accommodate larger advertisements or a greater number of advertisements. If a newspaper was mismanaged, the advertising revenue did not cover the cost of the additional pages. In addition, very little advertising that was found in student newspapers could be defended as socially productive. For instance, the growth of both cigarette and fashion advertising resulted in an increase in the size of the newspaper. This increase in size usually increased the cost of the production so that relatively little profit was earned from the advertising.\textsuperscript{230}

\textit{The Importance of School-Newspaper Advertising:}

An understanding of successful school-newspaper advertising comes in part from knowing its importance. Before the middle of the 1960s, the importance of student newspaper advertising could be considered in five ways (1) benefits to the advertiser, the sender of the message; (2) benefits to the consumer, the receiver of the message; (3) benefits to the publications that prints the advertisements; and (4) benefits to the student solicitor, who sells the advertisement.\textsuperscript{231}

\textsuperscript{231} Ivan Livingston Jones, \textit{An Analysis of the Educational Problems Peculiar to School-Newspaper Advertising} (Seattle, WA: University of Washington, 1961) p.8.
From the community merchant’s perspective, there were six specific purposes of advertising. These goals were (1) to sell goods; (2) to create demands; (3) to introduce styles and customs; (4) to seek goodwill; (5) to keep the product or advertiser’s name before the public; and (6) to introduce a new business or announce a change in location. If a given student-newspaper advertisement fulfilled one or more of these purposes, then the community merchant benefits.232

There could be many rewards for a school publication advertising program. With additional money from advertising revenue, a journalism program can expand. For example, special “extras” can be published, larger issues can be printed, or the school newspaper can be published more frequently. A more professional publication can be published because of the increase in the size or number of issues could provide more space or number of issues gives room for fuller coverage of school activities, which in turn can be a determining factor for better school spirit. In addition, students can gain valuable experience by selling advertising in addition to the usual editorial duties.233

**Student Newspapers at The University of Tennessee:**

The publication of a campus newspaper is one of the oldest traditions at the University of Tennessee. The first journalistic efforts of the University, then known as the East Tennessee University, were created and edited by the Senior Class of 1840-1841, and continued in the hands of the Senior Class until 1843. The contributors were never revealed as they signed their names with Greek letters.234 The history of university-sanctioned newspapers at the University of Tennessee begins with the semi-monthly publication of *The Orange and White,* November 17, 1944

---


234 *Orange and White,* November 17, 1944
University Times-Prospectus beginning on November 3, 1871. The first publication to take the name Orange and White was published on February 24, 1900 as a weekly publication and was later published semi-weekly. The Orange and White was published at the main campus in Knoxville and at the Memphis campus and was under the direction of the publications council starting in 1916. Unfortunately, very few records exist for the Orange and White because the majority of them were destroyed in a campus fire.

Student publications played an important role in school spirit at The University of Tennessee. In the early 1920s, the students created a movement to obtain a fee, called a blanket tax, to cover admission to athletic events and to pay for publications. The staffs of the student publications, such as the Orange and White, actively supported the fee. Although the fee did not pass in 1922, interest in the fee continued until it was passed in 1927 by a 75% student majority vote. The first female editor-in-chief, Katherine Goddard, was elected during the 1920s; she assumed the position on February 1, 1923.

On March 26, 1931, the paper first became a semi-weekly and it was printed for the first time on standard newsprint with seven columns to a page. The change enabled the use of an improved style of make-up and more feature stories were placed on the first page. The entire last page was dedicated to sports. Due to wartime restrictions, the paper reverted to a

---

236 Nelle Bardin “History of The University of Tennessee Publications” The University of Tennessee Magazine (1920) pp. 419-433.
238 “Present-Day Orange and White Evolved From Senior Class Publication Of 1840.” The Orange and White, October 13, 1944.
weekly in 1943. However, it regained its semiweekly status after the war.\textsuperscript{239} In addition, in 1940 the \textit{Orange and White} changed its name from \textit{Orange and White} to \textit{The Orange and White}.\textsuperscript{240}

Funding for the \textit{Orange and White} was problematic, especially during the Depression when the University faced significant financial woes. The legislature reduced funds for the University in 1931. The trustees tried to compensate in part by increasing the maintenance fee from fifteen to twenty dollars. The same year, the trustees dropped the Student Activities Fee, which had been $13.25 a quarter. This meant that the fees were actually slightly reduced. The Student Activities fee had provided a primary source of funding for the \textit{Orange and White} newspaper.\textsuperscript{241} The headline of the May 23, 1933 edition read, “Trustees to Kill Activities Fee: Athletics, Musical Groups, Publications Dealt a Severe Blow.” The financial difficulties that the newspaper faced became evident later that same year in a column entitled “\textit{Orange and White} Goes A-Begging For Curtains” published on October 13, 1933. The column reads,

\begin{quote}
It is nothing new for the \textit{Orange and White} to be accused of selling its journalistic soul. But for the first time it is true. The paper makes no bones about it. Boldly and openly it is willing to trade (1) column of publicity (the only coin it has) to the Home Economics Club for (1) set of window curtains for the editor’s office.
\end{quote}

The paper’s financial woes continued into the 1940s. \textit{The Orange and White} sponsored a subscription contest. Campus fraternities and sororities competed to obtain paid subscriptions to support the paper. A trophy and recognition in the paper were to be awarded to the winner.\textsuperscript{242}

In addition to its financial woes, the paper also addressed the growing popularity of cigarette smoking. On Friday March 1, 1935, the \textit{Orange and White} published an editorial

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{239} “Present-Day \textit{Orange and White} Evolved From Senior Class Publication Of 1840.” \textit{The Orange and White}, October 13, 1944.
\textsuperscript{240} The newspaper will be referred to as \textit{The Orange and White} unless the reference refers to the paper pre-1940.
\textsuperscript{241} James Reilly Montgomery “Threshold of News Days at the University of Tennessee 1919-1946” pp. 100 University of Tennessee Archives January 16, 2007.
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\end{flushright}
entitled, “Cigarettes, Candy, Chewing Gum!” The column laments students’ tendency to litter on campus. The column reads,

Anyone interested in determining the favorite brand of cigarettes of UT students need not employ a blindfold method of selection. All that he would need do would be count the number of each brand, which constantly litter the entrances to Ayres Hall. He need not limit himself to this, but could count the empty packages also.

A new student newspaper, *The Daily Beacon*, was established at the University of Tennessee in 1967 and was published four times per week. Soon afterward, the paper began publishing issues five times a week and continues to do so publishing about 180 issues per academic year.243

**Tobacco Experiment Stations at Universities in the Southeast:**

By the 1950s, the tobacco industry had collaborated with many universities in the South to learn how to better cultivate tobacco. The primary experiment stations were located at universities in North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Kentucky.244

During the spring of 1928, Clyde B. Austin, the founder of the Austin Tobacco Company, asked the University of Tennessee to consider establishing a tobacco research facility in Greeneville, Tennessee. Austin, along with a number of other prominent tobacco men, believed that the state needed a tobacco research station and that the location should be in the state’s leading burley tobacco growing region.245

The idea took shape during the state legislature’s 1930-1931 session. A bill was passed that granted $25,000.00 for the purchase of land on which a tobacco research station

---

Nelle Bardin “History of The University of Tennessee Publications” *The University of Tennessee Magazine* (1920) pp. 419-433.


245 Charles L. Click *A History of the University of Tennessee Experiment Station* (Knoxville, TN: The University of Tennessee) 1990, pp. 1-20.
would be established.\textsuperscript{246} This facility would be a cooperative effort between The University of Tennessee and the United States Department of Agriculture’s office of Tobacco and Plant Nutrition. The Tobacco Experiment Station opened in the spring of 1932.\textsuperscript{247}

During the first decade of the Tobacco Experiment Station’s existence, the Station’s primary goals related to the establishment of the facility. Although experimental studies had been conducted during this period, no significant breakthroughs were reported. During the war years, the station lost much of its manpower. The work at the station came almost to a standstill and was in desperate need of direction.\textsuperscript{248} However, the changes brought about by World War II that necessitated the production of more tobacco and the technology that would make this possible would set the stage for the station’s work over the next twenty-five years. According to Charles Click, the work conducted at the station during these years was the most influential in the station’s history. Advances in plant breeding and agronomics resulted in a number of major discoveries that have been beneficial to the farmer.\textsuperscript{249}

After the 1964 U.S. Surgeon General’s Report, tobacco production in the United States changed drastically. The change from unfiltered cigarettes to the filtered low-tar version enabled cigarette manufacturers to use a lower quality tobacco in their product.\textsuperscript{250} This trend also resulted in an increased use of foreign tobaccos imported from Africa, Asia

\textsuperscript{246} Charles L. Click \textit{A History of the University of Tennessee Experiment Station} (Knoxville, TN: The University of Tennessee) 1990, pp. 21-42.
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and Latin America. Therefore, the tobacco station changed its focus from creating new varieties and better quality tobacco to cultivating more tobacco at a reduced cost.\textsuperscript{251}

In Click’s opinion, the contributions made by the University of Tennessee Tobacco Experiment Station to the American tobacco industry are immeasurable.\textsuperscript{252} The role played by the station in increasing American tobacco production has placed tobacco near the top of the list of U.S. agricultural exports. The economic benefit derived from the increased production has placed tobacco near the top of the list of U.S. agricultural exports. From the early advances made against black root rot disease to the high yield varieties that are popular today, the station’s tobacco breeding program has had a large influence on the tobacco industry in the United States.\textsuperscript{253}

\textit{Conclusion:}

Cigarette and tobacco promotion have been an important part of the collegiate culture at colleges and universities across the nation. However, financial woes have also been an important part of the history of student publications. Because of the desperate need for funding, the campus newspaper’s student-centered goal was compromised by its advertising. Unfortunately, the funding from the tobacco companies did little to help the newspaper’s financial woes.
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Chapter Four: The FTC’s Role in Ending Tobacco Advertising in Student Newspapers on College and University Campuses

During the 1950s and 1960s, student newspapers at colleges and universities were major vehicles for cigarette advertising and promotion. Student newspapers were attractive to the tobacco industry because they were a relatively inexpensive medium that targeted young adults who were largely unaware of the risks associated with cigarette smoking. Cigarette companies were important advertisers on campus and their advertising consumed much of the advertising space in student newspapers. However, as scientific and medical reports began to surface that linked cigarette smoking with cancer, the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) began to take action against the tobacco industry. And, ultimately, these actions resulted in the removal of cigarette advertising from student publications. This chapter traces the FTC’s involvement in tobacco advertising regulation during the 1950s and 1960s that resulted in the end of tobacco advertising in student newspapers.

Government agencies offered young people little protection from cigarette advertisers during the 1950s and early 1960s. During this time period numerous college newspapers and some high school newspapers carried numerous cigarette advertisements. In fact, nearly 2,000 college publications, mainly newspapers, received over 40 percent of their advertising revenue from the tobacco industry.254 In this litigious age, it is difficult to imagine cigarette advertisements blatantly targeting youth and young adults yet going relatively unnoticed.

It would be assumed that the FTC would protect college students from unscrupulous tobacco advertisers who were blatantly trying to persuade a new generation to become addicted to tobacco. However, during the 1950s and early 1960s the FTC was

relatively powerless against the powerful Tobacco Industry. Until the eve of the Surgeon General’s Report in 1964, the FTC had little success regulating cigarette advertising.

**College Newspapers and Cigarette Advertising:**

College newspapers and tobacco shared a relationship that spanned over 40 years and five decades. Although most college student newspapers accepted advertising dollars from the tobacco industry without any controversy, some colleges did take action and pull the cigarette advertisements of their own accord. For instance, *Main Events*, the campus newspaper at City College in New York City and *Maroon*, the campus newspaper at University of Chicago, both dropped cigarette advertisements before the Tobacco Institute, the public relations arm of the tobacco industry, finally pulled the advertising because of pressure from the FTC in 1963. However, dropping cigarette advertising from student newspapers was not a simple matter. It involved contracts, possibly the loss of the school paper, and even lawsuits. On October 29, 1952 *Main Events* announced that it planned to drop all cigarette advertising. Part of an editorial that underlined the issue stated:

> We feel that we are condoning cigarette smoking by allowing placement of advertising space at a time when it was impossible to overlook the facts of cigarette surveys.\(^{255}\)

Three issues later the newspaper was out of money, it stated that it wished, to express its deep regrets that the financial solvency of this newspaper – and apparently many other school papers across the country – depends, to such a large extent, upon a product which, according to the evidence, contributes so largely to the death of thousands each year. Because the issue at stake here is not the publication life of a single newspaper, but whether or not the collegiate press must inevitably fold when outside advertising (primarily cigarette) is the basic source of its financial survival.\(^{256}\)

---


The Nation printed an editorial on January 26, 1963 entitled “Collegians and the Weed:”

Apparantly Main Events is the first college newspaper to discontinue cigarette advertising on the initiative of the staff… The vaunted editorial independence of the great American press is here being tested, and the fact that the test is on a small and local scale does not alter the principle involved.257

Soon after The Nation article, the Catholic weekly, America, and the Medical Tribune, a national weekly for physicians, devoted space to the story. The public response was immediate – especially from the physicians. The City College school administrators were given the necessary funds to continue their campus paper.258

Earle Ubell, the New York Herald Tribune’s science editor, discussed the issue in a letter to the City College students. The majority of the eight-page issue discussed the controversy. More than 500 of the 6,000 copies that were run were sent to student college newspaper editors with the front-page comment:

We have no wish to point out individuals and tell them not to smoke; what you do is your own business. But especially for the young people who each semester enter the colleges of the nation… freshmen and seniors alike, whose understanding of this complex story is limited or made lopsided by the continual barrage of advertising through radio-TV, newspaper and magazine, and their own college press, we urge responsible editors of the country to help offset the potentially dangerous effects of smoking by using their good offices to discuss the issue for the benefit of all students.259

These comments were issued April 29, 1963 – two months before the Tobacco Institute’s recommendations that cigarette advertising be dropped from all college publications.

On the same day at the University of Chicago, the American Cancer Society’s Illinois division in conjunction with Coccyx, the University of Chicago group organized to eliminate cigarette advertising from the college daily, held a conference attended by editors and

editorial assistants from 18 colleges in the metropolitan area. The purpose of the conference was to work to persuade editors to discontinue cigarette advertising and to enlist them in a drive to write anticigarette material. The presenters at the conference included a surgeon, the editor of the campus newspaper at the University of Chicago, and an advertising executive. The conference presented evidence on smoking and urged editors, if they were convinced that smoking and lung cancer were causally related, to refuse to renew their cigarette advertising contracts for the 1963-1964 academic year. Or, they might publish anticigarette advertisements created by Coccyx, the first series of which was entitled “On Campus Cancer” as a parody of “On Campus,” a column by popular humorist Max Shulman that was sponsored by Phillip Morris and Marlboro cigarettes.260

However, not everyone on campus was pleased with the decision to pull the advertising from college newspapers. For instance, in 1963 the advertising manager of Maroon defended cigarette advertising by stating:

Cigarette advertisements are highly lucrative and, therefore, highly desirable. Esthetically speaking, cigarette advertisements are generally praiseworthy for their art and good taste.261

Even into the 1980s, twenty years after the advertising was removed, many college newspapers worked to convince the tobacco industry to advertise in college newspapers. For instance, in a letter dated October 20, 1981 from Ann Shank-Volk, the president of College Newspaper Business and Advertising Managers Incorporated (CNBAM), to the Tobacco Institute, the members of CNBAM ask the Tobacco Institute to reconsider their voluntary ban on college newspaper advertising. The letter states,

We, the members of College Newspaper Business and Advertising Managers

---

Inc. (CNBAM), request that the voluntary ban on advertising in college newspapers be rescinded by the Tobacco Institute. CNBAM is a national organization of over fifty major college newspapers. The college market itself is a lucrative one, consisting of 12,000,000 full and part-time students. 79% of these students read their college newspaper on a regular basis. CNBAM believes that by advertising in college newspapers, your industry would be making an economic, efficient media purchase aimed at the youth market, which is consistently supported the tobacco industry. 262

In spite of CNBAM’s efforts to regain tobacco advertising, the Tobacco Institute did not renew its college newspaper contract.

**Tobacco Litigation and the Formation of the Tobacco Institute:**

The first lawsuit involving three of the six major cigarette companies claiming that cigarette smoking caused lung cancer was filed in March 1954. All six manufacturers were involved in litigation based on similar claims. The primary legal issues that the industry faced centered around advertising, antitrust issues and health concerns. These concerns resulted in the creation of various tobacco related organizations that represented the interests of tobacco manufacturers. These organizations managed the industry’s legal, research, and communications issues.

For the tobacco industry, the key defense strategy in the smoking and health litigation has been to try the plaintiff. On the other hand, the plaintiff’s strategy is to try the corporate defendants. During the tobacco litigation of the 1950s and 1960s, the plaintiffs essentially asserted that the defendants have conspired to propagate “the deadly delusion of an ‘open question’ concerning the issue of smoking and health.” 263 For instance, one complaint alleged that:

---


The defendants, individually and as members of the tobacco industry, conspired to misrepresent and through their concerted action, misrepresented to the users of cigarettes, and failed to warn users of cigarettes of the dependency induced by cigarette use and the adverse consequences of cigarette use.\(^{264}\)

The primary allegations against the industry assert that the industry combined to deprive the public of certain scientific data and that it used advertising to help persuade the public that the cigarette habit was safe.\(^{265}\)

However, the tobacco industry itself had profited from public health concerns for years, and had built business around consumer health concerns. Most cigarette makers had, at some time, employed advertising campaigns that suggested health benefits offered by their particular brand, such as "smoother on the throat," "Not a cough in the carload," "More Doctors smoke Camel," among others. In the early 1950s cigarette producers introduced more filtered cigarette brands to ease consumer fears. For instance, Pall Mall advertised that the unfiltered, yet longer, Pall Mall cigarette successfully filtered the smoke through the tobacco to help "Guard against throat scratch." As the industry capitalized on health fears, they simultaneously worked to disprove the claims that smoking caused serious illness.\(^{266}\)

Although the tobacco industry had successfully dealt with controversy in the past, it seemed that more significant action was now in order. A December 14, 1953 meeting of the cigarette industry tobacco executives resulted in a call to develop a "pro-cigarette" public relations entity. The industry felt that the most effective way to face this growing problem


\(^{266}\) “The Tobacco Institute - Roots in the Tobacco Industry Research Committee” no date [http://roswell.tobaccodocuments.org/about_TI.htm](http://roswell.tobaccodocuments.org/about_TI.htm) (Retrieved 26 August 2006).
was to employ public relations counsel. On December 15, 1954 the tobacco industry hired Hill & Knowlton, a New York-based public relations agency, to create the trade association. Within the month, Hill & Knowlton and the industry collaborated to provide public relations for the industry and, simultaneously, fund research to study the damaging claims being made against its product. The Tobacco Industry Research Committee (TIRC) was officially formed in January 1954.267

Providing counter arguments against the mounting evidence against the tobacco industry became a primary function of the TIRC. The 1952 Reader’s Digest article entitled “Cancer by the Carton,” the studies by Drs. Wynder, Graham and Croninger that successfully induced cancer by painting cigarette tar on the skin of laboratory mice and the corresponding British study by Richard Doll, forced the tobacco industry to acknowledge the "major scientific and public relations problem" it was facing. Therefore, the industry could no longer ignore the mounting evidence that linked cigarette smoking with cancer and other diseases.268

In January of 1954 the tobacco industry announced its “Open Question” position in “A Frank Statement to Cigarette Smokers.” The four primary elements of this position as it evolved in the 1950s were:

1. It has not been scientifically established that smoking is a cause of disease, particularly lung cancer.
2. The solution lies in more research to which the industry is committed.
3. Scientists have been unable to establish any ingredient as found in cigarette smoke, which has produced lung cancer in animals or human beings.
4. The industry believes that cigarettes are not injurious to health.269

In spite of the fact that the tobacco industry claimed in 1954 that the TIRC was formed with the function of sponsoring independent research into smoking and health issues and to resolve the “Open Question” regarding tobacco and health, the actual function of the TIRC was, as SAB (Scientific Advisory Board) Chair, Dr. Clarence Cook stated in 1954, “[T]o build a foundation of research sufficiently strong to arrest continuing or future attacks” on the tobacco industry.270 Furthermore, one of the TIRC’s major activities from 1954-1958 and thereafter was to serve as the public relations vehicle for the tobacco industry in interviews, speeches, and testimony before Congress, the FTC, and in court.271

In 1955, the FTC issued guidelines to prevent cigarette advertisements from making direct or indirect health related claims in their advertising. One effect of this legislation was to prevent the tobacco industry from making any claims that product improvements, such as filtration, had any beneficial health effects. Then, in 1959 the FTC enacted a rule that prevented companies from mentioning tar or nicotine levels in their cigarettes because it could be referred to as a health claim.272

The tobacco industry created the Tobacco Institute (TI) in 1958 to replace the TIRC’s public relations and legal functions and the Council for Tobacco Research (CTR) to continue the TIRC research functions. The Tobacco Institute’s primary objective was to publicize "the industry's position on the smoking and health issue, representing the industry's


position to the Congress and the state legislatures and generally stating the industry's position to the public on issues ranging from smoking and health to taxation and all legislation affecting the industry.\textsuperscript{273} Led by attorney-based committees (the Committee of Counsel) and Covington and Burling (TI counsel), the Tobacco Institute was comprised of the tobacco lobby, legislative, public relations, state affairs, and federal affairs branch of the tobacco industry.

The Tobacco Industry, Federal Regulations and the FTC:

History of Tobacco Advertising:

During the period 1913-1953, cigarette consumption in the United States boomed. Many believe that this increase in consumption was the direct and intended result of the tobacco industry's advertising and marketing efforts. Throughout this time period, few legal or moral restraints were placed on cigarette promotion. Even before print advertising was common, picture cards were included in every cigarette pack. To encourage the smoker to purchase more cigarettes, the cards would be printed as part of a series. A series might include pictures of celebrities, athletes, scantily clad women, and of businessmen who made the transition from rags to riches.\textsuperscript{274}

When print media advertisements gained popularity in the 1930s and 1940s, the themes of glamour and safety became widely circulated. Virtually every major movie star and professional athlete promoted a brand of cigarettes. Smoking was also very prevalent in the movies. These promotional techniques were targeted at the youth and young adult audience whose desire to emulate celebrities would lead them to start smoking. As part of their goal


of increasing the market, the tobacco industry also sought to target women and soldiers.\textsuperscript{275}

However, for all of the “glamour” of cigarette smoking, market research uncovered that smokers did experience some unpleasant physical side effects related to smoking. The most notable side effects of smoking were coughing and a scratchy throat. For instance, a brand history of Pall Mall indicates that in 1948 product research found that “a large number of smokers suffered from throat irritation in various degrees. Consequently, the copy line that Pall Mall “filters the smoke” was changed to “filters the smoke on the way to your throat.” The addition of “on the way to your throat” proved to be an even more effective copy line. Likewise, Chesterfields were advertised as not adversely affecting the “nose, throat, and accessory organs,” Phillip Morris contained “DiGel” to remove irritants, Camel invited smokers to a 30-day test of the effect of Camels on their “T-Zone,” Lucky Strike used UV-rays and toasting to remove harsh irritants, and Kools went further by promoting their menthol as being good for a cold. However, R.J. Reynolds went the furthest by stating that Camels aided in digestion, gave students a lift and additional energy, contained 28% less nicotine, and did not affect an athlete’s wind.\textsuperscript{276} The majority of these offenses were found in both student publications and general circulation periodicals.

Although information dating back to the 1930s was adequate to trigger the industry’s duty to warn its consumers about the possible dangers of tobacco use, or at least put the tobacco industry on notice, evidence linking cigarette smoking and cancer was established


during the early 1950s. In addition to failing to warn the public in the face of increasing scientific evidence, the industry also resisted a number of warning proposals. Therefore, the tobacco industry had several documented opportunities to adopt a voluntary warning label before the government mandated warning labels.\(^{277}\)

*The Case Against Tobacco:*

The case against the tobacco industry was threefold. First, as a part of the general corporate “conspiracy/misconduct” case, the public statements being released to the public through advertising with the internal state of awareness of the strength and validity of the connection that was established between smoking and various diseases. For instance, even as the Arthur D. Little Company was replicating, albeit with diminished results, the mouse-painting studies that had previously demonstrated that cigarettes contained carcinogens, Liggett was promoting its L&M filter as “Just What the Doctor Ordered.” While the research should have caused concern about the product, the advertising was clearly created to reassure the public about the safety of the product.\(^{278}\)

Second, one could argue that the tobacco industry’s marketing efforts were irresponsible by stating that the promotional design was created and implemented with the single-minded goal of increasing the cigarette market. Advertising is viewed as the leading factor in smoking initiation with a particular emphasis on youth, young adults, and women, and in smoking continuance in the face of growing public knowledge of increased health


risks. For instance, the two themes of safety and glamour appeared repeatedly from 1913-1964, with a special emphasis on safety throughout filter cigarette’s introductory era from 1953-1955 and the “tar derby” from 1958-1960. During this time period, celebrity endorsements saturated the advertising media. A powerful component of this argument is the FTC’s finding, that was held up on appeal, that many of these advertisements were deceptive and misleading.279

The death-knell of the use of celebrity endorsements came with the Cigarette Advertising Code. Additional regulations also damaged the industry. For instance, the inclusion of warning labels on cigarette packs and, later, in cigarette advertising encouraged the industry’s advertising to become more subtle. However, the themes of glamour and safety persisted nonetheless. Glamour was no longer personified in recognizable celebrities but in the anonymous happy, healthy individuals depicted in the advertisements. Claims of safety were cleverly implied in advertisements for “safer” cigarettes that were low tar, low gas, had charcoal filters, or all natural. The intent and effect of both was the same: to deviate from the legally required warning label and reassure smokers in their decision to start and continue smoking.280

FTC and Government Regulation:

The FTC flirted with cigarette advertising regulations since the 1930s, going after


manufacturers who made unproven health claims about their products. However, the 1950s and early 1960s are perhaps the most important era in cigarette regulation. Public health concerns drove cigarette manufacturers to compete in rival advertising campaigns promoting their filters (The "Tar Wars" or "Tar Derby"). In the early 1950s, only 2% of cigarettes had filter tips. However, by 1960, 50% of cigarettes were filter tips. The reason this drastic change in cigarette marketing was the publication of the first major study that definitively linked smoking to lung cancer. Mortin Levin’s epidemiological survey of Buffalo lung cancer patients between 1938 and 1950 appeared in The Journal of the American Medical Association. His controversial and shocking finding: smokers were statistically twice as likely to develop lung cancer as non-smokers. Because of the scientific research that was beginning to connect smoking with cancer, FTC started to complain that cigarette advertisements that touted the physical benefits of smoking were deceptive in 1950. However, the ultimate finding of the FTC’s 1950 R.J. Reynolds decision was that cigarettes were not “appreciably harmful” to healthy smokers.

An article in U.S. News & World Report stated the FTC’s position on cigarettes and cigarette advertising very clearly. The article stated the FTC’s position that,

For smokers, one cigarette is about like another. Cigarettes do not soothe the throat, help digestion, or relieve fatigue according to the findings of the Federal Trade Commission. All cigarettes contain some poison and one brand is no less irritating than any other brand. Cigarette smoking is not good for the individual.

The Commission reached these conclusions after an investigation of tobacco industry advertising claims. The findings are based on laboratory tests conducted by the Food and


In proceedings culminating in 1950 with cease and desist orders against every major tobacco company, the FTC found virtually all cigarette advertisements had been false, misleading, and deceptive.\footnote{286 Abrams, T.; Crist, P.; Kaczynski, S.; Marple, W. "Confidential Report Containing Legal Advice and Attorney Opinion Work Product Regarding Numerous Smoking and Health Issues Relevant to Litigation, Prepared by Outside Counsel for RJR, with Whom B&W Maintains A Common Legal Interest, and Forwarded to B&W in-House Counsel". No date. Bates: 681879254-681879715. p.271. \url{http://tobaccodocuments.org/landman/681879254-9715.html} (Retrieved 28 July 2006).} For instance, in the proceedings against R.J. Reynolds, the FTC found that many of the celebrity endorsements were deceptive because either the celebrities did not smoke or they did not smoke Camels exclusively.\footnote{287 R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., 46 F.T.C. 706 (1950). modified, 192 F. 2d 535 (7th Cir. 1951), order modified, 48 F.T.C. 682 (1952).} The Chesterfield “Nose, Throat, and Accessory Organs Not Adversely Affected by Smoking Chesterfields” campaign was also the subject of an FTC investigation that resulted in a cease and desist order entered against Liggett and Myers Tobacco Company.\footnote{288 55 F.T.C. 354 (1958) (Bruff Depo. Exh. 7)}

A statement in an April 5, 1950 press release issued by the FTC explains the Commission’s response to claims that some cigarettes contain fewer irritating substances than others. The FTC’s release of the cease and desist order against Camel and Old Gold reads,

In any event, it is declared that smoke is an “irritant” – containing as it does the substances carbon dioxide, carbon monoxide, nicotine, ammonia, and various aldehydes, including formaldehyde, tars, and formic acid. The Commission found that the smoke from all the leading brands of cigarettes contains all of these irritating substances “in essentially the same quantities and degree.” And, “being an irritant,” the Commission pointed out, “the smoke will irritate disordered throats,” and “excessive smoking” of any brand will irritate throats even in normal healthy condition.\footnote{289 FTC Office of Information, Orders 4795 and 4922, (April 5, 1950). Bates Number: 980300567/0572 p. 1. <http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/hgo15f00>}

Regarding R.J. Reynolds’ use of celebrity appeals in Camel advertisements, the release said,
The Reynolds Company is further forbidden to represent that Camels differ in any of those respects from other leading brands of cigarettes, or to use any testimonials which contain any of the prohibited representations or which are not “factually true in all respects.”

The FTC decision in the Chesterfield case stated that the advertisement reported the results of a survey of 30 smokers who smoked Chesterfield cigarettes for a six-month period. During this time period, a physician examined the research participants every two months. At the end of the six months, the smokers were not adversely affected by smoking Chesterfields. However, the FTC noted that the study extended beyond the initial six months for an additional eighteen-month period. During this latter period, four of the 30 participants displayed coughing spells that were attributed to smoking.

In 1951, American Tobacco Company’s Lucky Strike Cigarettes received a cease and desist order from the FTC because it was in violation of the Federal Trade Commission’s previous rulings and the Federal Trade Commission Act. American Tobacco Company was ordered to cease and desist from any advertising that:

1. Lucky Strike cigarettes or the smoke therefrom contains less acid than do the cigarettes or the smoke therefrom of any of the leading brands of cigarettes.
2. That Lucky Strike cigarettes or the smoke therefrom is less irritating to the throat than the cigarettes or the smoke therefrom of any of the other leading brands of cigarettes.
3. That Lucky Strike cigarettes or the smoke therefrom contains less nicotine than do the cigarettes or the smoke therefrom of any of the four other leading brands of cigarettes.

The following year, R.J. Reynolds received a modified order to cease and desist from the FTC. On January 17, 1952, the FTC mandated that Camel cigarettes stop the implying

---


292 F.T.C. “Order To Cease And Desist” (June 20, 1951) Bates Number: 980297792/7793 <http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/acn85f00>
the following in its advertising:

1.) That the smoking of such cigarettes encourages the flow of digestive fluids or increases the alkalinity of the digestive tract or that it aids digestion in any respect.
2.) That the smoking of cigarettes relieves fatigue or that it creates, renews, gives or releases body energy.
3.) That the smoking of such cigarettes does not affect or impair the “wind” or the physical condition of the athletes.
4.) That such cigarettes or the smoke therefrom will never harm or irritate the throat, nor leave an aftertaste.
5.) That the smoke from such cigarettes is soothing, restful, or comforting to the nerves, or that it protects against nerve strain.
6.) That Camel cigarettes differ in any of the foregoing respects from the other leading brands of cigarettes on the market.
7.) That Camel cigarettes or the smoke therefrom contains less nicotine than do the cigarettes or the smoke therefrom contains less nicotine than do the cigarettes or the smoke therefrom of any of the four other largest selling brands of cigarettes.293

Later that same year, the FTC was looking into Phillip Morris’ claim that their cigarettes are less irritating.294 On February 5, 1952 the FTC found the following aspects of the Phillip Morris to be false and deceptive and would be banned by Examiner Earl J. Kolb’s order.

That by the use of a… hygroscopic agent as a moistener, Phillip Morris cigarettes would be rendered nonirritating or less irritating than those brands in which other hygroscopic agents are employed.295

The FTC also prohibited Phillip Morris from stating:

That Phillip Morris cigarettes cause no irritation to the upper respiratory tract and are less irritating to that area than other leading brands.
That they have any value in alleviating or removing irritation of the nose or throat due to smoking.
That they may be smoked as much and as often as one likes without irritation

293 F.T.C. “Modified Order to Cease and Desist” (January 17, 1952) Bates Number: 980300590/059 <http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/ogo15f00>
295 F.T.C. “Hearing Examiner’s Initial Decision” (February 5, 1952) Bates Number: 980299330/9331 <http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/uqo15f00>
to the throat. That they give protection from smokers coughs, the effects of inhaling or from throat irritation due to inhaling. That the leading brands are more irritating than Phillip Morris or that irritation caused by smoking lasts longer when such other brands are used. That the smoke from Phillip Morris cigarettes will not affect the breath or leave an aftertaste.  

In the December 1, 1952 case, Federal Trade Commission v. Liggett Myers Tobacco Co, the FTC found cigarettes definitively not to be a drug. Section 15 (c) of the Federal Trade Commission Act states,  

The term "drug" means (1) articles recognized in the official United States Pharmacopoeia, official Homoeopathic Pharmacopoeia of the United States, or official National Formulary, or any supplement to any of them; and (2) articles intended for use in the diagnosis, cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention of disease in man or other animals; and (3) articles (other than food) intended to affect the structure or any function of the body of man or other animals; and (4) articles intended for use as a component of any article specified in clause (1), (2), or (3); but does not include devices or their components, parts, or accessories.  

As a result of this finding, cigarette manufacturers were prohibited from advertising that cigarettes could be smoked without inducing any adverse affects on the nose, throat, and accessory organs. Because cigarettes were not defined as a drug, jurisdiction was conferred upon the court to issue an injunction against the alleged false advertising under sections 12 and 13(a) of the FTC Act that states that it is unlawful for person, partnership, or corporation to

---

296 F.T.C. “Hearing Examiner’s Initial Decision” (February 5, 1952) Bates Number: 980299330/9331 <http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/uqo15f00>


disseminate false advertising.\textsuperscript{299} As a result of this ruling, Liggett and Myers was forced to stop implying that Chesterfield cigarettes were less irritating.\textsuperscript{300} The other major cigarette companies such as Lorillard, American Tobacco Company, and R.J. Reynolds were involved in similar legal actions involving the FTC in 1952.

In spite of the FTC’s legal actions against the major tobacco companies, many of the brands continued to advertise using the very claims that were just banned. For instance, in 1953 Chesterfield advertised that its cigarettes were “Always milder,” “Better tasting,” “Cooler smoking,” and generally not irritating. In response to Liggett and Meyers’ continued reluctance to follow the FTC’s orders the Commission stated,

This is the second action instituted by the Commission to halt allegedly false and misleading advertising that Chesterfield cigarettes can be smoked without inducing any adverse effect upon nose, throat, and accessory organs of the smoker…The present complaint alleges that the respondent’s advertising represents directly and by implication that Chesterfield cigarettes not only will have no adverse effect on nose and throat and accessory organs, but also (1) that the smoke from Chesterfield cigarettes is milder and cooler and consequently less irritating to the user than other cigarettes, (2) that the smoke from Chesterfield cigarettes will soothe and relax the nerves of smokers irrespective of the physical condition or the smoking habits of the smokers, and (3) that the smoke from Chesterfield cigarettes does not leave an unpleasant aftertaste in the mouth. These claims and representations, according to the complaint, are false, misleading, and deceptive.\textsuperscript{301}

After chastising Liggett and Meyers for not heading previous rulings, the FTC complaint mentions that Chesterfield cigarettes are not the only offending brand and that the Commission had previously instituted proceedings and issued orders against American Tobacco Company, R.J. Reynolds Tobacco, P.J. Lorillard Company and Phillip Morris & Co.

\textsuperscript{299}Commerce Clearing House, Trade Regulation Reports #67, 67,377 Cited 1952 Trade Cases, FTC Vs. Liggett And Myers Tobacco Co. (December 18, 1952) Bates Number: 980295134/5159 < http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/kym85f00>
\textsuperscript{300}Commerce Clearing House, Trade Regulation Reports #67, 67,377 Cited 1952 Trade Cases, FTC Vs. Liggett And Myers Tobacco Co. (December 18, 1952) Bates Number: 980295134/5159 < http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/kym85f00>
prohibiting the use of a variety of claims, some being of the same general nature as were involved in this complaint.\textsuperscript{302} In spite of the FTC’s adamant complaints regarding health claims made by tobacco companies, particularly Liggett & Meyers’ Chesterfield cigarettes, a hearing examiner later dismissed the charges against Liggett & Meyers Tobacco Co. on the grounds that there was not significant public interest, that such statements were merely “puffing” terms, and that the counsel for the complaint had failed to make a prima facie case.\textsuperscript{303} Likewise, the cases against the other companies including Phillip Morris were also dismissed.\textsuperscript{304}

After nearly four years of frustrating dealings with the tobacco industry, the Director of FTC’s Bureau of Consultation, Charles E. Grandey, contacted the presidents of the major tobacco companies urging them to adhere to some proposed industry standards. The FTC defends its desire for further regulation by stating:

\begin{quote}
Recent scientific developments with regard to the effects of cigarette smoking have increased the Commission’s interest in advertising claims made for such products and have increased the Commission’s interest in advertising claims made for such products and have increased its responsibility under the law to prevent the use of false or misleading claims.\textsuperscript{305}
\end{quote}

The letter continues by stating that the proposed standards are part of a voluntary code and would not modify the provisions of any existing cease and desist order. Grandey also wrote that he believes that the proposed standards are in accordance with the industry’s desire to

\begin{footnotes}
\end{footnotes}
resolve any scientific questions about its product. The letter closed by asking the tobacco industry executives to provide comments and suggestions about the facility of the FTC’s proposed standards as well as an indication of whether each particular company would be willing to abide by the proposed voluntary standards.

The FTC’s 1954 proposed standards, for instance, prohibited cigarette advertisements from claiming “directly or by implication that cigarette smoking in general or the smoking of any brand of cigarettes is ‘not harmful’ or ‘not irritating’. The proposed standards also required that advertisements should not imply any medical approval of smoking. Further, the advertisements should not represent directly or indirectly that the smoke of any brand of cigarettes contains any less nicotine, tar or resins than any other brand of cigarettes.306

The suggested standards for cigarette advertising were:

Cigarette advertisements--

1) Should not represent directly or by implication that cigarette smoking in general or the smoking of any brand of cigarette is beneficial to health in any respect,
2) Should not represent directly or by implication that cigarette smoking in general or the smoking of any brand of cigarettes is (a) not harmful or (b) not irritating,
3) Should not represent directly or by implication, including illustrations, that by virtue of its ingredients, method of manufacture, length, added filter, or for any other reason the smoke of any brand of cigarette contains less nicotine, tar, resins, or other deleterious substances unless such representation is supported by impartial scientific test data, which are current at the time of dissemination of the claim, and which conclusively prove the existence of the claimed differences to a significant degree and the claim is limited to the particular deleterious substance or substances.
4) Should not refer to (a) the throat, larynx, nose or any other part of the body (b) digestion (c) energy (d) nerves or (e) doctors,
5) Should not use any word, term, illustration or combination thereof, in such a way as to indicate medical approval,

6) Should generally be limited to the subjects of quality, taste, flavor, enjoyment, and other similar matters of opinion,
7) Should make no comparative claims regarding the volume of sales of competitive brands or the purchase of particular types, qualities or grades of tobacco unless such a claim is based on verified current information,
8) Should contain only genuine testimonials that represent the current opinion of the author who currently smokes the brand named.
NOTE: By publishing any testimonial the advertiser makes all of the direct and implied representations contained therein and all of the standards herein listed apply thereto.
9) Should not contain claims accounting to false disparagement of other cigarette manufacturers and their products.  

The purpose of these 1954 “cigarette advertising guides” that were to apply to the entire industry was to close the loopholes in its brand specific decrees. Although the guides specifically prohibit all references to “throat, larynx, lungs, nose or other parts of the body,” or to “digestion, nerves or doctors.” A later press release emphasized that “no advertising should be used which refers to either the presence or absence of any physical effect of smoking.” The guides also prohibited all tar and nicotine claims unless definite scientific proof existed that the claims were true. However, the guides specifically allowed the advertising of pleasure and taste.  

The tobacco industry appeared to be relatively accepting of the FTC’s proposed code. For instance, in American Tobacco Company’s President, Paul M. Hahn’s, reply to FTC Director Charles Grandey’s letter he said that American Tobacco Company is in full sympathy with the FTC’s general objectives in its efforts to eliminate questionable claims and implications from all cigarette advertising. However, Hahn continued by stating the advertising of American Tobacco Company’s brands, Lucky Strike, Pall Mall and Tareyton

---

cigarettes, were completely free from any questionable claims and implications. Therefore, Hahn stated, that American Tobacco Company should “look with favor upon any process that would provide an effective means of bringing about general adherence to such a policy throughout the cigarette industry.” Hahn continued by stating that American Tobacco Company intended to continue its policy of making no questionable claims or implications in the advertising of its cigarettes. American Tobacco Company would also be willing to abide by any standards that it deems fair and proper. To that end, American Tobacco Company said that it believed that statements made by advertisers should be “truthful, clear, understandable, and warranted by facts.”

As a result of the implementation of the code, cigarette advertising changed track within a matter of months. Instead of advertisements that showed dark stains on filters or referred to the health concerns related to smoking, advertisements featured good taste and pleasure. The cigarette advertising practices that are now condemned, such as the upbeat quality of the advertisements and the alluring portraits of the joys of smoking at work and at play, date from the implementation of the FTC’s code in 1955. When it prohibited the mention of doctors and coughs, the FTC removed the most powerful weapons from the small cigarette companies. Even in the face of more convincing cancer research, the sales of cigarettes came back with force in 1955 and continued strongly through the late 1950s and early 1960s.

In 1955, after the hearing examiner dismissed the charges against Liggett and Meyers

---

and other tobacco companies on grounds that the claims were puffery, the FTC ordered that the proceedings before a hearing examiner continue to decide if the makers of Chesterfield cigarettes used false advertising when they claimed that their cigarettes were “Milder,” “Soothing and Relaxing,” and had no “Unpleasant After-Taste.” By reversing this decision and remanding the case to the examiner, the FTC stated:

We do not agree with the examiner’s findings that the representations “Milder,” “Soothing and Relaxing,” and “Unpleasant After-Taste” are laudatory, harmless, or mere “puffing” terms.313

Recognizing that misleading representations are difficult to distinguish and that “puffing” is usually an expression of opinion, the Commission stated:

In our judgment, the questioned representations present sufficient factual issues – as to qualities which Chesterfield cigarettes may or may not possess – to warrant completion of these proceedings.314

Although the FTC disagreed with the examiner’s general conclusions, the Commission agreed with the examiner in dismissing the charges revolving around the use of the word “cooler.” The FTC agreed with the examiner’s finding that there was “no evidence, certainly no substantial evidence on the issue of coolness.” However, the Commission wanted the rest of the examiner’s decision to be overturned. As further grounds for reversing the hearing examiner’s decision, the Commission said:

We also do not agree with the hearing examiner’s conclusion that a prima facie case has not been established. There is in the record considerable uncontroverted respectable evidence that is relevant to the issues here involved. Our view is that a prima facie case has been established, by which we do not necessarily mean that on the basis of the present record an order

to cease and desist would issue, but rather that there is in the record reliable
evidence which, when considered in connection with reasonable inferences
which may be drawn therefrom, would probably support an order in the

Another issue that was causing additional concern at the FTC was centering on the
claims being made about the new filter tip cigarettes. On May 6, 1955 FTC’s Director of the
Bureau of Consultation, Charles E. Grandey, wrote a letter to Horace G. Hitchcock of the
Manhattan law firm Chadbourne, Parke, Whiteside, Wolff & Brophy; the law firm
represented the tobacco industry. Grandey wrote,

> In recent weeks there has been a noticeable broadening of claims made for
> filter tip cigarettes. It is therefore especially requested that your company re-
> examine its present claims for its products, particularly filter tip cigarettes, in
> light of proposed Guide No. 2. If, upon reexamination, your company finds
> that any of its claims are not in harmony with the suggested guides, it is
> requested that the necessary changes to that end be made.\footnote{Grandey-CE, “Letter to Horace Hitchcock,” May 6, 1955. Bates Number: 968237839/7840 <http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/alv94f00> (Retrieved 1 September 2006).}

The new advertisements for the filter tip cigarettes implied that filters made cigarette
smoking less harmful. This claim was in clear violation of Guide No. 2 that stated that
cigarette advertisements “Should not represent directly or by implication that cigarette
smoking in general or the smoking of any brand of cigarettes is (a) not harmful or (b) not
irritating.”

The late 1950s brought more charges against the tobacco industry. After 1955, the
fear of cancer persisted but most means for exploiting that fear were prevented. The
publicity linking cigarette smoking to cancer took its toll on the industry and smoking began
to decline. The industry’s response to these events was the aggressive marketing of filtered
cigarettes. Filters had been on the market before but had not achieved a significant market
share. The market share for filtered brands grew from 10 percent in 1954 to 35 percent in 1957. The reason for this increase was the belief that filters significantly reduced the amount of “tar” that the smoker ingested. Therefore, filters were marketed with direct appeals to smokers’ health concerns. For instance:

L&M: “This is it. L&M filters are just what the doctor ordered!”
Kent: “What a priceless difference in PROTECTION a few extra pennies make!”
Viceroy: “New Health-Guard filter makes Viceroy better for Your Health.”
Parliament: “Recessed Filter – Maximum Health Protection.”

This theme of reassurance surfaced again in the “tar derby,” in which many cigarette brands competed to position themselves as being lower in tar and nicotine than the other brands. Finding this competition identical to a new barrage of health claims, the FTC ordered this practice stopped in 1959-1960.

In 1957 the FTC began to pursue antitrust action against Phillip Morris, Inc.

Specifically, the FTC issued a complaint that Phillip Morris was in violation of the Clayton Act. The FTC complaint stated that Phillip Morris “violated and is now violating the provisions of subsection (d) of Section 2 of the Clayton Act as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act (U.S.C. Title 15 Section 13). The Robinson-Patman Amendment to the Clayton Act requires that, if promotional allowances are given they be made available to all

competing customers on proportionally equal terms.\textsuperscript{321} The FTC charged that Phillip Morris,

1) Paid allowances in varying amounts to some customers, but did not do so or offer to do so, in any amount, to other competing customers.
2) In paying such allowances to competing customers, did so in amounts not equal to the same percentage of such competing customers’ net purchases and not proportionately equal by any other test; and did not offer or otherwise accord or make available such allowances to all such competing customers in amounts equal to the largest of such percentages, or proportionately equal by any other test.
3) In paying such allowances to competing customers, required some of them to comply with certain terms and to furnish or make certain reciprocal service or payments, but did not require others to do so in any manner or amount, or required them to do so in a less burdensome manner or in lesser amounts, and did not proportionally equal by any other test.
4) In determining allowances to be paid competing customers, did so on the basis of individual negotiations with each such customer, which resulted in proportionately unequal, different, and arbitrary terms.\textsuperscript{322}

As an example of this unlawful treatment of customers, the complaint cites a record of payments made in 1956 to various retailers for items such as posters, carton displays, counter displays, and change trays. The complaint continues by listing the amounts paid to various companies selling the Phillip Morris brand through vending machines. Allowances were also granted to customers functioning as tobacco wholesalers. For example, The Metropolitan Tobacco Company of New York City was paid $50,000.00 in allowances in 1956, yet nothing was offered to any of the other wholesale customers competing with it.\textsuperscript{323}

The cigarette market underwent another informational jolt in 1957. Health experts began to argue that reducing the tar content in cigarettes would be likely to reduce the risk of lung cancer as more studies linking smoking and lung cancer were published. Attention

\textsuperscript{321} FTC, “Press Release, Publication” April 4, 1957 Bates Number: 963025771/5772 \texttt{<http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/wtk85f00>} (Retrieved 1 September 2006).
\textsuperscript{323} FTC, Press Release, Publication April 4, 1957 Bates Number: 963025767/5768 \texttt{<http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/utk85f00>} (Retrieved 1 September 2006).
quickly focused on the newly popular filter cigarettes whose tar and nicotine yield had not yet been publicly revealed. Congressional hearings were held on filter cigarette advertising, new tar and nicotine ratings were published in *Consumer Reports*, and a two part series on cigarette filters appeared in Reader’s Digest. Each report concluded that filter cigarettes had been so greatly modified to enhance flavor that their tar and nicotine yield was generally no better than that of nonfilter cigarettes.\(^ {324} \)

This news initiated the great “Tar Derby.” Notwithstanding the FTC guides, vigorous advertising of tar and nicotine content returned, new filter brands were introduced, and existing filters were improved. And, in a development that the FTC had earlier thought to be technically impossible, the tar and nicotine levels of nonfilter cigarettes was significantly reduced. However, the FTC guides continued to prohibit tar and nicotine claims that were not based on scientific proof. But, with so much noncommercial data on the subject of filters becoming available in technical journals and in the popular press, the “sound scientific data” requirement became another large loophole in the Commission’s policy.\(^ {325} \)

In July 1957, the Senate introduced a bill that would have required a mandatory warning on cigarette packs. That same month, the House of Representatives introduced a bill that required the disclosure of tar and nicotine levels on cigarette packs. The tobacco industry was in opposition to both bills.\(^ {326} \)

However, during this time when FTC regulation was needed most, the Commission


was found to be relatively unable to enforce any standards on the tobacco industry. In 1958 the FTC was the subject of hearings conducted by the Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs, over which Representative John A. Blatnik (MN) presided. This Subcommittee was concerned with FTC efficiency in the field of false and misleading advertising in several areas that included filter-tip cigarettes. The topic of advertising for filter-tip cigarettes was of concern to the Subcommittee because of the health related claims that the filter-tip cigarette manufactures were making and because of the fact that the filter-tip cigarettes often contained more nicotine than previous unfiltered cigarettes. Many of the advertisements for filter-tip cigarettes made claims that the tips would remove the elements of smoke that endangered the public’s health. However, the true effectiveness of the filters often came into question. The level of nicotine and tar in cigarettes also was a cause for concern. For instance, L&M cigarettes produced by Liggett & Myers contained 1.5 milligrams of nicotine and 11 milligrams of tar in 1955. However, two years later there was a 70 percent increase in nicotine and a 33 percent increase in tar. In 1958 when L&M introduced its filter, the tar content climbed to 17 milligrams. In June of 1958, six prominent brands of cigarettes were all advertising the lowest tar content.\footnote{The Tar Derby’s climax came during 1959. All six major manufacturers were in the}

While the FTC failed to protect consumers against these false claims, it is also true that the FTC lacked the power to do so. The power of the FTC was limited in controlling tobacco advertising because it did not have the power to ask a court for an injunction when tobacco was concerned. The FTC has this power when the advertising is related to other products such as foods, drugs, cosmetics, and devices. Therefore, the FTC needed this power to effectively govern cigarette advertising.\footnote{The Tar Derby’s climax came during 1959. All six major manufacturers were in the}

\footnote{John A. Blatnik “The Medicine Man under the Eagle’s Eye” \textit{The Progressive} (November 1958) p.6.} \footnote{John A. Blatnik “The Medicine Man under the Eagle’s Eye” \textit{The Progressive} (November 1958) p.6.}
process of mounting major advertising campaigns to introduce their new lower tar brands, when the FTC intervened. In December of 1959, the Bureau of Consultation at the FTC started to negotiate secretly with the six companies. First, every claim about levels of nicotine and tar would be considered an implied claim of positive health effects. Second, epidemiological evidence of the health effects related to cigarette smoking would be mandated for future claims. Everyone realized that this type of evidence did not exist and could not be produced for many years.\textsuperscript{329}

The furious Tar Derby was still raging in 1960 when the FTC, which previously had not achieved complete success in trying to get tobacco manufacturers to moderate their claims about filter cigarettes, put its foot down and announced that no more tar-and-nicotine claims would be permitted in cigarette advertising.\textsuperscript{330} Early in 1960, the Commission announced it had achieved a significant success from its negotiations with the six companies. The FTC negotiated a "voluntary" industry-wide ban that removed nearly all mention of tars and nicotine instantaneously. For instance, Kent advertisements changed its slogan from "significantly less tars and nicotine than any other filter brand" to "designed with your taste in mind." Likewise, Lorillard reintroduced the unfiltered king-size version of Old Gold, and created a new advertising campaign that would center on the slogan "tender to your taste." Once again the tobacco industry returned its traditional and usually successful course—advertising pleasure, flavor and taste against a backdrop of glamour, beauty, and ease. The formula worked, its success was proven by all-time highs in sales.\textsuperscript{331}

For six years that followed, cigarette advertising was devoid of all references to tar


and nicotine. Likewise, information regarding nicotine and tar nearly disappeared from nearly all other sources as well. Consumer Reports stopped publishing its tar and nicotine ratings and Reader's Digest continued to do so only occasionally. The new advertising regulations doomed the new low-tar brands. Regarding the FTC intervention, one advertising professional noted: "[Y]ou build a better mousetrap and then they say you can’t mention mice or traps."332

A Second Attempt at a Voluntary Advertising Code:

In 1963, the United States Department of Justice in collaboration with the FTC began seeking out ways it could create a “voluntary” advertising code that would define “good advertising practices” and eliminate “undesirable advertising.” In a May 20, 1963 letter to Robert L. Wald of Wald, Harkrader & Rockefeller, the legal counsel of P. Lorillard Company, from Lee Loevinger, the Assistant Attorney General of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, undesirable advertising is “advertising that makes an appeal to young persons or which attempts to glamorize smoking by relating it to youth, sex, romance, success, and so forth.” The letter continues to state P. Lorillard Company was prepared to submit to the Department of Justice an advertising code that might be adopted.333

Because of its legal dealings with the FTC and legislature, the tobacco industry considered whether it was advisable to adopt a voluntary advertising code in 1964. In a meeting of Liggett executives and J. Walter Thompson, Liggett’s President, Zach Thoms asked the advertising agency to do some exploratory research on a voluntary advertising code. The proposed code included a warning label that was to have read:

This product is intended for the use of adults only. Excessive use may be injurious to health, and in certain cases, even moderate use may be inadvisable.

However, the tobacco industry had some concerns about how a voluntary cigarette advertising code might relate to antitrust laws. For instance, in the May 20, 1963 letter to Walt of Lorillard Tobacco Company from the U.S. Department of Justice stated the following in reference to potential antitrust concerns that might arise from following the proposed code, “The Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice has concluded that the Department will not institute criminal proceedings against the tobacco companies and/or their representatives…”334 In a June 19 letter to a Washington law firm representing the industry, Antitrust Division Chief, William, H. Orrick, Jr. noted that the Federal Trade Commission was considering standards to regulate cigarette labeling and advertising and that the House Interstate Commerce Committee would be conducting hearings on a number of bills that would establish regulations for tobacco advertising. "Under these circumstances," Mr. Orrick wrote, "it would be inappropriate for us to give any sanction to the permanent establishment of a private organization, setting industry standards until the views of Congress and the Federal Trade Commission have been made known. In the meantime, however, we assure you that no criminal antitrust prosecution will be brought by us as a result of adherence to the code."335 If the tobacco industry was not protected from antitrust laws, the code's provisions might raise technical questions of restricting competition through limiting advertising.

Under the terms of the 1964 code, the manufacturers agreed not to advertise on


certain television programs and in certain types of periodicals that targeted a younger audience. Specifically, the code’s provisions generally banned the use of celebrity endorsements, advertising in college newspapers and other media directed primarily at those under the age of 21, health claims, and the use of models under the age of 25 or who appear to be under the age of 25. The tobacco industry also agreed not to solicit the trade of persons under 21 years old through the distribution of free cigarette samples. However, the code also discouraged marketing techniques such as trade names for filters (Kent’s "Micronite" name, for example, was banned), further reducing the stock of code phrases used to remind smokers of health fears. In 1966, Time magazine observed, "between the federal Trade Commission and their own industry’s self-imposed Cigarette Advertising Code, cigarette salesmen have just about been reduced to saying that a smoke is a smoke." The authority to enforce the code was given to the Code Administrator who was empowered to assess up to $100,000.00 in damages. The first and only Code Administrator was New Jersey Governor Robert B. Meyner.

Although withdrawing advertising from student newspapers was part of the Cigarette Advertising Code of 1964, the formal decision to withdraw campus advertising was brought before the Tobacco Institute during meeting on June 18, 1963. The minutes from the meeting state,

Mr. [Robert B.] Walker announced that The American Tobacco Company had already decided to terminate its entire college promotional program and

---


that the decision was effective and being implemented. Mr. [William S.] Smith stated that R.J. Reynolds had already cancelled its advertising in college publications for the coming fall and that the Reynolds company had also decided to terminate its college promotional program. Mr. [Morgan J.] Cramer stated that the Lorillard Company had also already decided to terminate its college advertising and promotion. Mr. [Edwin P.] Finch indicated that Brown & Williamson Corporation had been considering the matter, and that it had decided to terminate its program. Mr. [Zach] Toms said that the Liggett and Myers Tobacco Company’s current view was that it was going to terminate its college promotion, with the possible exception of college publication advertising using the same copy as they used in national magazines and newspapers. Mr. Paul Smith said that Phillip Morris had been considering the question of college advertising and promotion, but that Mr. Cullman was out of the country and that Phillip Morris had not reached any decision on its policy.339

In addition to their general consensus, with the exception of Phillip Morris, that cigarettes should no longer be advertised in campus newspapers, the major tobacco companies also decided how they were going to publicize the issue. The minutes for June 18, 1963 continued

It was the consensus of the group that the Institute should not affirmatively seek to publicize the individual decisions of the various companies to give up college advertising and promotional activities. On the other hand, it was felt that, if Mr. [George V.] Allen [President of the Tobacco Institute] should receive inquiries from the trade press or other areas, it would be proper for him to reemphasize the industry’s position that smoking is an adult custom and report the fact that, to avoid any confusion and misunderstanding in the public mind as to this position, a number of the member companies of the Institute had each decided to discontinue college advertising and promotional activities.340

On June 19, 1963 the Tobacco Institute’s public relations agency, Hill & Knowlton, issued the following statement to the press on the issue of advertising in college newspapers:

In response to a question from Peter Bart of The New York Times, George V. Allen, president of The Tobacco Institute, Inc., today made the following statement:

---


"The tobacco industry's position has always been that smoking is an adult custom. To avoid any confusion or misconception in the public mind as to this position, a number of member companies of the Tobacco Institute, I understand, have each decided to discontinue college advertising and promotional activities."

The next meeting of the Tobacco Institute held on July 9, 1963 referenced the large amount of publicity that was centering on decision to discontinue advertising in student newspapers. Nearly every major daily newspaper in the nation covered the decision. The minutes of the meeting stated:

In view of the amount of publicity and speculation expected to attend any announcement bearing on cigarette advertising or promotion, it was suggested by several members that President Allen's announcement should be the only statement of the Institute's activity and that none of the members should speak to the press with respect to the Institute's decisions. It was of course recognized, however, that any press inquiry relative to the decisions or policies of an individual company was peculiarly a matter for the particular company concerned rather than for the Institute.

Usually pressure from the FTC had been the impetus for “self-regulation” in the tobacco industry. However, in the case of student newspapers, it seems that the negative publicity that the industry was receiving for advertising on campus motivated the decision, at least in part. The minutes from the July 9, 1963 meeting of the Tobacco Institute also reflect the concern about public opinion. The minutes from the meeting continued by stating,

There then ensued discussion of the continued appearance in the press of repetitious anti-tobacco charges, and the view was expressed that to many members of the public these repetitions of old charges against tobacco were not recognized as such, but were possibly accepted as new material supporting those who have attacked tobacco. The question was considered whether any steps could be taken by the Institute to correct misconceptions that probably resulted from some of the activities of groups which were attacking the use of tobacco as, for example, the possible use by the Institute of ads in newspapers or other media, which would present facts relating to

---
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tobacco and health and correct some of the distortions and misconceptions which may have arisen.\textsuperscript{343}

Although public opinion certainly factored into the discontinuation of campus newspaper advertising and the adoption of a new advertising code, the impact of the impending release of the Surgeon General’s Report in January of 1964 also factored into the decision-making process. For instance, in September of 1963 Liggett & Myers Tobacco Company’s Surgeon General’s Committee met about the potential consequences of the Surgeon General’s Report and the potential FTC and FDA regulations that might result from the report’s findings.

When the 1964 Code was enacted, it was heralded as an exercise in “responsible” self-regulation. However, the Code proved not to be true regulation at all. First, the office of the Code Administrator “practically died stillborn.” Even though he had the ability to enact some small changes in advertising practices, such as persuading Liggett to discontinue its use of the term “snowy white” to describe its filter, Governor Meyner found that whenever he endeavored to employ the full scope of his authority, the tobacco industry withdrew from his supervision.\textsuperscript{344} For instance, Lorillard withdrew from the Code when it was fined for running an unapproved advertisement. All of the cigarette companies except R.J. Reynolds and Phillip Morris followed. However, the judge in the Lorillard case testified that it withdrew from both the Code Authority and the Tobacco Institute because it wanted to promote True cigarette’s nicotine and tar levels, a practice forbidden by the code.\textsuperscript{345} After
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\textsuperscript{345} Judge Depo. At 233
resisting its own self-regulation, the industry moved into the comfortable position of regulating each other’s compliance with the Advertising Code.\textsuperscript{346}

In addition, the Code did not significantly impact the Tobacco Industry’s historic reliance on the two advertising themes of safety and glamour. Of course, the identifiable film, television and sports stars no longer appeared in the advertisements. However, in their place appeared depictions of happy, healthy, macho, or glamorous models occupied in a range of exotic or enviable social activities. Like the preceding celebrity advertisements, these messages were designed to increase the cigarette market.\textsuperscript{347}

Furthermore, the Institute’s declaration that smoking was “a custom for adults,” and thus, presumably not one for non-adults, did have one result that applied on a more general basis than merely the college publication level. In the Fall of 1963, the American Tobacco Company began an extensive campaign for Lucky Strike cigarettes in which the advertising copy stated, “smoking is a pleasure meant for adults.” This sentiment appeared under a headline spread over two pages that asserted, “Lucky Strike Separates the Men from the Boys…But Not from the Girls.” On the left hand side of the page, the first part of the headline was illustrated by a photograph of a helmeted, Lucky Strike-smoking racecar driver who was smilingly flourishing a winner’s cup as he received the envious glances of youth pressing close behind him. The second part of the headline was illustrated by a shot of the same model –still equipped with his cigarette, smile and cup but without the young male


fans. Instead, the driver is being hugged by a female admirer. Therefore, the advertising professionals used the FTC regulation to transform their advertising message to illustrate the theme that cigarettes are not for boys, thus achieved the opposite effect by making the smoking of Lucky Strike the act that turns a boy into a man.\textsuperscript{348}

**Finally, a Victory for the FTC?**

The much heralded cigarette advertising code went into full effect on January 1, 1955. Although there is no effective way to rebut the proposition that cigarette companies submitted to the Code’s authority, critics of the code believe that they did so only to the extent that it served their economic purposes. For instance, some Congressional Representatives felt that the FTC’s Code had not gone far enough. Representative John Blatnik’s Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations organized hearings to investigate the FTC’s response to misleading advertising by the tobacco industry. And, the report from the hearings concluded that the FTC failed to fulfill its duty by not intervening further. The subcommittee swiftly dissolved and further hearings were cancelled. Some believed that the cancellation was evidence of the strong pro-tobacco forces within Congress.\textsuperscript{349} However, others believed that the Code was a very effective FTC regulation. A case could be made that Governor Meynor, and by inference, the Advertising Code, affected significant long-term changes in cigarette marketing practices.

Ultimately, when it was released, the political impact of the 1964 Surgeon General's Report was enormous. Within weeks, the FTC published a draft trade rule requiring health warnings in advertisements. The FTC proposed the initiation of proceedings relating to “the advertising and labeling of cigarettes. In June of 1964, rule-making proceedings were


\textsuperscript{349}Mark Parascandola “Public Health Then and Now: Cigarettes and the US Public Health Service in the 1950s” *American Journal of Public Health,* 91(2) February 2001 pp. 196-205.
initiated to require a health warning on packages, effective January 1, 1965, and advertising, effective July 1, 1965. The proposed warning was that “cigarette smoking is dangerous to health and may cause death from cancer and other diseases.”

The 1966 Report of Code Authority of the National Association of Broadcasters details four pages of changes in cigarette advertising techniques that were initiated by the Code Administrator. Furthermore, Governor Meynor rejected a number of advertisements and issued a set of procedural regulations. He also helped create regulations that restricted advertising during television programs that had a viewing audience that was over 45 percent under the age of 21. The Code also kept tobacco advertising out of school newspapers.

The 1964 Surgeon General’s Report was the needed impetus that brought the normally passive FTC to action. However, the FTC faced numerous obstacles. In June of 1964, FTC Chairman Paul Rand Dixon declared in testimony before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that the FTC had decided on a ruling that a strong health warning be put on every cigarette package and included in every advertisement. However, the committee gave Mr. Dixon a hostile reception. The FTC’s proposed ruling led those sympathetic to the tobacco industry to accuse it of discriminating against a legally sold product and of usurping the legislative functions of Congress.

The FTC did not receive any support from President Johnson. In fact, the White House intervened to delay putting the agency’s ruling into effect. In spite of what the Surgeon General said about the hazardous effects of cigarette smoking, the opposition to cigarette advertising regulation was formidable. Tobacco was a one-billion-dollar-a-year

---


agricultural product and a ten-billion-dollar-a-year consumer product, from which federal
and state governments gained over four-billion-dollars-a-year in tax revenue. The
Department of Agriculture regularly subsidized it with millions of dollars in price supports.\(^{353}\)

At the time of the Surgeon General’s report, the tobacco industry was spending $250
million each year on advertising. The weight of the combined strength of the tobacco
industry and its allies was felt in the form of the proposed legislation named the Cigarette
Labeling and Advertising Bill of 1965. This legislation appeared to protect smokers by
requiring a warning on cigarette packs (Caution: Cigarette Smoking May be Hazardous to
your health). However, in the end, it would actually constitute a legislative triumph for the
tobacco lobby. This piece of legislation was considered a victory for tobacco because it
prevented the FTC or any other government agency from mandating that tobacco
companies include a health warning in their cigarette advertising for the next four years. The
cigarette manufacturers continued merchandising their products with new vigor.\(^{354}\)

Although it endured some hard blows, the American cigarette industry remained
undefeated. For instance, although the industry received a great deal of negative publicity, if
you measured the influence of cigarette advertising against the anti-tobacco information,
advertising and pro-smoking messages still claimed an undisputed victory. The initial drop in
cigarette sales caused by the Surgeon General’s Report and the Reader’s Digest articles was
ultimately recovered. From 1953 to 1970 the number of cigarettes smoked in the U.S. in a
year increased from three hundred and eighty seven billion to more than half a trillion. Only
part of this market growth could be explained by an increase in population or on an adult
per capita basis. Therefore, the prosperity of the American tobacco industry, in spite of its

problems, was still greater than any other period in history.\textsuperscript{355}

Therefore, the anticipated Surgeon General’s report alone did not necessitate the creation of the FTC’s Code and the removal of the advertisements in the college student newspapers. Nor, was it the case that medical findings had no role, because without the release of the medical reports and statements during the 1950s and 1960s the collegiate community’s response as well as the FTC’s response to the issue would likely have been even slower. But there were a variety of other factors that influenced how the medical statements and reports were translated into a regulatory strategy, and those factors eventually tipped the balance in the direction of tobacco advertising regulation.

Chapter Five: Results From the Study of *The Orange and White*

In order to better understand the influence that cigarette manufacturers had on college campuses, this study looks at the advertisements that were printed in *The Orange and White*. The internal tobacco industry documents show that the same national advertisements were printed in dozens of universities across the nation. Therefore, the advertisements printed in *The Orange and White* are fairly representative of what one would find in any large university in the United States.

**Research Models:**

The data analysis for this paper is divided into two parts. The first section provides charts and graphs that provide descriptive statistical information about the data. The analysis examines the number of advertisements that were printed in *The Orange and White* each year, the brands that were advertised, and the creative strategies and tactics that were used. After a discussion of the charts and graphs, the paper follows with a discussion of the advertising campaigns that were used for each brand during the decade being examined. (All figures are located in the appendix that starts on page 217 and ends on page 348.)

*Taylor’s Strategy Wheel:*

Researchers who study creative and message strategy have recognized the importance of mapping the various strategies in advertising. One model that maps various creative strategies is Taylor’s Six-Segment Strategy Wheel. The strategy is based in the Foote,
Cone, & Belding (FCB) Grid. The FBC Grid combines high and low level involvement and left and right brain specialization.\textsuperscript{357}

The first division of the strategy wheel divides the wheel into a “Transmission view” and “Ritual view,” based on the work of James Carey. The terms “informational” and “transformational,” “claim” and “image,” and “rational” and “emotional” have also been used to label this distinction. The wheel identifies six message strategies, three transmission-based strategies and three ritual-based strategies.\textsuperscript{358}

The first strategy wheel segment (ego segment) is characterized by the Freudian Psychoanalytic Model. Products that are ego-related fulfill consumer’s emotional needs. These products allow the consumer to make a statement about who he or she is. The role of communication is to show how the product fits within the consumer’s definition of who he or she is. The second strategy wheel segment (social segment) is characterized by the Veblenian Social-Psychological Model. In this segment, products are used to make a statement to others and emotional needs are fulfilled by products that are visible to others. Appeals are directed towards being noticed, gaining social approval. The third segment (sensory segment) is based in Cyrenaics philosophy. Products provide consumers with moments of pleasure. Communication transforms the product into a pleasurable moment. The Pavlovian Learning Model characterizes the fourth segment (routine segment). Consumer decisions are motivated by rational buying motives. However, consumers do not invest large amounts of deliberation time and buy according to habit. Urgent needs characterize the fifth segment (acute need). Consumers desire pre-purchase information but time constraints limit the research process. Communication serves to build brand familiarity.

and recognition so that the brand is known and trusted. The sixth segment (rational segment) is typified by the Marshallian Economic Model. Consumers are assumed to be rational, conscious, and deliberative individuals. The consumers’ desire for product-related information is high. Product messages aim to inform and persuade (see Figure 1).\textsuperscript{359}

Advertisements were coded according to which segment represented the dominant strategy in the message. However, many messages use multiple strategies. However, for the sake of the charts and graphs, only one dominant strategy was selected. If multiple strategies were used in a campaign, they are discussed later in the results section when specific advertisements and campaigns are addressed.

\textit{Message Appeals:}

Like creative strategy, the individual tactics and appeals that are used in an advertisement are important elements to examine. Creative strategy is usually thought to be the larger ideas that govern a particular advertising or marketing campaign. Message appeals and tactics are the particular techniques that are used to accomplish the ends of the selected strategy. Therefore, the tactics are the particular persuasive devises that work to help accomplish the advertisement’s general persuasive goals. Usually, presenting product-related data and statistics is not enough to alter a consumer’s attitude or behavior. Some appeal or incentive needs to be employed to create change. Message appeals include reward appeals and emotional appeals.

Although people experience an array of emotions, three basic emotions are used most frequently in advertising. The three appeals that are used most frequently used are fear, humor, and warmth. Within the context of emotional appeals, humor is the emotional

appeal that is used most frequently in cigarette advertisements. Although humor appeals are the most frequently used emotional appeal in cigarette advertising, many scholars argue that humor does not persuade. However, research has shown that 20-44% of television commercials use humor. Some research-supported guidelines suggest males are more influenced by humor and that humor promotes positive affect and less counter arguing.

In addition to examining the influence of emotions, one can also examine the influence of the communicator. Traditionally, communication scholars have devoted considerable attention to “source credibility.” A source that is perceived to possess high levels of expertise by receivers as trained, experienced, skillful, informed, authoritative, able, and intelligent. Of course, different expert sources are important in different persuasion areas. For instance, some tobacco advertisements made use of experts such as tobacconists and physicians to promote the safety and quality of the product.

On the other hand, sometimes consumers respond to persuasion from sources that are similar to themselves. Examples of similar sources are people with the same problems, the same concerns, who are the same age, and who have the same interests and preferences. In addition, researchers have found that similarity increases message compliance. The similarity or “peer appeal” has a stronger influence on audience members when the source is a member of the same age group as the consumer. In addition to similarity, physical attractiveness also plays a role in advertising. There is considerable evidence that attractive

people are perceived to be more likable, friendly, interesting, poised, to make more money, and so forth.\textsuperscript{365}

The use of celebrity can be another extremely effective source tactic. Celebrities are most effective when the celebrity is an individual that consumers have a strong attachment for. Second, children are strongly influenced by celebrities who are currently “in.”\textsuperscript{366} Receivers also tend to follow the recommendations of celebrities if doing so helps them adapt to their environment. Another factor that can influence whether a celebrity will effectively endorse a product is the degree of match-up between the product and the celebrity spokesperson.\textsuperscript{367}

Another way through which a spokesperson, celebrity, expert or otherwise, might influence consumers is through a power relationship. Individuals in a power relationship can use rewards and punishments when influencing others. According to Raven, there are six basic types of social influence: informational, referent, expert, legitimate, reward, and coercive. The primary types of social influence observed in cigarette advertising were referent, reward, expert, and informational.\textsuperscript{368} Referent influence stems from the fact that the receiver identifies with the source or influence agent. The term “referent” is used to parallel the use of the term “referent group” in sociology. Referent group identification has a strong influence on behavior.\textsuperscript{369} When a person is attracted to another, and perceives similarity between them, he or she may comply with a request. Generally, any appeal to similarity or

mutual attraction can be called an instance of referent influence. A speaker that has expert influence or power over the receiver if the receiver believes that the source has superior knowledge or ability. Expert influence often influences private behavior or private adoption of beliefs. Reward influence is exerted if the agent can provide a positive incentive to a particular audience member. Sources who reward their audiences often promote more positive interactions between the target audience and the source. Further, agents who reward targets do not necessarily increase the extent to which the target identifies with them. Speakers also can try to influence through the use of information not previously available to receivers, or to employ logic or argument that receivers have not considered. Informational influence includes attempts at influencing others based on the content of the message, a message including facts, evidence, testimony or logical argument. Informational influence results in both a change in overt behavior and in private beliefs.370

In addition to coding advertisements according to the six segments of the Strategy Wheel, advertisements were also coded according to the persuasive message appeals that were used. These message appeals are called “creative tactics” in the charts and figures in this chapter of the paper. The creative tactics listed in the charts and figures include: celebrity appeals, referent appeals, informational appeals, humor appeals, reward appeals, and expert appeals. In order to differentiate celebrities and experts appeals from tactics that involve using a similar and/or attractive source, the term referent is used for non-expert and non-celebrity sources. However, it should be noted that some of the literature does use the term referent to encompass celebrity, expert and similar and/or attractive sources. The only tactics that were not derived from the literature were those that intended “to entertain” the audience. This category emerged from the data. For instance, a number of cigarette

advertisements used puzzles, games, or riddles to entice their audience to interact with their advertisement and product. Each advertisement was placed into only one category.

*The Orange and White* was published from September until June of each academic year. Because advertising campaigns in student newspapers are generally printed according to the academic year instead of the calendar year, the academic year was used for counting and classifying advertisements. However, in order to save space in the charts and graphs, the academic years are referenced according to the first year of the academic year (For instance, the 1920-1921 academic year is referenced as 1920).

**General Frequency Information for *The Orange and White* from 1920-1963:**

From 1920-1921 academic year to the 1963-1964 academic year, *The Orange and White* published a total of 2,399 advertisements that promoted the sale of cigarettes. The first cigarette advertisement appeared on February 24, 1921 and the final advertisement appeared on November 26, 1963. The 2,399 cigarette advertisements were published in a total of 1,650 issues of *The Orange and White*. The average number of cigarette advertisements to appear in a single issue of *The Orange and White* from the 1920-1921 academic year to the 1963-1964 academic year equals 1.5 ads.

Figure two shows the number of newspapers that were published, by decade, from 1920 to 1963. The second chart provides a comparison of the number of cigarette advertisements that were run in *The Orange and White* from the 1920-1921 academic year to the 1963-1964 academic year (see Figure 3). As the chart shows, the 1920s had the fewest number of advertisements with only 244 advertisements printed. The 1950s have the highest advertising frequency with a total of 966 advertisements. If the first and second charts are compared, it becomes evident that the increases in advertisements are not always linked to an increase in newspapers published. For instance, the largest number of editions of *The
Orange and White were published in the 1940s, however, the 1940s had relatively few advertisements for cigarettes (see Figure 2).

Figure four shows the variation in the number of cigarette advertisements printed in The Orange and White each decade. The graph clearly shows that even though the 1950s represents the highest frequency cigarette of advertising, other decades surpass or match the 1950s in the number of cigarette advertisements published. For instance, the 1930s and the 1960s surpass the 1950s at times. Likewise, at times, the 1920s nearly matches or surpasses the 1930s, 1940s, and 1960s advertising frequency (see Figure 4).

Figure five shows the frequency of advertising as it relates to the twelve most frequent cigarette advertisers in The Orange and White. As the decades progress from the 1920s to the 1960s the number of cigarette advertisers steadily increased. One of the primary reasons for the increase in advertisers is the increase in the number of cigarette brands offered due to the introduction of filtered brands. However, the most popular unfiltered brands, Chesterfield, Camel, and Lucky Strike advertise consistently until 1963 in spite of the introduction of filters (see Figure 5).

Figure six shows the most frequent cigarette advertisers for unfiltered cigarettes. Because filters were not introduced until the 1950s, this chart represents some of the largest cigarette advertisers in The Orange and White. Overall, Camel, Chesterfield (Chester.), and Lucky Strike (Luckies) are the most frequently promoted brands (see Figure 6).

Although their overall numbers are far lower than the unfiltered brands, the major filtered cigarette brands were more prevalent than their unfiltered counterparts from the mid 1950s until the end of cigarette advertising in 1964. The top four advertisers were Tareyton, Marlboro, Viceroy, and L&M or Liggett and Meyers. Although a menthol cigarette, Salem is included because it also advertised its filter (see Figure 7).
From the 1920s until the 1960s three major creative strategies dominated cigarette-advertising campaigns found in *The Orange and White*. From the 1930s until the 1960s the sensory approach dominated. However, in the 1920s and early 1930s the social strategy was most frequent because the social acceptability of smoking was in question. Likewise, during the late 1950s and early 1960s the social approach became more important because of the health consequences associated with smoking (see Figure 8).

**Cigarette Advertising in the *Orange and White* during the 1920s:**

The 1920s are a significant decade for cigarette advertising in campus newspapers because cigarette advertising began in campus newspapers during the 1920s and because cigarette advertising was working to make cigarette smoking more socially acceptable. Social acceptability was an essential issue among potential female smokers. The first cigarette advertisement appeared in the *Orange and White* on February 24, 1921. Chesterfield was the advertiser. Although cigarette advertising had a rather slow start during the 1920s, by the end of the decade cigarette advertising had a consistent place in the student newspaper. During the 1920s, a total of 244 cigarette advertisements were printed in the 300 issues of the *Orange and White* printed from 1920 to 1929. Thus, an average of .82 advertisements appeared in each edition of the newspaper.

During the 1920s, cigarette advertising increased but the advertising trend does not show a steady increase. Instead, the record shows a series of spikes. The following academic years had the greatest frequency of cigarette advertisements 1921-1922, 1926-1927, 1927-1928, and 1928-1929 academic years.\(^{371}\) The following academic years had the lowest frequency of cigarette advertising 1920-1921, 1922-1923, 1924-1925, and 1925-1926 (see Figure 9).

\(^{371}\) Please note that the years listed on graphs represent the first year of the academic year. For instance, the year 1920 represents the 1920-1921 academic year.
Four brands were advertised during the 1920s, Chesterfield, Old Gold, Fatima, and Camel. Chesterfield was the most frequently advertised brand with a total of 84 advertisements or 34% of the total advertising. Camel follows Chesterfield with a total of 73 advertisements or 30% of the advertising. Old Gold comes next with 61 advertisements or 25% of the advertising. And, Fatima is last with a total of 26 advertisements or 11% of the advertising (see Figures 10 and 11).

As both of these charts demonstrate, social strategies were the most prevalent approaches used in cigarette advertising in the *Orange and White* during the 1920s. Social strategies represented 67% of the advertising, or 164 total ads. The second most popular segment was the rational segment with 49 advertisements, or 20%, of the total number of cigarette advertisements. Both the ego and routine strategies comprised 5% of the total cigarette advertisements or 12 advertisements. The sensory approach was used in 7 advertisements or 3% of the total advertisements (see Figures 12 and 13).

During the 1920s, the referent appeal was the most prevalent approach used in cigarette advertising in the *Orange and White* representing 52% of cigarette advertising or 127 advertisements. Humor appeals were the second most prevalent tactic used in cigarette advertising in the *Orange and White* representing 21% or 51 advertisements. Tactics that served to inform the audience represented 11% or 27 advertisements. Appeals that emphasized a particular brand’s value or price represented 8% or 19 advertisements. Tactics that focused on brand loyalty represented 4% of the advertising or 10 advertisements. Celebrity appeals represent 3% of cigarette advertising or 7 advertisements. Reward influence comprised 1% of cigarette advertising or 3 advertisements (see Figures 14 and 15).

One of the primary reasons that the referent appeal and social strategy seemed to dominate the *Orange and White* advertising campaigns during the 1920s was the need to make
cigarette smoking socially acceptable. During the 1920-1921 academic year, the vast majority, 12 of the 13 total advertisements, of the cigarette advertisements only featured men. The one advertisement that featured a woman did not depict her as a smoker. Chesterfield was the only advertiser during this academic year. No people were featured in the cigarette advertising campaign during the 1921-1922 academic year. Fatima was the only brand advertised. During the 1922-1923 academic year 15 of the 16 total advertisements only featured men and the one advertisement that depicted both sexes did not show either person smoking. Fatima was the only brand promoted. During the 1924-1925 academic year, no cigarette advertisements appeared in the *Orange and White*. For the 1925-1926 academic year, the advertisements featured men only. Camel was the only advertiser. For the first time during the 1926-1927 academic year, more than one cigarette advertiser bought advertising space in the *Orange and White*. Chesterfield, Old Gold, and Camel advertised using primarily men in the 41 advertisements that appeared in the *Orange and White*. A few ads featured women and three advertisements depicted women smoking. During the 1927-1928 academic year, Chesterfield, Camel, and Old Gold continued to advertise and the number of women in advertisements continued to increase. Of the 50 advertisements printed, 35 featured women and eight of the 35 showed women as smokers. More than half of the advertisements featured women. In the 1928-1929 academic year, 20 of the 42 advertisements featured women in some capacity. Again, about half of the advertisements included women. And, Chesterfield, Camel, and Old Gold continued to be the primary advertisers. During the 1929-1930 academic year the number of cigarette advertisements fell to 25 and Old Gold and Chesterfield were the only advertisers. However, 15 advertisements, nearly two-thirds of the total, featured women (see Figure 16).

**Advertisements published in the *Orange and White* During the 1920s:**
Chesterfield:

The first cigarette advertisement was printed in the *Orange and White* on February 24, 1921. The advertisement for Chesterfield Cigarettes was a quarter of a page in size. The campaign utilized a social strategy that marked occasions for smoking cigarettes. For instance, the example in the figure provided (see Figure 17) centers on a sitting for a portrait. The man being photographed is nervous but the photographer makes him smile by showing him a package of Chesterfields. Therefore, this soft-sell approach shows that cigarettes can be used to put someone at ease. The primary tactic that is used is humor. The headline reads, “I smiled – and he shot me.” This initially shocking statement is further explained through the text. The text reads:

“I smiled – and he shot me.”

AFTER MONTHS and months,
MY WIFE Persuaded me.
SO I went around
TO THE photographer,
AND GOT mugged.
WHEN THE pictures came,
I SHOWED them to a gang,
OF AMATURE art critics,
AND PROFESSIONAL crabs,
DISGUISED as friends
WHO FAVORED me.
WITH SUCH remarks as
“DOESN’T HE look natural?”
“HAS IT got a tail?”
“A GREAT resemblance.”
AND THAT last one
MADE ME sore.
SO WHEN friend wife
ADDED HER howl
I TRIED again.
THIS TIME they were great.
FOR HERE’S What happened.
The PHOTOGRAPHER said,
“LOOK THIS way please”
AND HELD up something
AS HE pushed the button,
AND NO one could help
BUT LOOK pleasant.
FOR WHAT he held up
WAS A nice full pack
OF THE cigarettes
THAT SATISFY.

Other advertisements in this campaign were entitled “Every man in class knew the answer, “The tale of a dog – with a moral,” and “Transfer? A fat chance!” The advertisements were targeted at college-aged men.

Humor appeals are used throughout the advertisement in the description of the situations and the double-meanings of the words that are used. Humor is a tactic that complements a social strategy because humor is an important facet of social situations. Although the social strategy is the primary vehicle used to help persuade the audience, a sensory strategy is also employed. The man being photographs smiles because Chesterfield cigarettes satisfy.

Because the question of women smoking was a prevalent issue on college campuses, this first advertising campaign centers on male characters. Only one advertisement features a female and she is not depicted as a smoker. This Chesterfield campaign lasted until June 2, 1921. Another important feature of this advertising campaign is that it appears to have been developed for college students. Several of the advertisements mention the collegiate environment or professors.

After several years without making an appearance in the Orange and White, Chesterfield advertises again during the 1926-1927 academic year. Again, Chesterfield uses a social strategy. The advertisement shows men at a nightclub purchasing cigarettes from a cigarette girl. The dominant strategy in this advertisement is a social strategy. The text reads, “The natural choice – Out of the whole lot men pick Chesterfield for its genuine tobacco character – its natural good taste.” The text and the image reinforce the popularity of
Chesterfield. In addition, the text suggests that smoking is a habit for men. This text might serve to pacify universities that opposed women smoking (see Figure 18).

However, by the 1928-1929 academic year Chesterfield seemed to be marketing to both men and women. The text of the advertisements no longer suggested that cigarette smoking was a practice for men. Women became active participants in the storyline plots and it was even suggested that they might smoke. To encourage the idea that smoking might be acceptable for women, a social strategy is used that allows women to fit within a smoking culture (see Figure 19).

**Camel:**

On October 20, 1921, the first Camel advertisement was published in the *Orange and White*. Instead of using a soft-sell approach like the first Chesterfield advertisements, Camel uses a rational approach that focuses on product quality. The advertisement describes the packaging that keeps the tobacco air-tight. Informational tactics reinforces the rational approach by persuading the consumer by providing privileged facts. Further, the advertisement states that Camels are for “men who think for themselves.” This reinforces both the rational strategy and the fact that smoking was not appropriate for college women. A secondary strategy that is present in this advertisement is the sensory strategy. The primary objective of the special cigarette packaging is to preserve taste. This campaign ran for the entire 1921-1922 academic year (see Figure 20).

Camel did not advertise in the *Orange and White* again until the 1925-1926 academic year. This advertisement uses a sensory strategy that positions smoking Camels as a reward after a long journey. The headline reads, “When silvery moonlight falls on town and field – and the long, joyous tour home is ready to begin – have a Camel!” This advertisement also emphasizes an aspirational lifestyle. The advertisement uses a referent appeal in its use of a
luxury vehicle and a wealthy couple enjoying an evening drive. However, neither person is shown with a cigarette (see Figure 21).

During the 1926-1927 academic year, Camel continued to combine a sensory strategy with referent appeals. Instead of an evening drive, this time the context is a formal social gathering. The headline reads, “Some call it mellowness…” and the text continues by describing the high-quality tobacco used in Camel Cigarettes. The image in the advertisement shows a party where men smoke and women are shown in the background dancing (see Figure 22).

Camel returned to a rational strategy that focused on product-related information during the 1928-1929 academic year. A secondary strategy that comes into play is the sensory strategy. The reason that Camel is particular about its product quality is because of the brand’s desire to make enjoyable cigarettes (see Figure 23).

*Fatima:*

In its first college advertising campaign in the *Orange and White* during the 1922-1923 academic year, Fatima made use of a popular advertising figure during the early 20th century, namely the bellhop. Bellhops or bellboys were frequently called upon to perform services for hotel guests. These errands could include delivering necessary items. And, one such item could be a pack of cigarettes. The turn of the century bellhop is also a recognizable symbol of the hospitality industry. Hoteliers take pride in the services they provide. The bellhop’s image is that of a helpful, friendly individual, someone you can turn to for assistance or information. The use of the bellhop also communicated luxury because expensive hotels frequently used bellboys (see Figure 24).

This campaign strategy combines an ego strategy with a routine strategy. The headline “Day in and day out!” suggests the cigarette can be depended upon to satisfy. The
large fluted Doric columns and the use of the bellhop suggests the luxury of the hotel and implies that the cigarette is high quality through association.

Fatima was not the only organization to make use of the bellboy in its advertising. Numerous advertisers used the bellhop to promote their products. At the turn of the century bellboys were often black and the black bellboy became a popular icon in the early 20th century consciousness (see Figure 25).

Fatima changed its campaign for the 1923-1924 academic year. Instead of using the bellhop and a luxury hotel to communicate quality, Fatima used an exotic social scene. The headline, “What a difference just a few cents make!” accompanied by a scene from a downhill skiing resort, suggests that Fatima is a luxury or ego brand. Thus, Fatima continued with the same ego strategy but changed the execution. Instead of using a bellhop, Fatima used the appeal of an aspirational social group. Unlike previous advertisements, this campaign used women prominently in the advertisements. However, the women were not depicted as smokers (see Figure 26).

Old Gold:

Old Gold began advertising in the Orange and White during the 1926-1927 academic year. The brand began advertising with the “Something Always takes the Joy out of Life” comic strip. A renowned cartoonist named Clare Briggs created the comic. Briggs was a featured cartoonist during the peak of American Newspapering, which spanned from 1900 to 1930. Briggs was born in Reedsburg, Wisconsin in 1875 and resided there until 1884 when he and his parents moved to Dixon, Illinois. Briggs's cartoons were syndicated across the country and, by the 1920's, he was one of the most highly paid illustrators in the United States. In addition to his newspaper work, Briggs also published a number of books of cartoons, Skin-nay, The Days of Real Sport, Ain't It a Grand and Glorious Feeling, and When a Feller
"Needs a Friend," also reached a large audience. Many of the comic strips printed in the *Orange and White* featured the titles of his books of cartoons such as “Ain't It a Grand and Glorious Feeling” and “When a Feller Needs a Friend.” The comic strip combined a social strategy that emphasized the social acceptability of smoking and, the importance of smoking Old Gold in particular, with humor tactics. This particular advertisement emphasizes the necessity of smoking Old Gold to make a good impression on a date. The fact that Old Gold does not irritate the throat is of particular importance. The advertisement concludes with Old Gold’s slogan “Not a Cough in the Carload (see Figure 27).

Like many other cigarette advertisers, Old Gold was eager to prove that cigarette smoking was socially acceptable for women by the end of the 1920s. Old Gold’s 1927-1928 campaign featured various prominent people who attested that Old Gold cigarettes were the best. It was the first cigarette campaign to use celebrity tactics in the *Orange and White*. For instance, in this particular advertisement heiress Gloria Laura Mercedes Morgan-Vanderbilt selected Old Gold as her cigarette of choice in a blind taste test (see Figure 28). This advertisement combines a sensory strategy with a celebrity testimonial tactic to help persuade women to start smoking.

During the 1928-1929 academic year, Old Gold continued to target women. Instead of using a taste test, this campaign again focused on persuading the audience that smoking Old Gold cigarettes does not cause coughing. This sensory strategy appeals to what the cigarettes do not do. In addition to the sensory strategy, the advertisement uses a celebrity testimonial tactic. Madge Bellamy praises Old Gold for being easy on her throat (see Figure
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The campaign also included the testimonial of the famous artist and illustrator James Montgomery Flagg.373

In addition to celebrity testimonials, Old Gold also published statements from local tobacconists that were popular with the University of Tennessee students in their advertisements. For instance, Gray Piper Drug Co., located at 1506 West Cumberland, Knoxville, TN said,

“The growth of OLD GOLD Cigarettes’ popularity here has been amazing to me, but what interests me most is the way students stick to the brand after they start smoking it. OLD GOLD smokers don’t switch.”374

Another leading tobacconist that served University of Tennessee students, J. Blaufeld & Son, 516 Gay Street, Knoxville, TN said,

“OLD GOLD is easily the fastest-growing cigarette in this locality, and I shouldn’t be surprised before long to find it the most popular cigarette on the campus. The boys sure do like its smoothness.”375

Because of the tobacco industry’s large budget, cigarette advertisers often could hire famous artists and designers to create their advertising. Few artists define an age as completely as John Held Jr. In many ways, he defines the "Roaring Twenties." Harold Ross, who was a boyhood friend created a feature called “Gay Nineties” that poked gentle fun at the previous generation. Done in linoleum cuts, these images have come to symbolize the era almost as much as his flappers are associated with the Twenties.

Seldom have two generations experienced such a gap. Mothers who grew up with those petticoats and hoopskirts must have looked at their flapper daughters and wondered how they could have gone so wrong. In popular magazines like Vanity Fair, Harper's Bazaar, and Redbook, his images of Betty Coed and Joe College were placed weekly before an adoring
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public of parents who longed to see some humor in the situation and the teenaged and college crowd who looked to them as role and style models. The skirts were never quite that short, nor were the sheiks quite so pencil-necked, but everyone wanted to believe that they were. Held's images reassured their delusions.\footnote{Jim Vadeboncoeur, Jr. “John Held Jr.” \textit{BPIB} \url{http://www.bpib.com/illustrat/johnheld.html#navigate} [Retrieved April 15, 2007]}

Old Gold’s use of Held’s creative abilities helped the brand resonate with a college audience during the 1920s. The Old Gold campaign’s humor does indeed make fun of the “Gay Nineties.” The creative strategy is primarily social because it reinforces the idea that smoking cigarettes is a modern way to distinguish one self from the previous generation (see Figures 30 and 31).

Old Gold concluded the decade with advertisements that promoted an Old Gold premium that was being offered with the purchase of Old Gold cigarettes (see Figure 32). The premium is an Old Gold velour cigarette box. This advertising approach combines a rational strategy with reward tactics. Again, from the advertisement itself and the design of the cigarette box, it seems that Old Gold is targeting female smokers.

\textit{Summary:}

During the 1920s cigarette advertising in the \textit{Orange and White} increased in its frequency and in the number of brands being advertised. In addition to increasing in its regularity, cigarette advertising also became more sophisticated in its message appeals. By the end of the decade, advertisements were using complex social strategies that associated cigarette smoking with high social status and helped to make smoking more socially acceptable for women. Cigarette advertising also seemed to reflect the progressive attitudes and optimism of the time period. Smoking seemed to be a way to celebrate the financial
prosperity and innovation of the 1920s. Although the advertisements clearly targeted the college-aged audience, relatively few advertisements used college students.

**Cigarette Advertising in the *Orange and White* the 1930s:**

By the 1930s, cigarette smoking had become a very popular habit among college students. In addition, cigarette smoking was socially acceptable for both genders on college campuses. Therefore the college market was an important target audience for cigarette advertising. Advertising frequency steadily increased into the 1930s. Cigarette advertising in the *Orange and White* more than doubled. During the 1920s, 244 cigarette advertisements ran in the newspaper. During the 1930s, 613 cigarette advertisements ran in the 403 editions of the newspaper that were published from the 1930-1931 academic year to the 1939-1940 academic year. Although the increase in the number of advertisements is large, the advertising frequency per edition did not change as much as one might guess. For instance, during the 1920s an average of .82 advertisements ran in each edition of the *Orange and White*. By the 1930s the average increased to 1.52 advertisements per edition. Although this increase is significant, it is smaller than one might have thought because the *Orange and White* changed from a weekly to a bi-weekly.

In addition to the change in advertising frequency, the 1930s began with a change in the basic approach that cigarette advertisers used. More advertisements were using a sensory strategy instead of a social strategy perhaps because public opinion of cigarette smoking had changed. In addition, cigarette smoking was depicted as a glamorous and sophisticated habit that was embraced by both celebrities and socialites.

From the 1930-1931 academic year to the 1939-1940 academic year about half of the 613 cigarette advertisements that ran in the *Orange and White* promoted Chesterfield cigarettes. Camel maintained a regular advertising frequency with 174 advertisements. And,
Lucky Strike began to print regular advertisements in the *Orange and White*. On the other hand, Old Gold’s numbers remained quite low when compared to the other brands (see Figures 33 and 34).

During the 1930s, the sensory strategy dominated creative strategy with 251 advertisements or 41% of the total advertising using this approach. The sensory strategy was the prominent approach in the 1930-1931, 1935-1936, 1936-1937, 1937-1938, 1938-1940 and 1939-1940 academic years. Although the sensory approach was the most frequently used approach, the social strategy was not far behind with 234 advertisements or 38% of the total advertising. In fact, the social strategy dominated from 1931 to 1934. A large number of advertisements, 20% of the total or 123 advertisements, used a rational approach. The ego strategy was the least frequently used with only 1% or 6 advertisements falling into this category (see Figures 35 and 36).

Although the social strategy no longer dominated cigarette advertising in the *Orange and White*, from a tactical perspective, the use of a socially desirable referent or celebrity was prevalent; for instance, 71% or 435 advertisements used this type of approach. An informational approach was fairly common; this approach was used in 74 advertisements or 12% of the total. Using a reward tactic was also used occasionally; 61 advertisements or 10% of the ads employed this tactical approach. Relatively few advertisements endeavored to entertain their audience. Only 4% or 25 advertisements used this approach. Few advertisements used humor to sell their product. Just 2% or 12 advertisements used this tactic. Using an expert was even more rare with only 1% of the total or 6 advertisements using this approach (see Figures 37 and 38).

*Advertisements published in the Orange and White During the 1930s:*

*Camel:*
During the 1930-1931 academic year, Camel advertised its new “humidor” packaging. The term “humidor” refers to a special airtight container that was normally used to keep cigars moist. As cigars are typically thought of as being the premier or high-end tobacco product, the use of the term humidor implies quality. Therefore, the primary strategy that is used in this campaign is a rational strategy that is supplemented by informational appeal. The sensory strategy is also present in this advertisement. The goal of the special “humidor” packaging is to preserve the freshness of the tobacco and to enhance the taste. To support this message, the copy reads, “Smoke a fresh cigarette” (see Figure 39).

In addition to promoting Camels by informing the public about their superior quality, R.J. Reynolds also financed contests that rewarded consumers for smoking Camel cigarettes. For instance, the Camel advertisements publicize the fact that Camel cigarettes awarded $50,000.00 in the past year (see Figure 40).

The following academic year Camel used a sensory strategy. The headline reads, “Man! They’ve hit it this time!” The image reinforces the sensory strategy by showing a man smoking a cigarette. The idea of freshness and quality is also mentioned in the text (see Figure 41).

During the 1933-1934 academic year Camel cigarettes ran a campaign that explained the trickery involved in various illusions and magic acts. The advertisement makes the connection that smokers should likewise resist being tricked by tobacco products that do not adhere to the same standards as Camel. Thus, Camel uses a rational strategy to try to persuade students to smoke the Camel brand. However, the tactics used in the advertisement entertain the audience member by revealing the secrets to various magic acts. In the advertisement provided, Camel provides the reader with the secrets behind the famous magician Harry Houdini’s Milk Can Escape (see Figure 42). Other tricks that were revealed
included Hardeen’s packing case escape, the Japanese thumb tie illusion, and the cut rope made whole again trick.

The following academic year, Camel switched to a sensory campaign. In this series of advertisements cigarettes are prescribed as a remedy to various nervous habits. Through these ads, cigarettes are recommended as a way to counteract negative or undesirable sensations. This advertisement seems to be targeted very directly at college students that may be experiencing stress (see Figure 43). In addition to mussing hair, Camel claims to alleviate other habits such as newspaper crackling, doodling, forehead wrinkling, and hair mussing.

Instead of prescribing Camels for nerves, this advertising campaign promotes tobacco as a stimulant stating, “After Concentrating…Get A Lift with a Camel.” Again, Camel uses a rational strategy by promoting the product benefits. The use of a biology student’s testimonial provides referent tactics that help to reinforce the rational strategy. Like the other advertisements, this advertisement also uses a sensory strategy as a secondary persuasive approach (see Figure 44). This campaign includes students from a variety of majors including pre-med, law, architecture, and history. In addition to featuring students in various majors, it also featured people pursuing various career paths such as pilots, rodeo riders, engineers, firemen, and explorers.
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Camel continued to target college students by offering cash incentives for smoking its brand. Camel also invites college students to try to smoke a pack of Camels and if they are not satisfied they can return it for a cash rebate. This rational advertising strategy is combined with referent tactics. The young woman in the advertisement promoting the offer looks very much like a typical college student (see Figure 45).

In addition to college students, Camel also used athletes to promote its cigarettes. However, in spite of the change in spokesperson, the strategy remained the same. Both campaigns use a rational approach to persuasion. In this case professional athletes attest that Camels “Don’t get your Wind” or impede your athletic performance. This particular advertisement featured Lou Gehrig’s testimonial and images of Betty Bailey, a champion diver, George Barker, a track star, Bruce Barnes, tennis champion, and champion golfer, Tommy Armour (see Figure 46).

From 1937 to 1940 Camel continued promoting the fact that Camel cigarettes “never get on your nerves.” Each of the advertisements used a sensory strategy that described the medicinal properties of Camel and used the testimonials of various celebrities and athletes to support this claim (see Figure 47).

**Chesterfield:**

In 1930 Chesterfield used a purely sensory strategy. The headline states, “milder and better taste.” The text follows, “Promises fill no sack’ – it is TASTE and not words you enjoy in a smoke.” The purely sensory approach is complemented by the image of a burning cigarette (see Figure 48).

Chesterfield changed its strategy from a sensory to a rational strategy in January of 1931. Chesterfield’s rational strategy compares the rationale required to select a cigarette brand with the strategies used to figure out puzzles or optical illusions. Therefore, the
objective of the advertisement is to communicate the idea that the taste or quality of a cigarette is easy to determine. So, it should be easy to determine that Chesterfield is the superior brand (see Figure 49).

In addition to using product features such as taste and quality to promote its brand, Chesterfield also used the fact that it used Turkish tobacco to sell cigarettes. An advertising headline reads, “Let’s all go to Turkey.” The mention of exotic Eastern locations such as Cavalla, Smyrna and Samsoun as suppliers of their tobacco adds to the allure of cigarette smoking. The familiar image of the Hagia Sophia, a monument that is widely associated with travel to Turkey, also adds to the exotic feel of the advertisement. Therefore the major strategies at play in this advertisement are rational and ego related. The use of information is the primary persuasive appeal (see Figure 50).

Chesterfield changed its strategy again during the 1931-1932 academic year. Instead of focusing on the product itself, the advertising centers on the greater social context or meaning of the product. For instance, one major theme is that the smoking habit is universally accepted - even stodgy grandfathers. However, societal acceptance of cigarette smoking is dependant upon smoking the right brand of cigarettes (see Figure 51).

For the 1932-1933 academic year, Chesterfield used a more sophisticated approach for advertising cigarettes. The primary strategy in this advertisement is social. The women in the advertisement seductively inquires, “Tell me something…what makes a cigarette taste better?” Presumably, she is speaking to a male smoker who is ready and willing to answer her request. In addition to the primary social strategy, a sensory approach is also being used through the implication that Chesterfields are the best tasting cigarettes (see Figure 52).

Cigarette manufacturers also used advertising to promote the ratio programming that they sponsored. The performers that were used in the programming also used as
spokespeople for the particular cigarette brand. This particular promotional advertisement was printed in a 1934 edition of the *Orange and White* (see Figure 53).

Chesterfield used a social strategy to promote its brand during the 1934-1935 academic year. Again, Chesterfield uses a social strategy to imply that the approval of others depends upon smoking its brand. For instance, the Justice of the Peace agrees to marry the young couple because they smoke Chesterfields (see Figure 54).

During the 1935-1936 academic year Chesterfield changed from a social to a sensory strategy. The text reads, “I wouldn’t give that for a cigarette that doesn’t Satisfy…that doesn’t give me what I want in a smoke.” However, an element of peer approval is also present. The use of a similar source reinforces the social aspects of smoking (see Figure 55).

Like the John Held Jr. advertisements, Chesterfield advertisements poked fun at college students’ grandparents’ generation. In this appeal that combines a social approach with humor tactics, two elderly women smoke Chesterfields. The headline reads, “I’m not saying a word.” Smoking is shown to be a slightly taboo habit that is appealing even to elderly women. This advertisement ran during the 1936-1937 academic year (see Figure 56).

During the 1937-1938 academic year, Chesterfield continued to use a social strategy by focusing on occasions where one should smoke. One use occasion advertisement reads, “First a handshake…then ‘Have a Chesterfield.’” Therefore, this social strategy also includes elements from the routine segment of the strategy wheel (see Figure 57).

Chesterfield used sensory strategy during the 1938-1939 academic year. In addition to advertising that Chesterfield gives smokers more pleasure, the advertisement also promoted local radio programming sponsored by Chesterfield (see Figure 58).

During the 1939-1940 academic year, Chesterfield combined a social strategy with celebrity tactics. In this advertisement, Chesterfield claims to be the most popular brand of
cigarettes in the United States. A comparison is made between America’s choice in a beauty queen and its choice in cigarette (see Figure 59).

*Lucky Strike:*

Lucky strike first advertised in the *Orange and White* on October 13, 1931. The primary message strategy is rational and centers on product information. For instance, the primary focus of the advertisement is on the moisture-proof cellophane packaging. Like the Camel advertisements, Lucky Strike compares its packaging to a humidor (see Figure 60).

In addition to the Lucky Tab advertisement, Lucky Strike also used Jean Harlow’s celebrity endorsement tactics to promote its product. In addition, the advertisement promotes Jean Harlow and her films (see Figure 61). In addition to Jean Harlow, the campaign used other female celebrities such as Aviatrix Sally Eilers and actress Dorothy Mackaill. Each of the endorsements included a statement that the celebrity was not compensated for her testimonial and that Lucky Strike actually is her cigarette of choice. Although the execution of the advertisement is different, the rational strategy remains the same. However, the rational strategy is combined with a sensory strategy. Lucky Strike tastes good because of it’s packaging.

During the 1932-1933 academic year, Lucky Strike used a sensory strategy in its campaign. By using wild animals and Native Americans or other exotic people, Lucky Strike compared uncured tobacco to uncivilized animals or humans by stating, “Nature in the *Raw* is seldom *Mild*” (see Figure 62).

Lucky Strike changed from a sensory to a social strategy during the 1933-1934 academic year. This campaign focuses its attention on women by featuring a fashionable
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young woman. However the headline that reads, “The Height of Good Taste” suggests both a social and sensory strategy. Therefore, the advertisement suggests that women should smoke because it is pleasurable and communicates high social status (see Figure 63).

Again, during the 1934-1935 academic year, Lucky Strike combined sensory and social strategies. However, instead of capturing a purely aspirational lifestyle, the advertisement focuses on idealizing the ordinary. This makes the promises suggested in the advertisement much more attainable than in the previous campaign (see Figure 64).

During the 1934-1935 academic year, Lucky Strike continued to use a social strategy. However, this time the strategy appears to be used within the context of a dating situation instead of a social context. The advertisement also uses a referent strategy playing upon the fact that many people have had disagreements with their significant others and have been at a loss when considering what to do. Therefore, smoking is promoted as a way to make amends (see Figure 65).

During the 1936-1937 academic year Lucky Strike used celebrity testimonials to attest to the fact that Lucky Strike cigarettes are easy on the throat. For instance, Margaret Sullavan said that “Luckies are the answer for her throat.” In addition, the campaign included celebrities such as actress Claudette Colbert, actress Carole Lombard, actor Cary Grant, U.S. Senator Gerald P. Nye, and radioman Boake Carter. This campaign combines a sensory strategy with a celebrity appeal (see Figure 66).

Old Gold:

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Orange and White, February 4, 1937}
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\footnote{Orange and White, February 18, 1937}
\footnote{Orange and White, March 26, 1937}
\end{footnotes}
Old Gold’s strategy focused on keeping kissable. This advertisement uses a sensory strategy and a referent approach to suggest that Old Gold cigarettes are not as offensive as other cigarettes and will not diminish your attractiveness. The woman featured in the advertisement looks to be college-aged so her appearance would resonate well with students (see Figure 67).

Later during the 1934-1935 academic year, Old Gold maintains the same sensory strategy that it used during the 1932-1933 academic year. However, the present advertisement focuses on throat ease instead of “keeping kissable.” In addition, the tactics changed from using a referent to a celebrity appeal. For instance, singer and actor Bing Crosby said, “My throat is my fortune…that’s why I smoke Old Gold’s” (see Figure 68). Old Gold also featured other celebrities such as actress Mae West, actor James Cagney, actress Claudette Colbert, and actress Carole Lombard.

Summary:

In spite of the Great Depression and the increased stress and pessimism that the economic downturn caused, cigarette advertising in the Orange and White continued to increase in frequency and size. In some ways, cigarettes seemed to provide the same kind of escape as the movie industry provided. In fact, the tobacco industry recruited many top film stars in its advertising campaigns during the 1930s. In addition to film stars, cigarette advertising also started to position cigarettes as a way to start one’s career path. The industry maintained its efforts to target women by depicting women of high social standing in its advertisements and by demonstrating social approval through advertising. In addition, the
advertisements began to promote the habit as a way to manage stress and relax. R.J. Reynolds Camel brand used very targeted advertisements that used college students to promote the effectiveness of its brand. Although the number of advertisements featuring college students and targeting the college audience increased, the majority of the brands simply targeted young people and were not specifically aimed toward the college audience.

**Cigarette Advertising in *The Orange and White* during the 1940s:**

Cigarette advertising in *The Orange and White* during the 1940s was very sporadic because of the outbreak of the World War II. Because the nation was at war, many of the advertisements made cigarette smoking seem patriotic. In fact, many used the testimonies of servicemen and women to promote their product. From the 1940-1941 academic year to the 1949-1950 academic year *The Orange and White* published 500 editions. A total of 346 cigarette advertisements appeared in the 500 editions published, averaging .69 cigarette advertisements per newspaper.

Although the number of cigarette advertisements dropped during the 1940s, the number of brands being advertised increased. In addition to Chesterfield, Camel, Old Gold and Lucky Strike, Phillip Morris, and Raleigh also advertised during the 1940s. As the graphs show, Chesterfield and Camel were the most advertised cigarette brands and Old Gold and Lucky Strike were the least advertised brands in the in *The Orange and White* during the 1940s. Chesterfield and Camel were the most heavily advertised brands from the 1940-1941 to the 1942-1943 academic years (see Figures 69 and 70). However, due to the war effort, advertising either stopped completely or nearly stopped from the 1943-1944 to the 1945-1946 academic year. In addition, the editorial content published in *The Orange and White* also was significantly decreased. Cigarette advertising in *The Orange and White* made a healthy
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comeback from the 1946-1947 to the 1948-1949 academic year. However, cigarette
advertising dropped in 1949 for an unknown reason.

During the 1940s, the sensory strategy dominated cigarette advertising in The Orange
and White with 59% of all advertisements using a sensory approach. The social strategy was
the second most common with 27% of the advertisements falling into this category. The
third most often used strategy was the rational approach with 12% of all advertisements
using reason to reach consumers. During the 1940s, ego, acute need, and routine strategies
were not widely used in cigarette advertisements (see Figures 71 and 72).

Overall, tactics using celebrities were the most popular advertising approach during
the 1940s; 47% of the cigarette advertisements in The Orange and White used celebrity tactics.
The referent approach was the second most popular tactic with 36% of the advertisements
using this approach. Although the referent appeal was the most popular during the first half
of the decade, celebrity appeals dominated the latter years during the 1940s. If combined,
83% of all the advertisements used an aspirational individual to promote cigarettes. The
informational approach also was somewhat popular with 12% of advertising using
information as the primary tactic. Few advertisements used reward, expert or humor tactics
during the 1940s (see Figure 73 and 74).

Advertisements published in The Orange and White During the 1940s:

Camel:

During the 1940-1941 academic year, the first Camel campaign employed a social
approach. The advertisements in this series focused on men who had succeeded in their
particular career paths. In the advertisement shown (see Figure 75), an air traffic controller
relates the keys to his career path and tips for picking a good cigarette. Therefore, cigarette
smoking is implicitly positioned as a way to fit into the business world. Camel also uses
referent tactics. These tactics are made clear in the fact that the careers featured in the advertisements are both appealing and glamorous.

During the following year, Camel began to use rational strategy combined with a social strategy to promote its brand. Its advertisements combined celebrity with product information. Usually a celebrity spokesperson, in this case Evelyn Doman, promotes the virtues of smoking Camel cigarettes. The advertisement also promotes the fact that Camel cigarettes contain 28% less nicotine than the other four largest selling brands. Lower nicotine is promoted as a product benefit but the advertisement does not give the reader any reason why lower levels of nicotine are better (see Figure 76).

For the 1941-1942 academic year, Camel used the same approach by promoting the product using a spokesperson and product related information. However, because of the outbreak of WWII, the spokesperson was a member of the armed forces. It is important to note that this military based approach was used even before Pearl Harbor Day, which officially involved the United States in the war effort (see Figure 77).

Using the armed forces in Camel advertisements continued into 1942-1943 academic year. In this campaign, Camel used jargon or slang from the various branches of the armed forces to build rapport with its patriotic audience and establish the fact that its brand has a close relationship with the armed services. The headline reads, “In the Air Force they say – ‘Dodo’ for the new flying recruit, ‘Kite’ for airplane, ‘hit the silk’ for taking to parachute, ‘Camel’ for their favorite cigarette.” Therefore, this social strategy is combined with the powerful referent appeal of a member of the Air Force. In addition to the Air Force, this advertising campaign featured servicemen from the other branches of the military such as the army and navy (see Figure 78).
After a three-year break, Camel resumed advertising in *The Orange and White* in 1947. The primary message in this series of advertisements was that, “More people are smoking Camels than ever before.” In addition to the social strategy implied in promoting the popularity of the cigarette, Beryl Davis[^401] was the celebrity spokesperson for the brand. Big band singer Beryl Davis was born in England; the daughter of famous bandleader Harry Davis. Beryl Davis spent her formative years on tour with her father's orchestra, eventually becoming the act's featured vocalist. In 1944, Davis was recruited to join Glenn Miller's Army Air Force Orchestra (see Figure 79). Other featured musicians and singers included “Skitch” Henderson[^402], Patty Andrews[^403], Al Nevins[^404], and Desi Arnaz[^405].

During the 1948-1949 academic year Camel began to use a rational appeal in its college advertising. In this campaign, Camel urges students to give its cigarette a 30-day test for mildness. Although the primary appeal is a rational appeal, the secondary appeal is sensory because the smokers are testing the cigarette for mildness (see Figure 80).[^406]

**Chesterfield:**

During the 1940-1941 academic year, Chesterfield created advertisements that focused on the social acceptability of smoking. Using a referent appeal, this advertisement features a woman conversing with her father about smoking. The headline reads, “Right Dad… it’s the one cigarette that really satisfies.” In addition to the referent appeal, the advertisement promotes the satisfaction that one gets from smoking (see Figure 81).

[^401]: *The Orange and White*, October 3, 1947
[^402]: *The Orange and White*, October 8, 1947
[^403]: *The Orange and White*, October 15, 1947
[^404]: *The Orange and White*, October 22, 1947
[^405]: *The Orange and White*, October 29, 1947
[^406]: *The Orange and White*, October 3, 1947
By the 1941-1942 academic year, the Chesterfield campaign strategy changed to a patriotic effort that supported World War II. The headline reads, “The Order of the Day is Chesterfield Milder, Cooler…Better-Tasting” (see Figure 82).

During the 1942-1943 academic year, Chesterfield advertised again using a patriotic appeal. However, this time the brand used an army medic to attest to the quality of Chesterfield brand cigarettes. This rational appeal combines the expertise of a physician with a product-focused argument (see Figure 83).

The following academic year, Chesterfield continued to use advertising that related to the war effort. In this advertisement, the social strategy implies that popular people, like Tailgun Smitty, smoke Chesterfields. And, if you want the service person that you care about to be popular like Tailgun Smitty you ought to send him plenty of Chesterfields. However, the advertisement also makes use of a sensory approach (see Figure 84).

During the 1945-1946 academic year, Chesterfield used a referent approach to promote its brand in *The Orange and White*. The beautiful woman featured in the advertisement promotes the ABC slogan that stands for, “Always Buy Chesterfields.” The headline implies brand loyalty and suggests a routine strategy (see Figure 85).

Chesterfield’s tactics changed during the 1947-1948 academic year. Instead of using a referent appeal, the tactics changed to a celebrity appeal. Although the celebrity, Lauren Bacall, is the primary feature in the advertisement, the strategy is based in the sensory segment because the focus is on enjoyment that smoking cigarettes provides. In addition to promoting Chesterfield, the advertisement also mentions that Lauren Bacall will be starring
in the film “Dark Passage.” Other featured celebrities included actor James Stewart, actress Loretta Young, actress Claudette Colbert, and actor Ronald Reagan (see Figure 86).

Chesterfield returned to the routine strategy during the 1948-1949 academic year by using the ABC “Always Buy Chesterfield” slogan. However, Chesterfield combined the ABC slogan with a celebrity appeal. As in the previous campaign, the spokesperson, in this case Rita Hayworth, is promoting her new film “The Loves of Carmen.” In addition to Rita Hayworth’s testimonial, Chesterfield includes the testimonial of a college student from the University of Colorado (see Figure 87). In addition to Rita Hayworth, Chesterfield advertisements also included actress Betty Grable, singer Perry Como, actress Jane Wyman, and actor Gary Cooper.

Phillip Morris:

In its college campaign for the 1943-1944 academic year, Phillip Morris featured Johnny Roventini, the famous Phillip Morris bellboy. Alfred E. Lyon, Philip Morris’ Vice President for Sales, and Milton Biow, the famous president of the Milton Biow advertising who managed the Philip Morris Inc. account discovered Johnny Roventini in the Hotel New Yorker lobby during an April evening in 1933. Johnny Roventini served as one of the Hotel New Yorker’s corporate images. The Hotel New Yorker had been featuring the Brooklyn born, 48-inch youngster on its souvenir post cards as "the smallest bellboy in the world."

The corporate executives along with their bellhop were to take a little-known cigarette brand
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and move it to number four in national sales in five years time.\textsuperscript{415} Therefore, to \textit{The Orange and White} audience, the Phillip Morris bellhop was a well-known figure. Therefore, this advertisement combines a sensory strategy with celebrity tactics (see Figure 88).

Johnny Roventini reappeared during the 1948-1949 Phillip Morris campaign. In this series of advertisements, Roventini is featured in his own comic strip called “Campus Capers” that targeted college students. The comic strip is a social drama where Phillip Morris cigarettes save the day by eliminating cigarette hangover and by building students’ vocabularies. The overall strategy is social but the tactic is entertaining college students.\textsuperscript{416}

\textit{Old Gold}:

Old Gold advertised only during the 1946-1947 academic year. The campaign was designed with simplicity in mind. The Lorillard Tobacco Company wants to emphasize the fact that they are tobacco men and that the only thing that they attest about their product is that it is made for enjoyment. This advertisement works almost exclusively on a sensory level (see Figure 89).

\textit{Raleigh}:

Like Old Gold, Raleigh only advertised in \textit{The Orange and White} for one year. During the 1947-1948 academic year, Raleigh used a sensory strategy and celebrity tactics to sell their brand. In this advertisement, Tyrone Power, an American film actor who appeared in numerous of films from the 1930s to the 1950s, often as a swashbuckler or romantic lead, promoted the brand. The primary product feature that is promoted is the fact that the cigarette is moisturized to minimize throat irritation and increase enjoyment (see Figure 90).

\footnotesize\textsuperscript{415} “Call for Phillip Morris!!!” http://www.bellhop.org/johnnyhistory.htm [Retrieved April 22, 2007]
\footnotesize\textsuperscript{416} \textit{The Orange and White}, October 8, 1948
Other celebrity spokespeople include actress Joan Crawford, actor and decorated naval officer Douglas Fairbanks Jr., and actress Gene Tierney.

**Summary:**

Cigarette advertising in *The Orange and White* during the 1940s was influenced by the outbreak of the Second World War. World War Two influenced cigarette advertising in two ways: 1.) The frequency of advertising was reduced in the 1940s due to a shift in marketing efforts due to the war. 2.) The advertisements that were present in *The Orange and White* often used patriotic themes to promote cigarette smoking. In addition to the new marketing strategies instigated by the war, many of the advertisements used the same strategies and tactics as before. Common approaches included social approval, celebrity appeals, and rational strategies. Although throat irritation and coughing had been referred to before in advertisements, during the 1940s advertisements began to refer to the healthfulness of particular brands as well as nicotine content for the first time in *The Orange and White*.

**Cigarette Advertising in *The Orange and White* during the 1950s:**

The 1950s was the decade with the largest number of cigarette advertisements. A total of 966 cigarette advertisements appeared in 355 editions of *The Orange and White*. On average, 2.72 advertisements appeared in the newspaper. *The Orange and White* was published both weekly and bi-weekly. The paper was published bi-weekly during the 1950-1951 and the 1951-1952 academic years. The paper was published weekly from the 1952-1953 to the 1959-1960 academic year. A number of factors influenced the large number of advertisements in the newspaper. In general, cigarette smoking was a socially acceptable habit during the 1950s. In addition, new brands and varieties of cigarettes were introduced into the cigarette
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market. For instance, several new filter brands and menthol-flavored cigarettes were created during this time period.

From the 1950-1951 academic year to the 1954-1955 academic year, unfiltered cigarettes were the most popular product advertised. Starting with the 1955-1956 academic year and ending with the 1958-1959 academic year, filtered and unfiltered cigarettes advertised with a similar frequency. However, cigarette advertising in general began to dip from 1955-1956 academic year to the 1957-1958 academic year. By the 1959-1960 academic year, the frequency of filtered cigarette advertising surpassed the pre-1955-1956 levels for advertising unfiltered cigarettes. Menthol cigarette advertising fell behind both the filtered and unfiltered brands. But, during the 1959-1960 academic year the frequency of advertising among the menthol brands surpassed that of the unfiltered brands (see Figure 91).

In total, 552 of the 966 cigarette advertisements promoted unfiltered brands. Unfiltered cigarette advertisements represented 57% of the total cigarette advertisements that appeared in *The Orange and White*. Lucky Strike was consistently the most frequent advertiser with 221 advertisements. Camel and Chesterfield also were major advertisers with over 100 advertisements each. Phillip Morris, Old Gold and Pall Mall also advertised in *The Orange and White*. And, although they were not consistent advertisers, they did have a significant presence during certain years. For instance, Pall Mall was the most frequent advertiser in the unfiltered segment during the 1958-1959 academic year. But, it did not advertise in *The Orange and White* from the 1950-1951 to the 1957-1958 academic year (see Figures 92 and 93).

During the 1950s, 255 of the 966 advertisements printed in *The Orange and White* promoted filtered cigarettes. In total, 26% of the cigarette advertisements in *The Orange and White* related to filtered cigarettes. Filtered cigarette advertising steadily increased from the
1952-1953 academic year to the 1955-1956 academic year. Cigarette advertising dropped during the 1956-1957 and the 1957-1958 academic years. However, the advertising frequency resumed during the 1958-1959 and the 1959-1960 academic years. With a total of 77 advertisements, Tareyton was the most frequently advertised brand. Viceroy’s advertising rates were nearly the same as Tareyton with a total of 75 advertisements. Marlboro, Winston, and L&M also were frequent advertisers with over 55 advertisements each (see Figure 94 and 95).

Three primary strategies dominated the cigarette advertising in The Orange and White during the 1950s. These three strategies were the rational, social, and sensory strategies. The sensory dominated with 50% of the advertising falling into this category. Although the sensory strategy dominated, it was the primary strategy during the 1950-1951, 1955-1956, 1956-1957, 1958-1959, and 1959-1960 academic year. However, the sensory and rational strategies also dominated creative strategies certain years. During the 1951-1952 and the 1952-1953 academic years the social approach dominated. Likewise, the rational approach dominated 1954-1955 academic year, which was the year after the Reader’s Digest article was published warning the American public about the harms of smoking (see Figures 96 and 97).

During the 1950s, the referent tactic was the most popular in cigarette advertising in The Orange and White with 35% of the advertising falling into this category. The referent approach was the most prevalent approach during the 1950-1951, 1951-1952, 1952-1953, and the 1955-1956 academic year. The humor approach was the second most popular tactic with 32% of the advertising using this appeal. Although the humor approach was the second most popular appeal, it was the most frequent appeal during the 1953-1954, 1954-1955, 1956-1957, and the 1958-1959 academic year. Information was another tactic that was fairly prevalent with 18% of cigarette advertisements printed using this approach. In spite of the
fact that using entertainment was not one of the most popular tactics, it was the most popular appeal during the 1959-1960 academic year. Celebrity tactics and reward appeals were also occasionally employed (see Figures 98 and 99).

**Unfiltered Brands Advertised During the 1950s:**

**Lucky Strike:**

At the start of the 1950-1951 academic year, Lucky Strike advertised using a series of contests that would reach nearly every college campus in the U. S. In the first series of contests, Lucky Strike challenged students to write “Happy-Go-Lucky” jingles about Lucky Strike. Lucky Strike offered $25.00 cash prizes for winning jingles. For instance, a winning entry from Brooklyn College reads, “In art class we may disagree, if Goya beats Van Dyke. But one thing is unanimous, We all pick Lucky Strike.” The campaign’s appeal is social because it reinforces the idea that cigarette smoking is popular among college students. Every edition of the *Orange and White* would feature winning jingle submissions from around the nation. The jingles are intended to be humorous and entertaining. The jingle contest ran until the 1954-1955 academic year (see Figures 100 and 101).

During the 1954-1955 academic year, Lucky Strike changed its contest from jingles to “droodles”. “Droodles” are humorous picture puzzles that should relate to smoking Lucky Strike. Like the previous contests, a $25 dollar reward is offered for featured “droodles.” Again, the primary tactic that was used is humor. In the advertisement below, the sensory strategy dominates (see Figure 102). However, in other “droodle” advertisements, the strategy is social.

During the 1956-1957 and 1957-1958 academic years, Lucky Strike changed its contest from “Droodles” to “Sticklers.” “Sticklers” are jokes or riddles that rhyme. For instance, one example reads, “What do you call a dirty bird? …a murky turkey.” Again the
goal of the contest is to show that Lucky Strike is a popular across college campuses. The humorous approach is used to entertain students (see Figure 104).

**Camel:**

Camel began a series of cartoons called “Campus Interviews on Cigarette Tests” during the 1950-1951 academic year. This humorous approach profiled various animals and proves that in spite of their idiosyncratic traits, they agree that Camel is the best cigarette. For instance, even though the “Long-Wattled Umbrella Bird” lacks the common sense to get out of the rain, he still knows that Camel is the best cigarette. The advertisement continues by stating that “More People Smoke Camels than any other cigarette!” and that students should give the brand a 30-day trial (see Figure 105). Therefore, this series of advertisements combines humor with a social strategy. This cartoon continued through the 1951-1952 academic year. Other featured cartoon characters included “The Blow Fish,”[^420] “The Flicker,”[^421] and “The Common Loon.”[^422]

In 1952, Camel changed from the “Campus Interviews on Cigarette Tests” cartoon to the “…But Only Time Will Tell” cartoon. The objective of the cartoon is to convince college students to try smoking and to give the habit time before they decide. For instance, the cartoon shows a fraternity house and fraternity brothers testing out a new cat to see if it is a good mouser. But, just because it doesn’t catch a mouse immediately doesn’t mean that it cannot catch mice. In the same way, students should give smoking a fair try. Camel provides a rational argument for trying smoking that is complemented with humor tactics (see Figure 106).

[^420]: The Orange and White, October 4, 1950
[^421]: The Orange and White, October 11, 1950
[^422]: The Orange and White, October 18, 1950
During the following academic year, Camel advertised using a celebrity approach that used a social strategy. The campaign slogan was, “Camels Agree with More People” and focused on “How the stars got started.” In this particular advertisement, Dick Powell was the celebrity spokesperson. In addition to providing his testimonial on cigarettes, he also gives the story of how he got his start in the music industry by singing with a choral group at Little Rock College. Dick Powell was a famous singer, actor, and director (see Figure 107). Other Camel spokespeople included baseball player Mickey Mantle, actress Lisbeth Scott, actress Maureen O’Sullivan, actor Tyrone Power, and actor William Holden.

The primary strategy of 1955-1956 Camel campaign is sensory. However, the advertisements also emphasize the idea that cigarettes are a way to celebrate special occasions and relax after a job well done. For example, the text in the advertisement provided reads, “When you’ve worked pretty late, And the issue looks great…Why not celebrate! Have a CAMEL!” (see Figure 108).

Camel continued to used a social approach during the 1956-1957 academic year. However, instead of addressing the pleasure of smoking directly, Camel promotes its cigarette as the “real cigarette.” The headline reads, “Have A Real Cigarette…have a Camel!” This headline, accompanied by a photograph of a documentary film cameraman implies that Camels are for real men (see Figure 109).

Camel ended the 1950s by returning to the cartoon approach that it used at the beginning of the decade. The cartoons used a humor appeal but the overriding strategy is
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sensory because both the caption of the cartoon and the headline relate to the product’s quality and taste (Figure 110).

**Chesterfield:**

To start off the 1950s, Chesterfield used a cigarette-smoking test to appeal to college students on a rational level. The headline reads, “Open ‘Em, Smell ‘Em, Smoke ‘Em – Easiest Test In The Book.” Then, the student is challenged to compare Chesterfield with any other cigarette (see Figure 111).

During the 1951-1952 academic year, Chesterfield’s advertisements featured various competitive and Ivy League universities to show that their brand is the most popular among the most accomplished college students. For instance, the advertisements featured Rice, Northwestern, Princeton, Cornell, University of Virginia, M.I.T. and many others. Because the advertisement focuses on the popularity of the brand and the fact that many college students, like themselves, smoke Chesterfield, the primary campaign strategy is social (see Figure 112).

As health concerns regarding smoking begin to surface in the popular press, Chesterfield changes its campaign strategy to a more rational approach during the 1952-1953 academic year. Therefore, Chesterfield presents its own scientific evidence that proves that the “Nose, Throat, and Accessory Organs” are not harmed by smoking Chesterfield. In addition, Chesterfield claims that its report is the first ever such report published about a cigarette. In fact, the report even claims that it studied heavy smokers that smoked up to 40 cigarettes a day (see Figure 113).
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Like Camel, Chesterfield also used celebrity tactics during the 1953-1954 academic year. However, Chesterfield combined the appeal of a celebrity with ordinary college students. The appeal of the advertisement is primarily social as it shows Chesterfield to be a popular cigarette. In this particular situation, Ray Anthony is the celebrity. Anthony is an American songwriter, trumpeter, bandleader, and actor. He is known for “The Bunny Hop” and the “Hokey Pokey.” In addition, the advertisement features two female college students who also provide their testimonials (see Figure 114).

During the 1955-1956 academic year, Chesterfield changed its strategy from a social strategy to a sensory strategy. The headline reads, “Packs More Pleasure because it’s More Perfectly Packed!” The change in strategy is evident because of the focus on pleasure. Some of the tactics changed used to execute the strategy also changed. Instead of using celebrity or source similarity tactics, the Chesterfield advertisement used source attractiveness to promote its brand. The use of a sex appeal complements the use of an attractive source. Both the image of a beautiful model reclining with a cigarette and the tone of the copy seems more sexual in nature than previous advertisements (see Figure 115).

Like Camel’s campaign from the previous year, Chesterfield also tries to position its cigarette as the masculine cigarette. This advertisement reads, “Men of America: The Test-Driver. Nothing satisfies like the BIG CLEAN TASTE OF TOP-TOBACCO” (see Figure 116). Other featured professionals included a law enforcement officer, uranium geologist, highway architect, and a U.S. Air Force pilot. Although the tactics are based in a referent appeal and there are social elements of the advertisement, the primary strategy is
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sensory because the product focus is on enjoying the tobacco. Chesterfield ran the “Men of America” campaign during the 1957-1958 and 1958-1959 academic years.

**Phillip Morris:**

Like Chesterfield, Phillip Morris started out its 1950-1951 college campaign with a rational appeal that challenged students to test Phillip Morris cigarettes. This particular advertisement features a woman and reads “Believe in Yourself! Don’t test one brand alone – compare them all!” This advertisement seems to work toward empowering women and would resonate with female college students for this reason. Like the other Phillip Morris advertisement, this advertisement includes the slogan “Call for Phillip Morris” and features the bellhop Johnny (see Figure 117).

In 1951, Phillip Morris changes from a rational strategy to a sensory strategy that focuses on celebrity testimonials. In this case, Desi Arnaz and Lucille Ball attest that Phillip Morris does not cause throat irritation. In addition to providing their testimonial, they also promote the new “I Love Lucy” show on CBS. Again, the bellhop Johnny and the slogan “Call for Phillip Morris” appear at the bottom of the advertisement.

From 1954-1957, Phillip Morris cigarettes sponsored the Max Shulman column. The column was created by Leo Burnett Company, Inc.\(^{438}\) Shulman was a 20th century American writer best known for his television and short story character Dobie Gillis. His writing usually centered on young people, particularly in the college setting. After his success with the Gillis character, Shulman continued to write. His humor column, “On Campus,” was syndicated in over 350 collegiate newspapers at one point. This particular column entitled, “Husbands, Anyone?” focuses on how coeds select their future husbands (see Figure 119).

Old Gold:

During the 1956-1957 academic year, Old Gold resumed advertising in *The Orange and White*. Like Lucky Strike, Old Gold also used a contest. The contest was called Tangle Schools. The headline of the advertisement suggests a sensory approach by stating, “No Other Cigarette Can Match The Taste of Today’s Old Gold’s.” To enter the contest, students needed to untangle the names of well-known schools and send them in to the address listed on the advertisements. Therefore, because the advertisement involves a puzzle, entertainment is the primary tactic in this campaign (see Figure 120).

Pall Mall:

Pall Mall started advertising in *The Orange and White* during the 1958-1959 academic year. The strategy for the campaign was purely sensory. With the headline, “So friendly to your taste!” The campaign compares the experience of smoking cigarettes with eating fine foods such as various fruits and vegetables and shrimp. It’s obvious that the advertisement is capitalizing on the pleasure associated with smoking (see Figure 121).

Filtered Brands Advertised During the 1950s:

Winston:

Although sensory appeals are popular across cigarette brands, they are particularly popular among filtered brands. Filtered brands want to assure smokers that their brand provides the same flavor and their unfiltered counterparts. In addition to focusing on flavor, it appears from the photograph that smoking is being depicted as a way to start a relationship. Therefore, the advertisement also has strong social elements and uses a referent appeal (see Figure 122).
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Winston began using its famous “Winston Tastes Good! Like a Cigarette Should!” slogan during the 1955-1956 academic year. This advertisement’s primary strategy is a sensory strategy. The headline reads, “Winston brings you full flavor!” However, it also has significant social undertones. Again, smoking is shown as a way to start relationships, especially with members of the opposite sex (see Figure 123).

During the 1957-1958 academic year, Winston changed tactics from a referent approach that focuses on relationships to a humor approach that reinforced the overall sensory strategy. The campaign mimicked a comic strip with the characters ending the strip with the slogan, “Winston tastes good…like a cigarette should.” In one example that was a satire of Arthurian legend, Sir Gollyhad, a knight, befriended a dragon that terrorized the citizens of Camelot by offering the beast cigarettes. The dragon was satisfied and Sir Gollyhad wins the lady (see Figure 124). Other comics included “Mopy Dick,” a spoof on Herman Melville’s *Moby-Dick*, “In The Soup” a parody of the antics of burglars, and a comic featuring the ghost “Luke the Spook.”

*L&M:*

In addition to advertising the taste and pleasure that filtered cigarettes provided, some filtered cigarettes promoted the effectiveness of their filter. For instance, the L&M headline reads, “No filter compares with L&M’s Miracle Tip.” This focus on the filter properties implies a rational strategy. However, the advertisement also mentioned flavor in a subhead. Therefore, the sensory strategy is a secondary strategy in this advertisement. In addition, the advertisement used socialites and a businessman as a referent tactic to promote the brand (see Figure 125).
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L&M launched a similar campaign the following year. The focus remained on the cigarette filter and the strategy remained rational. However, the photograph and text related more directly to the college audience. The photograph used a similarity-based referent appeal as the man and the woman appear to be interacting or starting a conversation thanks to their mutual smoking habit (see Figure 126).

L&M continued to use the same social and referent approach during the 1957-1958 academic year. However, the focus is on the flavor. But, the similar referent approach remained the same. The college students in the advertisement say that L&M, “Smokes Cleaner” and “Tastes Better” (see Figure 127).

**Viceroy:**

Viceroy combines a rational and sensory strategy. In this advertisement, the taste of the cigarette and the construction of the filter are important components but it seems that the construction of the filter and the reasoning behind the smoothness of the taste are paramount. This advertisement also appears to be directed at college students. The headline reads, “On Every Campus College Men and Women are discussing why Viceroys are Smoother” (see Figure 128).

During the 1958-1959 academic year, Viceroy continues to use a rational strategy to advertise the effectiveness and healthfulness of its filter by stating that, “The Viceroy Filter Is Made From A Pure Natural Material Found In Fruit” (see Figure 129).

**Tareyton:**

During the 1955-1956 academic year, Tareyton, American Tobacco Company’s filtered brand, started to advertise its filtered brand. Like other filtered brands, Tareyton advertises the fact that “All the pleasure comes thru…The Taste is great!” in its headline. Therefore, the sensory strategy is the dominant strategy. However, the advertisement also
mentions the fact that the cigarette has a dual filter. The description of the double filter seems to suggest a more rational approach is also in play (see Figure 130).

As in the previous campaign, Tareyton used a sensory strategy. The headline reads, “Gives you more to enjoy – the taste is great! And, the advertisement, like the other filtered brands, shows smoking as a way to facilitate relationships. However, the effectiveness of the filter remained as a rational element of the advertising strategy (see Figure 131).

In a campaign that ran during the 1959-1960 and 1960-1961 academic years, Tareyton used a rational strategy to explain how its dual filter works. The advertisement shows the two layers that filter the cigarette smoke and the band that shows the division between the two separate filters. The sensory strategy is secondary as the advertisement focused on the filters filtering for flavor (see Figure 132).

Marlboro:

Phillip Morris began advertising its filtered brand, Marlboro, during the 1955-1956 academic year. Marlboro’s functional slogan, “You get a lot to like – filter, flavor, flip-top box” suggests a rational approach. Yet, the image in the advertisement portrayed a rugged looking man with a tattoo on his hand lending the brand a rather hardened or rebellious image. This advertisement seems to imply that this filtered brand is not a brand for sissies (see Figure 133).

During the 1957-1958 academic year, Phillip Morris Co. decided to change its sponsor of the “On Campus” column from its unfiltered Phillip Morris brand to its filtered Marlboro brand. In spite of the change in brand, the column remained the same. Max Shulman continued to make humorous observations about campus life. In this particular example, Max Shulman discusses Christmas shopping and provides gift ideas for college
students. Of course, Shulman recommends Phillip Morris brand cigarettes as gift ideas (see Figure 134).

**Menthol Brands Advertised During the 1950s:**

Two Menthol brands were advertised in *The Orange and White* during the 1950s, Kool and Salem. Salem advertised during the 1957-1958 academic year. The primary strategy in this advertisement is sensory. The headline reads, “A new idea in smoking...Salem refreshes your taste.” In addition, the brand advertised the social aspect of smoking through the use of a referent appeal. The photograph in the advertisement depicts a young couple smoking in a park (see Figure 135).

Kool advertised using the same sensory strategy as Salem during the 1958-1959 and 1959-1960 academic year, but using a different tactical approach. The headline reads, “Switch from the Hots to Snow Fresh Filter Kools.” But, the Kool Krossword puzzle occupies the majority of the advertising space. Therefore, the entertainment tactic is a significant part of the advertisement (see Figure 136).

**Summary:**

The 1950s was marked by innovations both in the cigarettes themselves and the techniques used to market the new brands. During the 1950s, more brands targeted college students more directly in their advertising. Lucky Strike, Camel, Chesterfield, Tareyton, Winston, Kool, Old Gold, L&M and Viceroy all created advertisements that directly target a collegiate audience. Relating directly to college students became more popular than celebrity and status appeals that were popular in the past. However, relating cigarette smoking to career success remained a popular approach. The primary innovations in cigarette production were the introduction of menthol and filtered cigarettes, which resulted in the introduction of many new brands. Filtered cigarettes initially used a rational approach to
market their brands by focusing on the healthfulness of the brand and the effectiveness of
the filter. However, by the end of the decade, the rational approach to promoting the filtered
brands was replaced by social and sensory strategies. Menthol cigarettes consistently used a
sensory strategy to promote the menthol flavor.

**Cigarette Advertising in The Orange and White from 1960 to 1964:**

From 1960 to 1963, 182 editions of The Orange and White were published. During
these three years, 390 cigarette advertisements were printed averaging 2.14 in each edition of
The Orange and White. This number is less than the average of 2.72 cigarette advertisements
published during the 1950s. However, only nine advertisements, all advertorials sponsored
by Marlboro, were published during the 1963-1964 academic year. And, each of the nine
advertisements were published before January of 1964. If only the academic years that span
1960-1961 to 1962-1963 are counted, the average number of cigarette advertisements
published during this time period surpasses the 1950s average at 2.93 advertisements printed
in each edition of The Orange and White.

During the early 1960s, for the first time, filtered cigarettes consistently surpass
unfiltered cigarettes in the number of advertisements published in The Orange and White. In
fact, filtered cigarette advertising reached its peak during the 1962-1963 academic year when
102 advertisements for filtered cigarettes were published. The frequency for advertising that
related to menthol cigarettes generally dropped during the early 1960s. However, menthol
cigarettes were never a primary category of cigarette advertising in The Orange and White (see
Figure 137).

During the early 1960s, Chesterfield was the most frequently advertised unfiltered
cigarette brand with a total of 46 cigarette advertisements printed in The Orange and White.
Chesterfield was the dominant unfiltered brand during the 1961-1962 and the 1962-1963
academic years. Lucky Strike was a close second with a total of 45 cigarette advertisements. Lucky Strike was the prominent unfiltered brand in 1960-1961 academic year. Camel was the third most frequent advertiser with a total of 18 advertisements. Old Gold and Pall Mall also advertised in *The Orange and White* but their advertising was relatively infrequent (see Figures 138 and 139).

During the early 1960s, the filtered cigarettes were dominant. The prominent brand of filtered cigarettes advertised was Marlboro with 77 advertisements published in *The Orange and White*. And, Marlboro was the most popular brand advertised from the 1960-1961 academic year to the 1962-1963 academic year. The second most frequent advertiser was Tareyton with a total of 48 advertisements. L&M was the third most frequent advertiser with 46 advertisements printed in *The Orange and White* (see Figures 140 and 141).

The dominant creative strategy during the early 1960s was a social strategy with 49% of the cigarette advertisements in *The Orange and White* using this approach. The second most popular strategy was the sensory strategy with 42% of the advertisements falling into this category. The final strategy used, the rational strategy, was used in 9% of advertisements (see Figures 142 and 143).

During the 1960s, the humor approach was the most popular tactic used by cigarette advertisers with 47% of advertisements printed in *The Orange and White* employing this tactic. This tactic led in popularity with 47% of the advertisements falling into this category. The second most prevalent approach was the referent tactic with 32% of advertisements falling into this category. The tactics of entertainment, reward, and information were used between 5% and 10% of appeals falling into this category (see Figures 144 and 145).

**Unfiltered Brands Advertised During the 1960s:**

*Camel*:
At the start of the 1960s, Camel continued to promote its brand as a masculine cigarette. This approach combined a sensory and social approach. Again, the brand’s positioning is social. The referent in this particular advertisement is named Don Pinder and he is a professional skin diver. The use of this athletic man as a referent reinforces the brand’s masculine image. However, the headline reads, “Have a real cigarette – have a Camel.” This statement implies that Camel is stronger or better than other brands. Further, Pinder is pictured enjoying his cigarette. Other advertisements featured athletes, sailplane enthusiasts, and a helicopter pilot (see Figure 146).

Camel continued its campaign to position its brand as a masculine cigarette. This series of advertisements is called “Career Clues.” It features high-level executives who give their advice on how they succeeded in their particular fields while they endorse smoking Camel cigarettes. Therefore, the primary goal of this campaign is to create a relationship between smoking cigarettes and career success (see Figure 147). This particular strategy is primarily social in nature. Featured professionals included bankers, company presidents and entrepreneurs. 

**Chesterfield:**

During the 1961-1962 academic year, Chesterfield ran a series of advertisements called Sic Flics. This series used images from silent films dating from 1920s or perhaps earlier. In this particular example, a young man is seated on a chicken. In the caption below he asks, “All I have to do is fly to St. Louis and back and then I’m initiated?” Clearly, this advertisement refers to the initiation process that is a part of Greek life on campus (see Figure 148).
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During the 1962-1963 academic year, Chesterfield changed to a sensory strategy that positioned the brand as a masculine brand. Instead of promoting the regular Chesterfield brand, the Chesterfield King brand is advertised. The headline reflects the sensory strategy by stating, “Tastes Great because the tobaccos are!” In addition, a young man is shown enjoying a cigarette (see Figure 149).

*Lucky Strike:*

Instead of continuing to promote its brand using contests, Lucky Strike introduced a character named Dr. Frood. Dr. Frood was an eccentric character that offered advice and clever observations to college students. Usually, the advice was intended to be humorous in nature. For instance, this advertisement threatens students with a life-sized portrait of Dr. Frood if they do not buy Lucky Strike Cigarettes. Although this advertisement is atypical because it does not offer advice, its style and humor is representative of the campaign (see Figure 150).

In 1961, Lucky Strike replaced Dr. Frood with Lucky Puffers. Lucky Puffers is a comic strip that personifies cigarettes and casts them into various campus roles. This approach combines a social strategy with humor tactics to entice college students to smoke their brand. This particular comic strip is entitled “Saturday Night.” The comic features cigarettes that are dating, walking down fraternity row, and just going outside for a smoke (see Figure 151).

During the 1962-1963 academic year Lucky Strike changed its campaign strategy to a social strategy that would position its brand as a male centered product. This strategy is similar to the social strategies that Camel and Chesterfield were using. In addition, Lucky Strike works to persuade its smokers to keep smoking Lucky Strike after graduation. The
reason for this appeal is that Lucky Strike is primarily a youth or young adult brand. The headline reads, “Get Lucky – the taste to start with…the taste to stay with” (see Figure 152).

Pall Mall:

Pall Mall resumed advertising in *The Orange and White* during the 1961-1962 academic year. Pall Mall began advertising by publishing the “Girl Watchers Guide.” Part of the social strategy of the “Girl Watchers Guide” involves joining “The American Society of Girl Watchers,” sponsored by Pall Mall. This advertising serial used a humorous spoof on “girl watching” to attract new male smokers (see Figure 153).

The following academic year, Pall Mall ran a similar campaign. However, in this case, the focus was on identifying the various types of girls on campus. As in the previous campaign, there is an implicit comparison between bird watching and girl watching. In this particular case, the campus type described is a “White-Coated Lab-Loon.” Men on campus are advised not to be intimidated by her and are assured that she doesn’t really want to compete with them. The copy says that she really has marriage on her mind just like other coeds. Again, the advertisement combines a social strategy with humorous tactics (see Figure 154).

**Filtered Brands Advertised During the 1960s:**

*Tareyton:*

During the 1960-1961 academic year, Tareyton used a sensory approach to promote its brand. The headline reads, “Filters for flavor – finest flavor by far!” The rational approach that was used the previous year was still present in the 1960-1961 campaign (see Figure 155).

During the 1961-1962 academic year, Tareyton began to use a combination of a social and a sensory strategy to promote its product. Tareyton used a Roman theme that seems to tap into the Greek social life on campus. The headline reads, “Tareyton delivers
the flavor – DVAL FILTER DOES IT!” The text reads, “Veteran coach Romulus (Uncle) Remus. “We have saying a Coliseum – Tareyton separates the gladiators from the gladioli.” It’s a real magus smoke” (see Figure 156).

Winston:

During the 1960-1961 academic year Winston advertised using a rational strategy. The headline reads, “It’s what up front that counts!” In addition to informing the reader about the Winston filter, the advertisement also uses the dating context to promote its brand. The advertisement included the Winston slogan, “WINSTON TASTES GOOD like a cigarette should” (see Figure 157).

L&M:

During the 1961-1962 academic year L&M began to publish quizzes that related to relationships, careers, politics and dating. In addition to providing the quiz, L&M tells students how 1383 students at 138 colleges responded to the items. The primary advertising strategy is social because the advertisement works to show that college students smoke L&M. The tactics entertain students through the poll (see Figure 158).

The following year L&M and Chesterfield sponsored a sweepstakes called the “L&M Grand Prix” that was aimed at college students. The sweepstakes promised to award 50 Pontiac Tempests to college students. The campaign uses a rational strategy and reward tactics to promote the Chesterfield and L&M brands (see Figure 159).

Viceroy:

During the 1961-1962 academic year, Viceroy sponsored a football contest. Every week, students were to guess the winners of the next series of big football games. The $100.00 prizewinner from a previous list also had his picture published in the advertisement. The names of the winners of the $10.00 prizes were also published in the advertisement.
Therefore, this advertisement uses a social strategy combined with tactics that entertain its target audience (see Figure 160).

The next year Viceroy changed to a social strategy that also focused on the sensory aspects of smoking. The image focuses on socializing in the collegiate atmosphere and the text centers on taste (see Figure 161).

Marlboro:

The Marlboro Man made his first appearance in *The Orange and White* during the 1962-1963 academic year. The primary strategy in this advertisement is ego related. The Marlboro Man is an individual that represents an American ideal to which many men aspire, which makes him a powerful referent figure (see Figure 162).

From 1960-1963 Max Shulman continued to publish his “On Campus” column for the Phillip Morris Marlboro brand. The Max Shulman column stands in stark contrast when compared to the advertisements that feature the stoic Marlboro Man. The column continued to focus on Shulman’s humorous observations of campus life. This particular column is entitled “Another Year, Another Dollar.” In this column Shulman celebrates his ninth year writing the “On Campus” column (see Figure 163). The “On Campus” column was the last series of cigarette advertisements printed in *The Orange and White*. The final column that Marlboro sponsored was printed on November 26, 1963. All of the other brands ended their campaigns in June of 1963. However, the “On Campus” column continued to be published starting in 1965. However, Burma Shave and Persona Injection Blades served as the corporate sponsors.

**Menthol Brands Advertised From 1960-1963:**

Kool discontinued its Kool Krossword and began to advertise using a sensory strategy. The advertisement asks if the reader is tired of filter cigarettes and other menthol
cigarettes, if so the reader is urged to “Come up…All The Way Up to the MENTHOL MAGIC of KOOL!” The primary image in the advertisement is a young man who looks as if he is college-aged. Therefore, the advertisement combines a sensory strategy with referent tactics (see Figure 164).

The Salem campaign during the early 1960s continued with the same natural theme that was used during the late 1950s. The campaign uses a sensory strategy combined with referent tactics. The primary image in the advertisement shows a couple enjoying some time in a park. The headline reads, “Salem refreshes your taste – “air-softens” every puff.” Therefore, the sensation of smoking is compared with the feeling of fresh air (see Figure 165).

Summary:

During the 1960s cigarette advertising continued its dominating presence in The Orange and White. Advertising for filtered brands was more prevalent than the non-filtered brands and the filtered brands had larger advertisements than their non-filtered counterparts. Detailed explanations of the effectiveness of filters virtually disappeared as social and sensory strategies dominated cigarette advertising. If filters were mentioned in advertisements, they were promoted based on what they did not do (ie. impede flavor) instead of their actual perceived function of filtering cigarette smoke.

Conclusion:

The presence of cigarette advertising gradually increased in The Orange and White from one single brand being advertised in 1921 to ten brands being advertised by 1962. Throughout the five decades that cigarette advertising had a presence in The Orange and White, the major three strategies remained the same: social, sensory and rational. During the 1920s, the goal of cigarette advertising was to gain social acceptance for the habit. Thus, a
variety of social approaches were used. During the 1930s cigarette smoking was a way to escape stress and socialize therefore both sensory and social approaches were common. However, a combination of rational and sensory strategies was used to advertise particular innovations in product packaging. During the 1940s, the sensory strategy dominated but many of the tactics centered on patriotism because of the war effort. The creation of filtered brands revived the rational strategy to promote the effective filtration provided by a particular brand. But, social strategies were common to demonstrate the popularity of a particular brand on campus. The sensory and social strategies returned to dominance in the 1960s when advertising regulations began to control health claims and the filter wars began to subside. Although the dominant strategy changed by decade, the primary three strategies were present with a good degree of regularity.

Although the dominant strategies fluctuated a bit by decade, the cigarette industry’s skill in targeting a student audience generally increased. From the 1920s to the early 1960s an increasing number of advertisements referred to students or the collegiate environment directly. This precise targeting was complemented by games and contests that attracted student participation and interaction with the brand. Because of these sophisticated techniques, cigarette advertising in student newspapers was truly ahead of its time. The popularity of cigarette smoking on campus from the 1920s to the 1960s is evidence of the influence that tobacco advertising can have on young adults. The advertisements that were printed in student newspapers such as The Orange and White were instrumental in persuading students that smoking was a desirable, sophisticated, and glamorous habit.
Chapter Six: Discussion and Conclusion

One of the primary contributions of this cigarette advertising research is that it provides information about how the tobacco industry targeted young adults in the absence of significant governmental regulations. Without government intervention, cigarette smoking became an important element of collegiate culture from the 1920s to the 1960s. Using advertising in student newspapers as well as other promotional techniques, college students across the United States were convinced that smoking was a socially desirable habit and that smoking would help them adapt to collegiate life and to adult life after college.

The purpose of this last chapter is to discuss some of the most frequent advertising themes that appeared in *The Orange and White* and how governmental intervention through the FTC influenced the various advertising approaches that the tobacco industry was using to attract new cigarette smokers. The themes that are discussed in this chapter were identified through examining the cigarette advertisements that were published in *The Orange and White* from 1921 to 1963. Therefore, the topics generated in this chapter emerged from a study of the research itself.

**Popular Cigarette Advertising Themes in *The Orange and White***:

From the early 1920s, when cigarette advertisements began appearing in the *Orange and White*, to the early 1960s, certain themes were popular in cigarette advertisements. These advertising themes were inductively grouped into several categories that emerged from the study of cigarette advertising in *The Orange and White*. These categories include “Matchmakers,” marketing cigarettes as a way to make a connection with the opposite sex, “Career Advisors,” selling cigarettes by associating smoking with career success, “Study Buddies,” suggesting that smoking enhances scholastic performance “Smoking and Health,” promoting the health benefits or physiological consequences of smoking a specific brand,
“Advertorials and Cartoons,” creating a cigarette advertisement that entertained students by mimicking editorial content, or “Promotional Advertising,” encouraging students to tune into tobacco sponsored broadcast programming.

Career Advisors:

From the very beginning of cigarette marketing, the tobacco industry positioned cigarettes as a way to achieve success in life. From the very beginning of the industrialization of cigarette manufacturing, Duke realized that upward mobility was an important part of the American psyche. And, he capitalized upon this facet of American culture by associating cigarettes with sophistication and success.446

Both Chesterfield and Camel often featured professional looking men smoking their brands during the early 1930s (See Figure 166).447 However, Chesterfield was the first brand to directly associate smoking with career success in its advertisements in the Orange and White (see Figure 167). In this first advertisement from 1933, the headline reads, “I’m working and Smoking overtime – hence a Milder Cigarette.” From the leather bound books in the background and his professional attire, the man in the image appears to be a young lawyer. The man provides his endorsement for Chesterfield by stating, “When I work hard, I usually smoke more; and when I smoke more I usually work harder – and that’s why I want a cigarette that is milder.” Therefore, the man suggests that smoking Chesterfield is going to help him in his work by keeping him alert.

During the 1934-1935 academic year, Camel ran advertisements that made the most direct connection between career success and smoking. The advertisements featured men and women from a variety of career and social backgrounds giving their endorsement for Camel. In addition to featuring men in various careers, the advertisement also features
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women in a variety of nontraditional career paths such as being a “Horsewoman” or a “Girl Explorer.” Careers mentioned in the advertisement include: engineer, transport pilot, reporter, transpacific flyer, explorer, cameraman, and rancher. Although the individuals are involved in a variety of different vocations, they all attest to the fact that they “get a Lift with a Camel” (see Figure 168).

Because of World War Two, the use of the career advisor approach continued to be popular. During the war, Chesterfield gave a tribute to the workers of America and their contribution to the war effort in its campaign in The Orange and White (see Figure 169). For instance the text in one such advertisement reads,

ALL OVER THE WORLD – America’s 900,000 aviation workers combine their skill and experience to satisfy today’s demand for war necessities. Thanks to our airplane makers, ground crews and pilots like Capt. Haakon Gulbranson (shown here), of Pan American airways, needed supplies are flown to our fighting men all over the world.

On the other hand, if joining the military is considered a vocation, cigarette marketers have advice to give their audience relating to getting ahead in the armed forces. For instance, the advertisements give slang terms used in the various branches of the military and the testimonial from a serviceman (see Figure 170).

During the early 1950s, the popularity of the career advisor approach waned in favor of other creative appeals. However, from the mid and late 1950s to the early 1960s the Career Advisor approach returned. The reason for the return of this approach is likely the fierce competition of filter wars. The brands that used this approach were the older non-filter brands, Camel and Chesterfield. In addition to using business tycoons, Camel also connected its brand to stardom. In its 1953-1954 campaign, Camel provided stories of “How the Stars got started.” In this series of advertisements, Hollywood stars would provide their endorsement of the brand as well of the story of how they broke into the movie business.
This approach encourages the reader to connect the brand with becoming famous (see Figure 171). In the 1956-1957 Camel campaign, the headline read, “HAVE A REAL CIGARETTE…have a Camel!” In a 1956 advertisement Murray Golub, a civil engineer on the Conn. Turnpike says, “I want a real cigarette – one I can taste. That’s why I’m a Camel smoker and have been ever since college” (see Figure 172). Chesterfield had a similar campaign, however, instead of featuring a testimonial the advertisement gave the forecast for particular lucrative careers. For example, the text for an advertisement featuring a nuclear physicist reads, “Experts predict atomic plants will produce 38% of electrical energy required in the U.S. in 1980. Wanted: more physicists for research and development” (see Figure 173).

It seems that the “Career Advisor” theme was a powerful persuasive approach for cigarette marketers wanting to target a college audience. Most students attending college are interested in learning skills that can be applied to a future career. This approach seemed to be targeting college-aged men as it featured males almost exclusively. In addition, during the late 1950s and 1960s the advertisements were for non-filtered brands that positioned them as the more masculine cigarettes. The “Career Advisor” theme seems to combine a social strategy with a referent tactics. The advertisements present cigarette smoking as a way to break in to the career world that students are aspiring to join and the advertisements also present individuals that students hope to emulate when they graduate.

*Matchmakers:*

Dating and relationships with the opposite sex is one of the most popular appeals in cigarette advertisements in *The Orange and White*. Because there was some question about the social acceptability of women smoking before 1930, most of the advertisements that used a dating context focused on women approving of their husband or boyfriend’s smoking habit.
However, once smoking became acceptable for both sexes, advertisements promoted cigarette smoking as a way to connect with the opposite sex.

Advertisements began featuring cigarette smoking as a way to break-the-ice with a member of the opposite sex in the early 1930s. Although it might have been suggested that men and women might smoke together in the 1920s, advertisements first began to feature couples smoking during the 1930-1931 academic year. In a Chesterfield advertisement that ran in 1932, the headline reads, “They Click with Me, too –.” The image shows a couple sharing a pack of cigarettes. The text follows,

THE young man is saying the reason he smokes Chesterfields is because they satisfy. The young lady agrees with him. She says, “They click with me, too. I’m not what you would call a heavy smoker. But even I can tell that they are milder…”

The advertisement seems to reflect the sentiment of the time. It was socially acceptable for women to smoke. But, women were not to be heavy smokers (see Figure 174). During 1935, Lucky Strike ran a similar campaign. The headline reads, “Remember how I brought you two together.’ I’m your best friend. I am your Lucky Strike.” The image features a couple sharing a pack of Luckies (see Figure 175).

The matchmaker approach virtually disappeared during the 1940s. However, it reappeared in The Orange and White in 1954 during the filter wars. It seems that the filter wars were an impetus for cigarette brands to either develop new strategies or return to previous strategies that had been successful in the past. Winston, a filtered cigarette, was the first brand to resume this strategy. In an advertisement that ran in 1955, the headline reads, “YOU’LL BOTH GO FOR THIS CIGARETTE! Get together on Winston” (see Figure 176). The image features a young man and woman smoking together. Like Winston, Tareyton also used a matchmaking approach and featured a young man and woman smoking together (see Figure 177).
The matchmaking approach was also popular among the non-filtered brands. For instance, Camel also advertised using a dating theme. The text reads, “When classes are through, And your girl’s next to you, Here’s a good thing to do – have a CAMEL!” (see Figure 178). In 1955, Chesterfield also ran advertisements that used a dating theme (see Figure 179).

Using the matchmaker approach to advertising demonstrated how smoking could serve a social need. Many young people are interested in dating and meeting people of the opposite sex. Cigarette manufacturers demonstrated how their product could help facilitate conversation with new people. The matchmaker theme definitely employs a social strategy and positions cigarettes as a way to relieve the anxiety associated with communicating with members of the opposite sex. In addition, the advertisements use a referent tactic by showing couples that students either relate to or aspire to emulate.

**Campus Cigarette:**

Many cigarette brands worked to position themselves as the most popular brand among college students. These advertisements targeted college students very directly by mentioning their particular school or other colleges and universities by name.

In the 1920s, Old Gold was the first cigarette brand to directly target college students. The campaign headline reads, “AT LEADING COLLEGES…This is an Old Gold year” (See Figure 180). Old Gold published statements from local tobacconists that were popular with the University of Tennessee students in their advertisements. For instance, Gray Piper Drug Co., located at 1506 West Cumberland, Knoxville, TN said,

“The growth of OLD GOLD Cigarettes’ popularity here has been amazing to me, but what interests me most is the way students stick to the brand after they start smoking it. OLD GOLD smokers don’t switch.”
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Another leading tobacconist that served University of Tennessee students, J. Blaufeld & Son, 516 Gay Street, Knoxville, TN said,

“OLD GOLD is easily the fastest-growing cigarette in this locality, and I shouldn't be surprised before long to find it the most popular cigarette on the campus. The boys sure do like its smoothness.”

However, use of the collegiate theme lost popularity after 1928 and did not reappear in *The Orange and White* until the 1950s when it was one of the most popular advertising approaches. Lucky Strike used the collegiate approach consistently from 1950-1962. Lucky Strike regularly mentioned specific colleges and universities by named and claimed to be the most popular cigarette among students. Lucky Strike based its claim on the fact that it surveyed over 30,000 college students (See Figure 181). Chesterfield also claimed to be the most popular cigarette at a variety of college campuses that included Rice, Northwestern, Princeton, Cornell, University of Virginia, and M.I.T. The advertisement asked local tobacconists to certify that Chesterfield was the most popular brand (See Figure 182).

In addition to making claims about being the most popular cigarette on campus, various cigarette brands sponsored contests to recruit college smokers. Lucky Strike sponsored campus contests that included jingles, word puzzles, called “Sticklers,” and picture puzzles, called “Droodles.” In addition to winning a $25.00 prize, both students and their universities would be mentioned in Lucky Strike advertisements (see Figure 183). L&M, Oasis, and Chesterfield, the Liggett and Meyers cigarette brands, sponsored a contest between Tennessee and Kentucky football fans to see which school could collect more
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cigarette packs (see Figure 184). Viceroy also sponsored a contest that centered on school spirit and college football. In the fall of 1961, Viceroy sponsored a contest where students were challenged to select the winning teams and scores for select football games. The winner would win a cash prize and would have his or her picture featured in a Viceroy advertisement (see Figure 185).

Associating particular cigarette brands with school spirit on campus was a popular advertising theme during the 1950s and early 1960s. Sponsoring a contest or mentioning specific colleges and university by name was a way to get students interested in smoking. In addition, promoting brands based on their popularity on certain college and university campuses reinforced the idea that cigarette smoking is a desirable habit among students. Like the “Career Advisor” theme, these advertisements combine a social strategy with a referent appeal. However, these advertisements focus more intently on the present. Instead of considering the careers students want to pursue in the future and the social circles that they hope to join, the advertisements focus on fitting in with their peers and being a socially desirable member of the campus community.

*Study Buddies:*

Because college campuses are academic institutions, the primary target audience for cigarette advertisers was the student population. Students, by their very nature, are concerned about their academic performance on exams and written assignments. A good way to appeal to the student population is to make the claim that cigarette smoking enhances academic performance. The primary ways that cigarette advertisements claimed to enhance academic performance was by heightening mental acuity and alertness. R.J. Reynolds Camel brand used this particular tactic regularly from the 1934-1935 to the 1937-1938 academic year. The advertisements featured male students’ testimonials. The common headline for the
campaign reads, “GET A LIFT WITH A CAMEL!” Charles Stephens, a pre-medical student provides his endorsement for Camel cigarettes (see Figure 186). His testimonial reads,

“I’ve followed the recent scientific investigations that confirm Camel’s ‘energizing effect.’ But I already knew from my own personal experience that Camels lift up my energy and enable me to tackle my next assignment with renewed vigor. It has definitely been established that Camels are a milder cigarette.”

In addition to offering his endorsement as a fellow student, Stephens provides scientific information that relates to the benefits of smoking. In another advertisement published in the Orange and White on March 29, 1935, Lawrence Alfred Brewer offers his endorsement. His testimonial reads,

“I’M SPECIALIZING IN HISTORY – French and English history,” says Lawrence Brewer. “In addition, I have a job in the library for four hours a day, and I also work up data and material for the debating team. I’ll tell you – it keeps me going hard. I’ve got more work than time. When I am hard pressed, smoking Camels is not only a pleasure – it’s a help too. For when I feel ‘fed up’ – and it seems as though my energy were all used up – I smoke a Camel and get a lift in energy. Camels have a swell, rich flavor: due, I presume, to the use of choicer tobaccos. I smoke as many as I want to – for Camels don’t ruffle my nerves.”

Students continued to offer their testimonials during 1937. However, as time passed the students provided more ambiguous endorsement that offered less information about them as individuals. Arthur H. Waldo Jr.’s testimonial reads,

“I GET MORE ENJOYMENT FROM CAMELS” says Arthur H. Waldo Jr. College Class of ’38. “I’ve found that Camels help offer the strain of long hours of study. Working out a tough assignment often can make me feel tense inside. So at mealtime, you’ll see me enjoying my Camels.” Yes, Camels speed up digestive fluids – increase alkalinity.  

The Study Buddy approach to advertising cigarettes was particularly popular with Camel cigarettes during the 1930s. However, this creative theme disappeared after the 1930s. The “Study Buddy” theme used a rational strategy by persuading students that smoking
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tobacco would enhance academic performance. This rational strategy was combined with referent tactics. The advertisements showed successful students attributing their academic achievements to smoking cigarettes.

*Smoking and Health:*

Although the smoking and health controversy did not become a public concern until the 1950s, many cigarette advertisements mentioned health related topics in their advertisements before the dangers of smoking became well known. Before the 1950s, cigarette advertisements claimed that certain brands did not cause throat irritation or coughing, aided digestion, calmed smokers’ nerves, and did not influence athletic performance. Once health and smoking issues began to cause concerns about smoking, health claims centered on filters and the quality of particular brands of cigarettes.

During the 1920s, Old Gold was the only cigarette advertiser to make health related claims in the *Orange and White*. In its campaigns that ran from 1926-1929, Old Gold used its famous slogan “…not a cough in the carload.” In addition, many of its advertisements mentioned coughing and throat irritation and prescribed Old Gold as a solution to these undesirable consequences of smoking. In many of the advertisements, someone has consistent problems with coughing and their cough disrupts a particular situation, such as a photo shoot. A friend or relative suggests Old Golds as a coughing remedy (see Figure 187).

During the 1931-1932 academic year, Lucky Strike began to make health related claims regarding cigarette smoking. The first health related campaign that Lucky Strike ran in the *Orange and White* asked the question, “DO YOU INHALE?” The text reassured the reader by stating, “More than 20,000 physicians, after Luckies had been furnished them for tests, basing their opinion on their smoking experience, stated that Luckies are less irritating to the throat than other cigarettes” (See Figure 188). Towards the end of the decade, Lucky
Strike used celebrities to attest to the healthfulness of their cigarette. In a 1937 advertisement actor Cary Grant says, “a light smoke rates aces high with my throat.” The advertisement continues by stating, “A Light Smoke ‘It’s Toasted’ – Your Throat Protection AGAINST IRRITATION – AGAINST COUGH” (See Figure 189).

Like Lucky Strike, Camel also created advertisements that mentioned the physiological effects of smoking. However, instead of mentioning the side effects that smoking Camels does not cause, the brand focused on the positive effects of smoking. For example, Camel used athletes, such as professional golfers Desmore Sute, Tommy Armour, and Gene Sarazen, as well as students to attest that smoking soothed their nerves (see Figure 190). Likewise, Camel used the testimonials from athletes such as New York Giants pitcher Carl Hubbell and tennis champion George M. Lott Jr. to attest that smoking does not impede athletic performance because “THEY DON’T GET YOUR WIND” (see Figure 191). In addition to not impeding athletic performance, Camel used the testimonials of students and professionals to claim that smoking was beneficial to digestion (see Figure 192).

During the 1940s, most advertisements connected cigarette smoking with patriotism. However, Camel continued to mention the physiological benefits of smoking Camel. In addition to mention the health benefits of the brand, Camel also advertised the fact that it contained 28% less nicotine than other leading brands. However, the advertisements failed to mention why a lower nicotine content is beneficial for smokers. To further Camel’s health claims, it used athletes such as Ralph Flanagan to promote the brand (see Figure 193). Camel also claimed that smoking Camel did not affect the “T-Zone.” The “T-Zone” was comprised of the smoker’s nose, mouth, and throat. Camel encouraged smokers to give its brand a 30-day test to prove the brand’s mildness (see Figure 194). Towards the end of the decade, Old Gold also made some claims that related to the healthfulness of smoking. This
simple advertisement emphasizes the fact that the makers of Old Gold are tobacco men and that the only thing that they attest about their product is that it is made for enjoyment. This advertisement also seems to be an effort on the part of Lorillard Tobacco Company to dismiss health concerns about smoking. Although this advertisement does not directly address health issues, it suggests that health related concerns are not important. Instead, the tobacco’s quality and enjoyment should be the smoker’s concern (see Figure 195).

During the early to mid-1950s, health claims regarding cigarette smoking increased in advertisements in *The Orange and White*. This increase was due to published reports that linked smoking to health problems and the introduction of filtered brands to help eliminate public fears about smoking. However, FTC regulations limited any health related claims and the mention of a particular filter effectiveness, tar content or nicotine content after the mid-1950s. Therefore, Health related claims disappeared from *The Orange and White* after 1958.

Both filtered and non-filtered brands made health claims during the 1950s. Non-filtered brands such as Camel and Chesterfield promoted the healthfulness of their produced based on the quality of their product. However, some unfiltered brands such as Lucky Strike, Old Gold, and Pall Mall avoided health related advertising during the 1950s. Filtered brands such as Tareyton, L&M, Viceroy, and Winston made claims about the effectiveness of their filters. Like the 1940s, Camel continued to advertise that its cigarettes had no effect on the smoker’s “T-Zone” and that smokers should give Camel a 30-day test for “mildness.” Like Camel, Chesterfield claims that the nose, throat and sinuses are not effected by smoking their brand. In addition, Chesterfield claims that its high quality cigarettes have low nicotine content. (See Figures 196 & 197). On the other hand, filtered brands such as Viceroy and L&M centered on the quality and effectiveness of the filter. For instance, L&M refers to its
filter as a miracle tip and Viceroy states that its filter is made from the same pure and natural materials found in fruit (See Figures 198 & 199).

Whether promoting the physiological benefits of smoking or reassuring smokers about the healthfulness of smoking, the relationship between smoking and health was a frequent topic in cigarette advertising in *The Orange and White*. Referring to the physiological or health related aspects of cigarette is a rational approach to advertising. This rational strategy uses product information as a means of persuading students that smoking is healthful or has desirable physiological results.

*Advertorials/ Cartoons:*

In order to entice their audience to read their advertisements, cigarettes brands mimicked editorial formats. Cigarette advertisements used comic strips, advice columns, and celebrity columnists to attract readers. This advertorial approach was almost always combined with humor. However, on a few occasions it was combined with novel or surprising information. These advertorials usually appeared in serials that ran for more than one academic year. The Max Shulman column, sponsored by Phillip Morris and Marlboro, was the longest running advertorial in *The Orange and White*. Phillip Morris Co. sponsored the column from 1953-1963. After 1963, when cigarette advertising was removed, Burma Shave and other non-tobacco sponsors continued the column.

The comic strip was the first advertorial format used by tobacco advertisers in *The Orange and White*. The first comic strip printed in the *Orange and White* was printed on October 1, 1927. The sponsor was Old Gold. The comic strip was, “Somebody Is Always Taking The Joy Out of Life,” by a cartoonist named Briggs (See Figure 200). The comic strip ran during the 1927-1928 and 1928-1929 academic years. However, the title and format of the cartoon frequently changed. During the 1929-1930 academic year, Old Gold used John
Held Jr. to create a comic in linoleum cuts that mimicked his famous “Gay Nineties” feature that poked gentle fun at the previous generation. Old Gold’s use of Held’s creative abilities helped the brand resonate with the college student audience during the 1920s. (see Figure 201). Old Gold discontinued the comic approach until 1934-1935 academic year when it began the “AT TRYING TIMES…TRY A Smooth OLD GOLD” comic campaign. This serial cartoon positioned smoking Old Golds as a “smooth” way to get out of awkward situations such as being “Pawed by a Pudgy Wudgy” or “Dished by a Dilemma.” In addition to providing a social use for smoking, the cartoons were intended to be humorous (see Figures 202 & 203).

Camel began to use a comic strip during the 1932-1933 academic year in its “It’s Fun to be Fooled…” series. In this series Camel revealed the secrets behind popular magic tricks. The point of the cartoon was to point out that its fun to be fooled during a magic show but not when choosing a cigarette (see Figure 204). Although it was popular during the 1930s, the comic approach did not return to The Orange and White until the 1950s when Camel introduced the “Campus Interviews on Cigarettes Tests.” This campaign featured a series of cartoons that personified animals describing their individual smoking habits (see Figure 205). The serial comic ran during the 1950-1951 and 1951-1952 academic years. The following academic year Camel advertised with the “…But only Time will Tell” comic. The point of the cartoon was to try to persuade students that, like everything else, you can only tell if you like smoking after you have given the habit a chance (see Figure 206). For instance the text of one advertisement reads,

ONLY TIME WILL TELL how great a student really is! And only time will tell about a cigarette. Take your time...make the sensible 30-day Camel mildness test. See how Camels suit you as your steady smoke.

Camel resumed the serial comic approach during the 1958-1959 academic year. This serial
cartoon used the slogan, “Have a real cigarette – have a CAMEL.” This series of cartoons focused on the importance of having a real cigarette. And, Camel is, of course, a real cigarette (see Figure 207). The text adjacent a cartoon reads,

More buxom blondes with shipwrecked sailors insist on Camels than any other cigarette today. It stands to reason. The best tobacco makes the best smoke. The Camel blend of costly tobaccos has never been equaled for rich flavor and easygoing mildness. No wonder Camel is the No. 1 cigarette of all.

Although Camel used the cartoon approach more than any other brand, Winston, Pall Mall, and Lucky Strike also used comics to advertise their brands. During the 1958-1959 academic year, Winston used cartoons to create a comic satire of popular literary works such as Arthurian legends and Moby Dick. In each comic, Winston cigarettes allow the hero to save the day (see Figure 208). Each cartoon ends with the familiar slogan, “Winston tastes good! Like a Cigarette Should!” Pall Mall also ran a cartoon series called “The Girl Watchers Guide.” This comic was a satirical guide for young men looking for a mate. The cartoon series ran during the 1961-1962 and 1962-1963 academic years (see Figure 209). Lucky Strike’s “Lucky Puffers” comic ran during the 1961-1962 academic year. This humorous column personified cigarettes and satirized campus life (see Figure 210).

Although cartoons and comics are a popular way to mimic editorial, *The Orange and White* also contained other forms of advertorials. For example, the popular Max Shulman comic, “On Campus” was a column where the humorist provided humorous stories and observations relating to college and university life. Although the column often was illustrated with a cartoon, the image was a subordinate feature of the advertorial (see Figure 211). In addition, Kool’s advertising campaign during the 1959-1960 academic year used a crossword puzzle format. The “Kool Krosswords” used a popular word game to mimic editorial content (See Figure 212).
From the 1920s to the 1960s, advertorials were popular in a variety of forms. Using the same format as editorial was a popular way for cigarette advertisers to get students interested in their advertising and entice them to try their product. Advertorials can include a variety of promotional tactics. Most of the cartoons and advertorials use humor to sell their brand. Other cartoons present product information or other novel kinds of facts to advertise the product.

**Promotional Advertising:**

In addition to purchasing advertising space, cigarette manufacturers also sponsored radio and television programming. Many cigarette advertisers used their advertising space to promote their product and their programs. Oftentimes, sponsoring programs also involved promoting the stars of these broadcasts.

The first advertisements that promoted cigarette-sponsored radio programming appeared in the *Orange and White* in 1929. The “Paul Whiteman Radio Hour” was promoted in a February 28, 1929 advertisement for Old Gold. The text reads,

> On your radio…OLD GOLD PAUL WHITEMAN HOUR…Paul Whiteman, King of Jazz, and his complete orchestra, broadcasts the Old Gold Hour every Tuesday from 9 to 10 P.M., Eastern Standard Time, over the Network of Columbia Broadcast System.

Although the advertisement promotes the broadcast, it is subordinate to the image, the headlines, and main body text. The promotions were printed in Old Gold’s advertisements from February to October of 1929. Like Old Gold, Lucky Strike included a promotion for “The Lucky Strike Dance Orchestra” in its 1931-1932 advertising campaign. Again, the promotional text was subordinate to all of the other text and images in the advertisements. Chesterfield gave one of its first promotional plugs for its radio shows in a February 19, 1932 advertisement. The promotional text reads,

> CHESTERFIELD’S RADIO PROGRAM – Nat Shilkret’s Orchestra and
Alex Gray, well-known soloist, will entertain you over the Columbia Coast-to-Coast Network, every night, except Sunday, at 10:30 E.S.T.

Like the promotional spots in the other advertisements, the text relating to the radio programming is the smallest in the advertisement and has nothing to do with the rest of the cigarette advertisement (See Figure 213).

However, by the end of 1932, Chesterfield was frequently using its entire advertising space in the *Orange and White* to promote its radio programs, such as an advertisement featuring the Boswell sisters. In fact, this advertisement was more focused on the sponsored broadcast than Chesterfield cigarettes (see Figure 214). Chesterfield continued to run advertisements that focused almost exclusively on its programming for the remainder of the 1931-1932 academic year. However, the following academic year, Chesterfield ran only one promotional advertisement for Arthur Tracy in the *Orange and White*. The rest of the advertisements only mentioned Chesterfield’s programming in subtext. On May 7, 1937, Chesterfield printed a promotional advertisement that invited readers to dance and sing with featured artists Hal Kemp and Kay Thompson on their program at 6:30 on Fridays on C.B.S. (See Figure 215). Chesterfield’s final promotional advertisement before the outbreak of the Second World War featured Glenn Miller. The advertisement was printed for the January 10, 1940 issue of *The Orange and White*.

On April 4, 1933, Camel ran the first promotional advertisement for its “All-Star Camel Caravan.” The full-page advertisement focused more on the programming schedule and the stars, such as singers Annette Hanshaw and Walter O’Keefe, than Camel cigarettes. However, Camel did not run another promotional advertisement for the Camel Caravan in the *Orange and White* until October 25, 1935. Again the advertisement focused more on the programming schedule and the performers, such as Walter O’Keefe, Deane Janis, Ted Husing and Glen Gray, than the Camel brand itself (See Figure 216). In 1937, Camel
introduced “Jack Oakie’s College.” The Camel sponsored radio program aired every Tuesday night and promoted the program several times in the *Orange and White*. The comic variety show presented college life as Jack Oakie thought it should be. Jack Oakie was an actor and comedian who was dubbed "The World's Oldest Freshman" because he was rather old for the collegiate roles he was frequently asked to play, including roles in *College Humor* (1933), *College Rhythm* (1934) and *Collegiate* (1935). In the movie *Rise and Shine* (1941), the 38-year-old was asked to play an 18-year-old senior.\(^{457}\) “Jack Oakie’s College” also featured performances from Benny Goodman’s Swing Band and George Stoll’s Orchestra (see Figure 217). Promoting Camel cigarettes among college students was an integral part of the program. The following is a vignette from the May 11, 1937 broadcast of “Jack Oakie’s College:”

GOODWIN:
Now back to the present, ladies and gentlemen. . .
Here's a scene at the Victor Hugo Restaurant, Beverly Hills. One of the most famous restaurants in the world. A charming young couple has just sat down at a table in the Palm Garden.

(FADE IN MUSIC)
MAN:
Well, Janet, we've certainly seen a lot today -- Malibu Beach this morning - lunch at the Brown Derby, watching a picture being shot in the afternoon - and . . .
GIRL:
And now - dinner at one of the finest restaurants in the world!
MAN:
Yes. Well, to be practical, here's the menu! What appeals to you?
GIRL:
U-m-m, let's see. Oh -- this sounds good. Jumbo squab with broccoli and candied sweet potatoes.
MAN:
That's quite an order after, an exciting day!
GIRL:
Don't worry, I'll enjoy every bit of it! Oh! Have we plenty of CAMELS?
MAN:
Of course. For "digestion's sake"!
GIRL:

You're right! It's grand to enjoy CAMELS. They give you such a delightful sense of well-being!
GOODWIN:
And, it's not surprising that CAMELS -- the cigarette that's made from costlier tobaccos -- appear on so many tables in the Victor Hugo. Here's what Hugo himself says: "Our patrons know fine tobacco as well as fine food. CAMEL Cigarettes are the overwhelming favorite here. "For digestion's sake smoke CAMELS" is a good idea to remember during and after every meal." 458

In addition to featuring a number of vignettes and sketches, this particular program featured actress and singer Judy Garland and Musician Benny Goodman.

Camel also promoted Benny Goodman's Great Swing Band's performance on the "Camel Caravan" in the Orange and White on April 15, 1938. Camel printed another promotional advertisement for Benny Goodman's Tuesday night program on January 27, 1939. The program gained popularity when it capitalized on young people’s cravings for Swing music. The swing music craze spanned from the mid-1930s to 1950. In addition to Goodman’s Tuesday night performances, the advertisement introduced Eddie Cantor's Monday evening comedy act. However, in 1940 all promotional advertisements in The Orange and White stopped because of the war. However, the radio program was broadcast on N.B.C. radio for over 20 years, spanning from 1933-1954.

In 1947, cigarette-sponsored promotional advertising resumed in The Orange and White. Phillip Morris along with its famous bellhop promoted “Phillip Morris Night with Horace Height.” The N.B.C. radio program was promoted as “The Newest Most Thrilling Hunt in America Including Top Stars from the Colleges” (See Figure 218). Several advertisements for “Phillip Morris Night with Horace Height” were printed in The Orange and White during the 1947-1948 academic year. Chesterfield began promoting the “Chesterfield Supper Club” in The Orange and White on November 19, 1948. The N.B.C. radio program

featured musicians Perry Como, Jo Stafford, and Peggy Lee (see Figure 219).

In 1950, the promotional advertising for cigarette-sponsored radio programming came to an end. However, in 1952, Phillip Morris began running promotional advertisements for its new television program “I Love Lucy” (see Figure 220). This series of advertisements comprised the last promotions for cigarette-sponsored programming in The Orange and White.

Although cigarette advertisements promoting broadcast programming were far from the most frequent advertisements in The Orange and White, it is important to mention them because they demonstrate how various cigarette brands used an integrated marketing strategy to promote cigarette smoking among college and university students. Many of these programs use a social strategy by demonstrating the popularity of the brand among students. Some combine a social strategy with celebrity tactics by associating their product with celebrities. These advertisements are unique demonstrate how broadcast and print media worked together to target students. The strategies and tactics that are used in the print advertisements seem to be consistent across media.

The Use of Endorsements:

A common theme that runs through nearly all advertising approaches is the use of endorsement. To sell cigarette smoking to the collegiate audience, advertisements used a variety of testimonials. Cigarette brands used the “Career Advisor” theme, that included the testimonials of celebrities and successful businessmen, to try to persuade students that smoking would help them reach their career goals. Advertisements also used student endorsements in college cigarette and study buddy approach to convince their audience that smoking was a popular habit among their peers. Cigarette manufacturers also used the endorsements of celebrities, athletes, and peers to help persuade students about the
healthfulness of their product. The promotional programming also implicitly or directly provided the endorsement of the musicians and actors who participated in the broadcasts. In addition to actual people, cartoons or comic characters also provided their testimonials about the product.

The use of endorsement was a powerful persuasive tool for cigarette advertisers because it works to help persuade the young audience that smoking is popular among their peer group and the social groups that they aspire to join. Therefore the advertisements communicate that cigarette smoking is both a socially acceptable and desirable habit. Cigarette smoking is also positioned as a way to create and manage social relationships. For instance, offering a stranger a cigarette is shown as a way to start social or dating relationships. It is also depicted as a way to manage uncomfortable or stressful social situations. Therefore, cigarette smoking is marketed as a tool for young people who need to learn how to navigate to social system of the adult world that they need to join. In this way, cigarettes, an unnecessary product, is given a useful and desirable role in American collegiate culture.

The Influence of Legislation on Advertising Appeals:

Cigarette advertising was very effective at persuading young adults and teenagers that cigarette smoking was essential right of passage for joining adult society. The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) recognized that the tobacco industry was engaging in some unethical practices to entice the college audience. Therefore, the FTC worked to limit the tools that the advertising industry could use before persuading the industry to completely remove the advertisements from student oriented publications. One of the most intriguing aspects of studying cigarette advertising in student newspapers is that the advertisements were virtually unregulated until the early 1950s. And, the regulations of the 1950s were minimal.
In January 1930, the FTC passed some of its very first cigarette advertising regulations. These regulations related to testimonials that Lucky Strike created that were from celebrities that did not smoke. The FTC ruled that the American Tobacco Co. had to stop creating advertising that included the testimonies of endorsers that never used their product. Further, the American Tobacco Co. needed to identify paid testimonials.\footnote{Stephen Fox The Mirror Makers: A History of American Advertisers & Its Creators. (Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1997) p.116.}

The first celebrity testimonials used in Lucky Strikes included a disclaimer that stated that the endorsement was made without monetary compensation. For instance, an advertisement featuring Jean Harlow that ran in the \textit{Orange and White} on October 29, 1931 included the following statement.

\textbf{Is Miss Harlow's Statement Paid For?} You may be interested in knowing that not one cent was paid to Miss Harlow to make the above statement. Miss Harlow has been a smoker of LUCKY STRIKE cigarettes for 2 years. We hope that the publicity herewith given will be as beneficial to her and to Fox and Columbia, her producers, as her endorsement of LUCKIES is to you and to us.

In addition to including Jean Harlow’s endorsement, the advertisement also mentions her current films (see Figure 221). This same advertising approach was also used in advertisements that featured aviatrix and actress Sally Eilers,\footnote{\textit{Orange and White}, November 6, 1931} actress Dorothy Mackaill,\footnote{\textit{Orange and White}, October 22, 1931 and February 5, 1932} actor Robert Montgomery,\footnote{\textit{Orange and White}, January 15, 1932} actor Douglas Fairbanks,\footnote{\textit{Orange and White}, February 12, 1932} actress Sue Carol,\footnote{\textit{Orange and White}, February 26, 1932} and actress Mary Ceston.\footnote{\textit{Orange and White}, March 4, 1932} Although the advertisements mentioned that the celebrity spokespeople were not compensated, both the actors and their films received publicity in the advertisements. In fact, it seemed that Lucky Strike was able to capitalize on the FTC’s restriction. Actors seemed more credible when the audience was informed that they were not...
being paid for the testimonial. In spite of Lucky Strike’s skillful management of the situation, celebrity endorsements lost popularity by the mid-1930s. However, in 1937, Lucky Strike began advertising again using celebrity testimonials. However, the testimonials were printed without any mention of whether the celebrities were compensated (see Figure 222).

In proceedings culminating in 1950 with cease and desist orders against every major tobacco company, the FTC found virtually all cigarette advertisements had been false, misleading, and deceptive.\textsuperscript{466} For instance, in the proceedings against R.J. Reynolds, like the previous case against Lucky Strike and American Tobacco Company, the FTC found that many of the celebrity endorsements for the Camel brand were deceptive because either the celebrities did not smoke or they did not smoke Camels exclusively.\textsuperscript{467} The Chesterfield “Nose, Throat, and Accessory Organs Not Adversely Affected by Smoking Chesterfields” campaign was also the subject of an FTC investigation that resulted in a cease and desist order entered against Liggett and Myers Tobacco Company.\textsuperscript{468}

In 1951, the FTC ordered the American Tobacco Company’s Lucky Strike brand to abandon any claims regarding the acid levels of its cigarettes, throat irritation, and nicotine levels. Likewise, R.J. Reynolds’ Camel cigarettes received a mandate that it had to stop advertising that smoking Camel brand aids digestion, calms the nerves, increases energy levels, doesn’t impede athletes “wind,” and that it contains less nicotine than other brands.\textsuperscript{469} Likewise, the FTC prohibited Phillip Morris from stating that its brand was less irritating

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{467} R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., 46 F.T.C. 706 (1950). modified, 192 F. 2d 535 (7th Cir. 1951), order modified, 48 F.T.C. 682 (1952).
\item\textsuperscript{468} 55 F.T.C. 354 (1958) (Bruff Depo. Exh. 7)
\item\textsuperscript{469} F.T.C. “Modified Order to Cease and Desist” (January 17, 1952) Bates Number: 980300590/059 <http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/ogo15f00>
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
than other brands of cigarettes.\textsuperscript{470} These regulations initiated a major shift in creative strategy. Before the 1950s, many of Camel’s advertisements focused on the physiological effects of smoking. For instance, the brand gave you energy and calmed your nerves but it did not impede your ability to perform in athletic events or affect the “T-Zone.” Therefore, many Camel advertisements in \textit{The Orange and White} encouraged students to consider the effects that smoking might have on their bodies. However, after 1950, Camel changed tactics and began advertising using stories of how celebrities and tycoons became successful or light-hearted cartoons to promote its brand. Likewise, during the late 1940s and early 1950s Chesterfield ran numerous advertisements to counteract health concerns. After the FTC regulations, the advertisements in \textit{The Orange and White} Chesterfield changed its approach and advertised to students by suggesting that it was the most popular cigarette on college campuses, that it was a popular cigarette among members of the opposite sex, and by suggesting that people who were successful in their careers smoked the brand. Health concerns were completely ignored in advertising for non-filtered cigarette brands.

Another set of FTC guidelines were created in 1954. The purpose of these 1954 “cigarette advertising guides” was to close the gaps in its brand specific decrees. The guides specifically prohibited all references to “throat, larynx, lungs, nose or other parts of the body,” or to “digestion, nerves or doctors.” A later press release stated, “No advertising should be used which refers to either the presence or absence of any physical effect of smoking.”\textsuperscript{471} In addition, the guides banned all tar and nicotine claims unless definite scientific evidence existed to prove the claims. However, the guides permitted the

advertising of pleasure and taste.\textsuperscript{472}

Again, these guidelines changed the advertising approaches that were used in \textit{The Orange and White}. From the middle of the 1950s to the early 1960s, advertising for filtered brands was increasing while the advertising for the non-filtered cigarettes was gradually declining. Instead of advertising referring to the effectiveness of or benefits of various filters, the advertising began to refer more exclusively to what the filters did not do. For instance, the filters did not impede the flavor or pleasure of smoking. This change in approach probably appealed to \textit{The Orange and White}'s college student audience. Young people typically are not interested in the long-term health consequences that result from smoking. Instead, they are more interested how their peers will react to the habit. From the late 1950s to the early 1960s the tobacco industry created advertisements that focused almost exclusively on the pleasure and social benefits that cigarette smoking provided. During the last five years that cigarettes were advertised in campus newspapers, \textit{The Orange and White} contained more cigarette advertising than ever before. And, the cigarette advertising was more image-based than ever before. Thus, in some ways, the FTC increased the appeal of the filtered brands by preventing them from discussing any health related issues.

Although the FTC regulations might have prevented an older generation from feeling a false sense of security about the healthfulness of cigarette smoking, the regulations did very little to help young adults and teenagers who were the industry’s primary target audience. The FTC regulations prevented the cigarette manufacturers from addressing much factual product information and forced the industry into highly successful image-based advertising campaigns that were much more appealing to young people. Not surprisingly, most students found comic strips and other humorous appeals and collegiate appeals to be

much more enticing than detailed explanations of the various types of cigarette filters. The only FTC regulation that protected the college market was the 1964 Cigarette Advertising Code that prevented cigarette companies from advertising in student newspapers such as *The Orange and White*.

The 1964 Cigarette Advertising Code formally brought tobacco promotion in student newspapers to an end. On June 19, 1963, the Tobacco Institute formally decided to pull its advertising from student media. American Tobacco Company, R.J. Reynolds, Lorillard, and Liggett and Myers all agreed to discontinue their cigarette advertising immediately. During the meeting of the Tobacco Institute, Paul Smith of Phillip Morris said that their company had not made a decision on the question of college advertising.\footnote{Temko, S.L. "The Tobacco Institute, Inc. Minutes of the Eighteenth Meeting of the Executive Committee". 18 Jun 1963 (est.). Bates: 2022975647-2022975650. \url{http://tobaccodocuments.org/pm/2022975647-5650.html}} Phillip Morris was the last cigarette advertiser to remove its cigarette promotions from *The Orange and White*. The code did not formally go into effect until 1964. Consequently, the final Marlboro sponsored Max Shulman column was printed in *The Orange and White* on November 26, 1963. It was the very last cigarette advertisement to be printed in the student newspaper at The University of Tennessee.

**Research Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research:**

Although this research endeavored to present the topic of cigarette advertising in the college press as completely as possible, there are some areas where the present study falls short. First, the research only studied the student newspaper at the University of Tennessee. Even though the cigarette industry’s media records suggests that the same advertisements were printed in nearly every college newspaper, college media sales organizations such as NEAS and CBAM suggest that schools with larger enrollments receive more national advertisements than smaller schools. Therefore, it is possible that the research presented in
this study is not representative of smaller colleges and universities. In addition, it is also possible that religious schools also might have rejected the cigarette advertising because certain denominations consider smoking to be a vice. Thus, it might prove to be helpful to compare the cigarette advertising at a large school like the University of Tennessee with tobacco advertising that was printed at smaller or private colleges.

In addition, one could argue that because the University of Tennessee is located in the southeastern United States, which is the primary tobacco-growing region, it would be a more fertile environment for cigarette advertising. Therefore, comparing the frequency of cigarette advertising at the University of Tennessee with another institution of similar size outside of the southeast could prove helpful. However, industry documents do suggest that it is likely that regional differences would be minimal.

Another possible limitation of the study is that very little information regarding the creative inspiration behind the advertising campaigns is accessible for research. Interviewing the advertising creatives and the tobacco marketers that inspired the various campaigns would be extremely useful to furthering this line of research. However, because the advertisements are between 44 and 86 years old, and because few records exist regarding the creative teams, this information would be nearly impossible to find for the majority of the campaigns.

Presentism is also a limitation of this research. It is difficult to examine cigarette advertising without considering all of the information that has become publicly available since 1963. Of course, the audience that read these advertisements did not have all of the information about smoking and viewed the habit very differently than most people do today. Therefore, the way that these advertisements are considered in 2007 is much different than they would have been considered 44 to 86 years ago. Perhaps future research could interview
people who were students when these advertisements were printed to get a more accurate perspective on how these advertisements were interpreted when they were printed. However, because of the age of some of the advertisements, it is unlikely that participants could be found to discuss the earlier decades.

Another area of study that could be explored more fully is the influence of tobacco representatives or sales people on campus and their role in persuading students to smoke. This research and other studies have reported that the cigarette industry used professional sales representatives and students to promote cigarette smoking on campus. There are still many unanswered questions regarding the techniques and objectives used in this area. Likewise, research suggests that the tobacco industry lobbied public relations and public information officers on college and university campuses to create a tobacco friendly atmosphere for students. More information could be learned about these efforts and how successful the tobacco industry was in its persuasive efforts to sway college administrators.

Even though this research has its limitations, it does present a first glance into how cigarette manufacturers targeted college students by advertising in student newspapers such as The Orange and White. This study provides the reader with a general idea regarding the frequency of cigarette advertising in student newspapers, the persuasive strategies and tactics that were used, as well as some popular creative themes and approaches that were devised to appeal to students from 1921 to 1963. Instead of providing definitive answers to questions about the influence of the tobacco industry on campus, it is hoped that this research will compel others to ask more questions about this subject. In many ways, this research seems like a starting point rather than the end for a particular stream of research.

**Conclusion:**
In conclusion, this dissertation provides the reader with a glimpse into a relatively unknown world. Very little research in advertising or history makes any reference to the presence of tobacco on college and university campuses from the 1920s to the 1960s. This research provided insights into the strong presence of cigarette advertising in student publications on college and university campuses, using *The Orange and White* as a case study. It is hoped that this research will help reveal how and why generations of America’s young adults and youth became attracted to cigarette smoking and, eventually, addicted to nicotine.
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"I'd rather have a Chesterfield!"

Figure 19: Chesterfield 1928

Everything for QUALITY
—noting for show

THAT’S OUR IDEA in making CAMELS—the Quality Cigarette.

Why, just try Camel and look at the package! It’s the only cigarette in the world made to keep it as fresh and full-flavored the moment you open the package, as when you light the cigarette. No other cigarette is so easily lighted or so readily smoked.

Camel is the cigarette that toasts your fingers and makes you feel good. It’s so light and easy on the nerves that you can smoke Camel for hours and not feel the least bit gummy.

Camel is the cigarette that gives you the most for your money. It’s the cigarette that gives you the most pleasure for the least amount of money.

Camel is the cigarette that will make you feel better and live longer. It’s the cigarette that will make you feel better and live longer.

Camel is the cigarette that will make you feel better and live longer.

Figure 20: Camel 1921

---

476 Orange and White, October 26, 1928
477 Orange and White, October 20, 1921
When silvery moonlight falls on town and field—and the long, joyous tour home is ready to begin
—have a Camel!

Some call it mellowness...

And it is something to make the heart of a smoker. To make his amber phantasies

Figure 21: Camel 1926
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478 Orange and White, April 15, 1926
479 Orange and White, January 23, 1927
It's your opinion that interests us because we make Camels for you to smoke and enjoy.

CAMEL
CIGARETTES

WHY CAMELS ARE THE BETTER CIGARETTE

The world's largest group of tobacco experts... one brand... one quality... one size package... everything concentrated on Camel goodness.

The smoothness and mildness of Camels can possibly only through the use of selected tobaccos.

The most skilled blending gives Camels in individuality of taste that is beyond imitation.

They have a mellowness that you have never known in any other cigarette, regardless of price.

Camels never lose your taste or leave an unpleasant after-taste.

Figure 23: Camel 1929

Figure 24: Fatima 1923

---

480 Orange and White, May 16, 1929
481 Orange and White, April 11, 1923
Figure 25: Pears’ Soap 1911

Figure 26: Fatima 1924

482 Overland Monthly, April 1911
483 Orange and White, January 31, 1924
Figure 27: Old Gold 1927\textsuperscript{484}

Figure 28: Old Gold 1928\textsuperscript{485}

\textsuperscript{484} Orange and White, October 1, 1927
\textsuperscript{485} Orange and White, May 27, 1928
Figure 29: Old Gold 1929\textsuperscript{486}

Figure 30: Old Gold 1930\textsuperscript{487}

\textsuperscript{486} Orange and White, March 18, 1929
\textsuperscript{487} Orange and White, January 16, 1930
Figure 31: Old Gold 1930

Orange and White, March 6, 1930

Figure 32: Old Gold 1930

Orange and White, May 1, 1930
Figure 33: Total Cigarette Advertisements by Brand – 1930

Figure 34: Brands of Cigarettes – 1930s
Figure 35: Creative Strategy by Year – 1930s

Figure 36: Creative Strategy by Percent – 1930s
Figure 37: Advertising Tactics by Year – 1930s

Figure 38: Advertising Tactics by Percent – 1930s
Every Package now a Humidor

Camel now comes with its own personal Humidor! No more fumbling with the cigarettes, no more waiting for them to cool down. Camel is the perfect companion for any smoker.

Figure 39: Camel 1931

$50,000

Paid to Winners of Camel Contest!

First Prize: $25,000
Second Prize: $10,000
Third Prize: $5,000

Figure 40: Camel 1931

---

490 Orange and White, April 23, 1931
491 Orange and White, May 21, 1931
Figure 41: Camel 1932

Figure 42: Camel 1933

492 Orange and White, April 21, 1932
493 Orange and White, January 20, 1933
Figure 43: Camel 1934

Orange and White, February 9, 1934

Figure 44: Camel 1935

Orange and White, February 25, 1935
Figure 45: Camel 1936

Figure 46: Camel 1936

496 Orange and White, February 15, 1936
497 Orange and White, February 15, 1936
Figure 47: Camel 1937\textsuperscript{498}

Figure 48: Chesterfield 1930\textsuperscript{499}

\textsuperscript{498} Orange and White, May 14, 1937

\textsuperscript{499} Orange and White, October 16, 1930
Figure 49: Chesterfield 1931

Figure 50: Chesterfield 1931

500 Orange and White, January 29, 1931
501 Orange and White, October 22, 1931
Figure 51: Chesterfield 1932

Figure 52: Chesterfield 1933

502 Orange and White, February 19, 1932
503 Orange and White, January 3, 1933
Figure 53: Chesterfield 1934

Orange and White, April 29, 1934

Figure 54: Chesterfield 1935

Orange and White, May 17, 1935
Figure 55: Chesterfield 1936

Figure 56: Chesterfield 1937

---

506 Orange and White, April 3, 1936
507 Orange and White, April 1, 1937
Figure 57: Chesterfield 1937

Orange and White, December 3, 1937

Figure 58: Chesterfield 1938

Orange and White, October 19, 1938
Figure 59: Chesterfield 1938

Figure 60: Lucky Strike 1931

510 Orange and White, January 18, 1939
511 Orange and White, October 29, 1931
Figure 61: Lucky Strike 1931

Figure 62: Lucky Strike 1932

---

512 Orange and White, October 29, 1931
513 Orange and White, November 4, 1932
Figure 63: Lucky Strike 1934\textsuperscript{514}

How Refreshing!

Luckies
They Taste Better

Luckies use the finest tobacco—only the cleanest leaves—there are the mildest leaves—they cost more—they taste better.

\textsuperscript{514} Orange and White, January 26, 1934

\textsuperscript{515} Orange and White, October 5, 1934
Figure 65: Lucky Strike 1935\textsuperscript{516}

Figure 66: Lucky Strike 1937\textsuperscript{517}

\textsuperscript{516} Orange and White, February 15, 1935

\textsuperscript{517} Orange and White, April 11, 1937
Figure 67: Old Gold

Figure 68: Old Gold 1934

518 Orange and White, October 13, 1932
519 Orange and White, October 5, 1934
Figure 69: Frequency of Cigarette Advertising by Brand

Figure 70: Cigarette Advertisements by Brand - 1940s
Figure 71: Strategy by Brand 1940s

Figure 72: Strategy by Percent
Figure 73: Advertising Tactics - 1940

Figure 74: Tactics by Percent
Figure 75: Camel 1940

Figure 76: Camel 1941

520 The Orange and White, November 8, 1940
521 The Orange and White, February 14, 1941
Figure 77: Camel 1941

Figure 78: Camel 1942

522 The Orange and White, November 21, 1941
523 The Orange and White, October 7, 1942
Figure 79: Camel 1947

Figure 80: Camel 1948

---

524 The Orange and White, October 2, 1947
525 The Orange and White, October 8, 1948
Figure 81: Chesterfield 1940

Figure 82: Chesterfield 1941

526 The Orange and White, November 29, 1940
527 The Orange and White, March 21, 1941
Figure 85: Chesterfield 1946

Figure 86: Chesterfield 1946

---

530 *The Orange and White*, January 11, 1946
531 *The Orange and White*, January 11, 1946
Figure 87: Chesterfield 1948

Figure 88: Phillip Morris 1943

532 The Orange and White, October 8, 1948
533 The Orange and White, October 23, 1943
Figure 89: Old Gold 1947

Figure 90: Raleigh 1947

---

534 The Orange and White, March 12, 1947
535 The Orange and White, January 17, 1947
Figure 91: Comparison of Advertising Across Three Classes of Cigarettes

Figure 92: Primary Unfiltered Cigarette Advertisers
Figure 93: Frequency of Advertising for Unfiltered Brands – 1950s

Figure 94: Primary Advertisers for Filtered Cigarettes – 1950s
Figure 95: Advertisers for Filtered Cigarette Brands – 1950s

Figure 96: Creative Strategy by Year – 1950s
Figure 97: Pie Chart

Figure 97: Creative Strategy by Percent - 1950s

Figure 98: Graph

Figure 98: Creative Tactics by Year – 1950s
Figure 99: Creative Tactics by Percent

Figure 100: Lucky Strike 1952

---

536 The Orange and White, October 2, 1952
Figure 101: Lucky Strike 1954

Figure 102: Lucky Strike 1954

537 The Orange and White, April 15, 1954
538 The Orange and White, October 4, 1954
Figure 103: Lucky Strike 1954

Figure 104: Lucky Strike 1956

539 The Orange and White, October 4, 1954
540 The Orange and White, November 2, 1956
Figure 105: Camel 1951

Figure 106: Camel 1952

---

541 The Orange and White, March 30, 1951
542 The Orange and White, October 23, 1952
Figure 107: Camel 1954

Figure 108: Camel 1955

---

543 The Orange and White, April 15, 1954
544 The Orange and White, October 14, 1955
Figure 109: Camel 1956

Figure 110: Camel 1958

545 The Orange and White, November 2, 1956
546 The Orange and White, November 7, 1958
Figure 111: Chesterfield 1950

Figure 112: Chesterfield 1951

---

547 The Orange and White, October 18, 1950
548 The Orange and White, October 17, 1951 and November 7, 1951
Figure 113: Chesterfield 1952

Figure 114: Chesterfield 1954

549 *The Orange and White*, October 16, 1952
550 *The Orange and White*, April 29, 1954
Figure 115: Chesterfield 1954\textsuperscript{551}

Figure 116: Chesterfield 1958\textsuperscript{552}

\textsuperscript{551} The Orange and White, May 6, 1954
\textsuperscript{552} The Orange and White, April 1958
Figure 117: Phillip Morris 1951

553 The Orange and White, April 20, 1951
STOP WORRYING about cigarette irritation

REMEMBER:
PHILIP MORRIS . . . and only Philip Morris . . . is entirely free of a source of irritation used in all other leading cigarettes!

START SMOKING FOR PLEASURE!
PHILIP MORRIS gives you MORE SMOKING PLEASURE than any other leading brand.
You—you'll be glad tomorrow, you smoked Philip Morris today!

CALL FOR PHILIP MORRIS

You'll love "I LOVE LUCY" starring LUCILLE BALL and DESI ARNAZ. The new TV laugh riot over CBS.

Figure 118: Phillip Morris 1952\textsuperscript{554}

\textsuperscript{554} The Orange and White, April 14, 1952
HUSBANDS, ANYONE?

It has been alleged that girls go to college for the sole purpose of finding husbands. That is, of course, an infamous canard, and I give fair warning that small and spunky as I am, anybody who ever says such a distasteful thing when I am around had better be prepared for a sound holloa.

Girls go to college for precisely the same reasons as men do: to broaden their horizons, to strengthen their minds, to sharpen the focus of their vision, to teach them how to think as they should. But if, by chance, while a girl is engaged in these lofty pursuits, a likely looking husband should pop into the view, why, what's wrong with that? Eh? What's wrong with that?

The question now arises, what should a girl look for in a husband? A great deal has been written on this subject. Some say character is most important, some say background, some say appearance, some say education. All are wrong.

The most important thing — her nose — in a husband is health.

Though he be handsome as Apollo and rich as Captain Mccarthy, what good is he if he just lays around all day accumulating badgers?

The very first thing to happen meeting a man is to make sure that he is sound of mind and limb. Before he has a chance to impress you with his wit and charm, ask him to uncross his legs, shut his mouth, roll back his eyes, put out his tongue, pulp his chest, run his fingers, ask him to straighten out, a straighten out, with his teeth. If he fails to pass these few basic tests, throw him in the next prospect.

If, however, he turns out to be physically fit, proceed to the second most important requirement in a husband. I refer to a sense of humor.

A man who can't take a joke is a man to be shunned. There are several simple tests to find out whether your prospect can take a joke or not. You can, for example, stuff his trousers or burn his "Mail" coming, hit him and say "I'm going to get me a new wife". Or turn loose his pet monkey or shave his hand.

After each of these deadly pranks, laugh gaily and shout "April Fool!" If he replies, "But this is November 24," or something equally shameful, cross him off your list and thank your lucky stars you found out in time.

But if he laughs silently and calls you "Little Marx" then put him in the next list. Find out whether he is gentle.

The easiest, quickest way to ascertain his gentleness is, of course, to look into the eyes as he smokes. Is it mild? Is it human? Is it male? Does it look into the pools? Does it remind you of the lass in the picture? Does it remind the necklace? Is it the perfect companion to bring to the party, the perfect evening companion? Is it pleasant? Is it gentle and friendly and full of dulcet pleasure?

I am sure, dear Philip Morris, you will find the man to your bosom with heaps of steel, for you may be sure, that he is gentle as a summer breeze, gentle as a mother's kiss, gentle to his very marrow.

And now, having found a man who is gentle and healthy and blessed with a sense of humor, why not bring him home? To make sure he will always earn a housewife living. That, fortunate, is very simple. Just enter him in Engineering.

-The makers of Philip Morris, who bring you this column, would like to know when pleasant and gentle life's companion (Philip Morris), of course!

Figure 119: Phillip Morris 1956

555 The Orange and White, 1956
HERE ARE THE CORRECT ANSWERS TO THE OLD GOLD TANGLE SCHOOLS PUZZLES

Check the record of your answers against these to see if you are automatically eligible to compete in the tie-breakers:

1. South
2. Purcell
3. Holmes
4. Indiana
5. Toledo
6. Rutgers
7. Ohio State
8. Michigan State
9. Michigan
10. Northwestern
11. Iowa State
12. Indiana
13. Syracuse
14. Wisconsin
15. Nebraska
16. Washington State
17. Penn State
18. Minnesota
19. Pennsylvania State
20. Maine
21. Rhode Island
22. Boston College
23. Wake Forest
24. Temple
25. Navy
26. Marquette
27. Kansas State
28. Kansas
29. Missouri State
30. Missouri
31. Arkansas
32. Oklahoma State
33. Oklahoma
34. Oregon State
35. Washington

Enough entries have been checked to show that many players have correctly solved all 28 puzzles, thereby creating a tie for all prizes.

If the record of your answers to the first 28 puzzles, mailed in or before December 15, coincides with the correct answers published here, you are automatically eligible to compete in the tie-breaking puzzles. The series of tie-breakers will be published in the next issue, commencing on or about January 11. Watch for the tie-breakers.

Please note Rule 2 as published in the official Temple School rules at the beginning of the contest. . . which reads as follows:

Rule 2 (b) In case more than one persons solves correctly the same number of puzzles, the prize list for and as many substitutes prize as there are persons tied, will be reserved and those as going will be released in order of tie all of tie-breaking puzzles, to determine the order in which the reserved prizes will be awarded.

YOU'LL GO FOR OLD GOLDS

Today's Old Golds are an exclusive blend of fine, nature-ripened tobaccos . . . rich ... so light ... so golden bright.

That's why Old Gold Filter Kings and King Size . . . without a filter . . . TASTE GREAT STRAIGHT. For the same reason, OLD GOLD FILTERS GIVE YOU THE BEST TASTE YET IN A FILTER CIGARETTE.

NO OTHER CIGARETTE CAN MATCH THE TASTE OF TODAY'S OLD GOLDS

Figure 120: Old Gold 1957

---

556 The Orange and White, January 11, 1957
Figure 121: Pall Mall 1959\textsuperscript{557}

Figure 122: Winston 1954\textsuperscript{558}

\textsuperscript{557} The Orange and White, February 13, 1959

\textsuperscript{558} The Orange and White, May 13, 1954
Figure 123: Winston 1956

Figure 124: Winston 1958

559 The Orange and White, April 6, 1956
560 The Orange and White, April 4, 1958
Figure 125: L&M 1954\textsuperscript{561}

Figure 126: L&M 1955\textsuperscript{562}

\textsuperscript{561} The Orange and White, November 18, 1954

\textsuperscript{562} The Orange and White, October 14, 1955
You’ll be sittin’ on top of the world when you change to L&M.

Light into that L&M. Live Modern flavor.

Smokes cleaner. Tastes best.

Best tastin’ smoke you’ll ever find!

Put yourself behind the pleasure end of an L&M. Get the flavor, the full rich taste of the Southland’s finest cigarette tobacco. The patented Miracle Tip is pure white inside, pure white outside, as a filter should be for cleaner, better smoking.

Figure 127: L&M 1958

---

563 The Orange and White, April 4, 1958
On Every Campus... College Men.
and Women are discovering why

**Viceroy**
are Smoother

Here is the reason: Only Viceroy has 20,000 filters in every tip—twice as many filters as the other two largest-selling filter brands—to give that smoother taste—that Viceroy taste!

**Viceroy** are Smoother than any other cigarette. Because Viceroy have **twice as many filters** as the other two leading filter brands!

The exclusive Viceroy filter is made from pure cellulose—soft, snow-white, natural.

Figure 128: Viceroy 1956

---

564 The Orange and White, May 11, 1956
The Orange and White, March 28, 1958
The Orange and White, November 4, 1955

Figure 129: Viceroy 1958

Figure 130: Tareyton 1955
Figure 131: Tareyton 1956

Figure 132: Tareyton 1960

---

567 *The Orange and White*, October 19, 1956

568 *The Orange and White*, April 8, 1960
You get a lot to like

filter
flavor
flip-top box

Marlboro
THE NEW FILTER CIGARETTE FROM PHILIP MORRIS

Thank's new recipe for the man-size flavor.
It comes full through the filter with an easy draw.
Thank the Flip-Top Box for the nearest cigarette package
you ever put in your pocket or purse. Popular filter price.

(MADE IN RICHMOND, VIRGINIA. FEDN A NEW PHILIP MORRIS STORE)

Figure 133: Marlboro 1956

569

569 The Orange and White, May 4, 1956
THE GIFT HORSE

I know how busy you are—studying, going to class, watching night movies—but let me interrupt your multifaceted activities—studying, going to class, helping old grads find their destinies after Homenecning—to remind you that busy is how you are—studying, going to class, watching for that one in the chemistry store—then the week goes by, and the Yuletide will soon be upon us. Busy or not, we must turn our thoughts to Christmas shopping. Let us, therefore, pause for a moment in our busy schedules—studying, going to class, nailing double—to examine a number of interesting gift suggestions.

We will start with the hardest gift problem of all: What do you give to the person who has everything? Well, here follows a list of half dozen gifts which I will gladly guarantee the person who has everything does not have:

1. A daddy's chair.
2. A low hula.
3. A street map of York.
4. Fifty pounds of chicken fat.
5. A carton of filter-Marlboro.
6. A carton of non-filter Philip Morris.

"What?" you exclaim, your young republicanism rising in wild incredulity. "The person who has everything does not have cartons of filter Marlboros and non-filter Philip Morris!" you shriek, your voice rising mockingly. "What absurd nonsense!" you reply, making a screech gesture.

And I reply with an emphatic no! The person who has everything does have filter Marlboros and non-filter Philip Morris—not for long anyway—because if he has Marlboros and Philip Morris and if he is a person who likes a well, suave, fine, flavorful cigarette—and who does not? who does not?—why, then he doesn't have Marlboros and Philip Morris; he smokes them. He might possibly have a large collection of Marlboros and Philip Morris, but that Marlboro and Philip Morris! No. An impossibility.

Now we take up another thorny gift problem: What do you buy your girl if you have no idea? Quite a challenge, you will agree, but there is an answer—an ingenious, exciting answer! Surprise your girl with a beautiful bronze head of herself!

---

Oh, I know you're not a sculptor, but that doesn't matter. All you have to do is enrol yourself to your girl's romance, so she will be willing to do you a favor. Then some night when your girl is fast asleep, have the romance better your girl's face—quietly, as not to wake her—and then quickly your plaster of Paris on top of the button and then quietly wait till a handkerchief is off, the better will keep it from sticking—and then bring in the mold, and you will have your head in it and a beautiful bust to surprise your girl with! Remember: it is important, very important—to enrol yourself to the romance, because if anything should go wrong, you don't want to be without a gift for the holiday season.

Your gift problem is no problem if you will give Marlboro to your filter smoking friends and Philip Morris to your non-filter smoking friends. Both come in soft pack or gift boxes; both are made by the sponsors of this column.

---

Figure 134: Marlboro 1958

---

570 The Orange and White, November 21, 1958
Figure 135: Salem 1957

Figure 136: Kool 1960

571 The Orange and White, October 11, 1957
572 The Orange and White, May 27, 1960
Figure 137: Comparison of Advertising Across Three Classes of Cigarettes

Figure 138: Unfiltered Cigarette Advertisements – 1960 to 1963
Figure 139: Advertisements for Unfiltered Cigarettes – 1960 to 1963

Figure 140: Advertisements for Filtered Cigarettes – 1960 to 1963
Figure 141: Advertisers for Filtered Cigarette Brands – 1960s

Figure 142: Creative Strategy by Year – 1960 to 1963
Figure 143: Creative Strategy by Percent – 1960 to 1963

Figure 144: Creative Tactics by Year – 1960 to 1963
Figure 145: Creative Tactics by Percent - 1960 to 1963

![Pie Chart](image)

Referent (32%), Inform (7%), Humor (5%), Entertain (9%), Reward/Value (47%)

Figure 146: Camel 1961

![Cigarette Ad](image)

The best tobacco makes the best smoke!

---

573 *The Orange and White*, October 27, 1961
“Hitch your wagon to a ‘growth’ industry—and grow with it!”

Figure 147: Camel 1961

“Plan your pleasure ahead, too.

Have a real cigarette—Camel

THE BEST TOBACCO MAKES THE BEST SMOKE.

Figure 148: Chesterfield 1961

574 The Orange and White, October 27, 1961
575 The Orange and White, October 27, 1961
Figure 149: Chesterfield 1962\textsuperscript{576}

\textsuperscript{576} The Orange and White, October 2, 1962
YOU MAY RECEIVE A LIFE-SIZED, AUTOGRAFED PORTRAIT OF DR. FROOD—UNLESS YOU ACT NOW!

Hurry! Rush out now—and buy a pack of Luckies! Smoke them quickly! Send the empty pack to Dr. Frood. If you do it now—Frood guarantees not to send you this photo.

CHANGE TO LUCKIES and get some taste for a change!

THIS IS NO IDLE THREAT! Dr. Frood portraits will be mailed at random beginning November 15. Only students who send us empty Lucky packs will be safe! TAKE NO CHANCES! Mail those empty packs today. Send them, with your name and address, to Dr. Frood, Box 2990, Grand Central Station, New York 17, New York.

Affectionately—
Dr. Frood

-------------------

577 The Orange and White, November 18, 1960

Figure 150: Lucky Strike 1960

-------------------
Figure 151: Lucky Strike 1961

Figure 152: Lucky Strike 1962

578 The Orange and White, November 2, 1961
579 The Orange and White, April 27, 1962
Figure 153: Pall Mall 1962

Figure 154: Pall Mall 1962

580 The Orange and White, January 12, 1962
581 The Orange and White, October 2, 1962
Figure 155: Tareyton 1960\textsuperscript{582}

Figure 156: Tareyton 1961\textsuperscript{583}

\textsuperscript{582} The Orange and White, September 20, 1960

\textsuperscript{583} The Orange and White, October 12, 1961
Figure 157: Winston 1960\textsuperscript{584}

Figure 158: L&M 1960\textsuperscript{585}

\textsuperscript{584} The Orange and White, November 18, 1960
\textsuperscript{585} The Orange and White, April 1, 1960
Figure 159: L&M 1962

Figure 160: Viceroy 1961

586 The Orange and White, November 6, 1962
587 The Orange and White, November 10, 1961
Figure 161: Viceroy 1962

Figure 162: Marlboro 1962

---

588 *The Orange and White*, May 10, 1962

589 *The Orange and White*, December 7, 1962
Figure 163: Marlboro 1962

The Orange and White, September 12, 1962
Figure 164: Kool 1960

Figure 165: Salem 1962

---

591 *The Orange and White*, October 7, 1960
592 *The Orange and White*, October 9, 1962
Figure 166: Camel 1931 Career Advisors 593

Figure 167: Chesterfield 1933 Career Advisors 594

593 Orange and White, April 2, 1931
594 Orange and White, January 17, 1933
Figure 168: Camel 1935 Career Advisors

Orange and White, April 26, 1935
Figure 169: Chesterfield 1943 Career Advisors

Figure 170: Camel 1943 Career Advisors

596 The Orange and White, March 10, 1943
597 The Orange and White, May 12, 1943
Figure 171: Camel 1954 Career Advisors\textsuperscript{598}

Figure 172: Camel 1956 Career Advisors\textsuperscript{599}

\textsuperscript{598} The Orange and White, March 4, 1954

\textsuperscript{599} The Orange and White, October 5, 1956
Figure 173: Chesterfield 1958 Career Advisors

Figure 174: Chesterfield 1932 Matchmakers

---

600 The Orange and White, November 21, 1958
601 Orange and White, November 18, 1932
Figure 175: Lucky Strike 1935 Matchmakers

---

^602 Orange and White, March 29, 1935
Figure 176: Winston 1955 Matchmakers\textsuperscript{603}

\textsuperscript{603} *The Orange and White*, December 2, 1955
Figure 177: Tareyton 1956 Matchmakers

---

604 The Orange and White, February 10, 1956
Figure 178: Camel 1956 Matchmakers\textsuperscript{685}

\textsuperscript{685} *The Orange and White*, February 24, 1956
Figure 179: Chesterfield 1955 Matchmakers

---

606 The Orange and White, October 27, 1955
And still another leading tobacconist in Knoxville, Tennessee says:

"OLD GOLD is easily the fastest-growing cigarette in this locality, and I shouldn't be surprised before long to find it the most popular cigarette on the campus. The boys sure do like its smoothness."

J. BLAUFELD & SON
516 Gay Street

Figure 180: Old Gold 1928 Campus Cigarette

---

607 Orange and White, April 12, 1928
Figure 181: Lucky Strike 1954 Campus Cigarette

---

608 The Orange and White, January 14, 1954
Figure 182: Chesterfield 1954 Campus Cigarette

Figure 183: Lucky Strike 1957 Campus Cigarette

609 The Orange and White, January 14, 1954
610 The Orange and White, October 25, 1957
Figure 184: Chesterfield/L&M/Oasis 1960 Campus Cigarette

---

611 The Orange and White, October 21, 1960
Figure 185: Viceroy 1961 Campus Cigarette

612 The Orange and White, November 10, 1961
Figure 186: Camel 1934 Study Buddies

---

613 Orange and White, November 2, 1934
Figure 187: Old Gold 1928 Smoking and Health\textsuperscript{614}

Figure 188: Lucky Strike 1932 Smoking and Health\textsuperscript{615}

\textsuperscript{614} Orange and White, November 15, 1928
Figure 189: Lucky Strike 1937 Smoking and Health

Figure 190: Camel 1937 Smoking and Health

615 Orange and White, May 17, 1932
616 Orange and White, February 26, 1937
617 Orange and White, February 26, 1937
Figure 191: Camel 1935 Smoking and Health

Orange and White, October 11, 1935
Review
The Michigan State College M.P.C. was a popular social event in the college community. The event included a special appearance by the famous Camel cigarette brand. The1936 Smoking and Health Orange and White, December 4, 1936
Figure 193: Camel 1941 Smoking and Health

Figure 194: Camel 1948 Smoking and Health

---

620 The Orange and White, December 10, 1941
621 The Orange and White, October 22, 1948
Frankly, we're bewildered as you are by all the hoop-la about laboratories, tests, and medical claims. We agree: a cigarette is supposed to give you pleasure. Period.

And your pleasure is the sole aim of the advanced scientific techniques we use in the making of OLD GOLDS . . . the best, deepest, richest smoking pleasure you've ever found in a cigarette!

If that's what you're after . . . if top-quality tobaccos at the peak of flavor are your idea of a perfect cigarette . . . then OLD GOLDS are your answer. Try 'em—for pleasure's sake!

If you want a TREAT instead of a TREATMENT...smoke O.G.s!
Figure 196: Chesterfield 1952 Smoking and Health

Figure 197: Chesterfield 1953 Smoking and Health

---

623 The Orange and White, November 6, 1952
624 The Orange and White, October 1, 1953
Figure 198: L&M 1954 Smoking and Health

Figure 199: Viceroy 1958 Smoking and Health

625 The Orange and White, November 18, 1954
626 The Orange and White, March 29, 1958
Figure 200: Old Gold 1934 Advertorials/Cartoons

---

627 Orange and White, November 2, 1934
"You wouldn't turn a dog out on a night like this!" wailed Nell.

"But father, with his slick city ways and perfumed hair, he turned my head..."

"Out ye go!" roared the irascible old yeoman... "any gal of mine that gives away the last of my smoother and better OLD GOLDS suffers the consequences. Down to the corner store with ye, and bring back a fresh carton or never darken my doorstep again!"

OLD GOLD

FASTEST GROWING CIGARETTE IN HISTORY... NOT A COUGH IN A CARLOAD

On your Radio... OLD GOLD—PAUL WHITMAN HOUR. Paul Whitman and complete orchestra... every Tuesday, 9 to 11 P.M., Eastern Standard Time.

Figure 201: Old Gold 1930 Advertorials/Cartoons

---

628 Orange and White, March 6, 1930
Figure 202: Old Gold 1935 Advertorials/Cartoons

Orange and White, February 15, 1935

Figure 203: Old Gold 1935 Advertorials/Cartoons

Orange and White, March 29, 1935
Figure 204: Camel 1933 Advertorials/Cartoons

631 Orange and White, April 11, 1933
Figure 205: Camel 1951 Advertorials/Cartoons

632 The Orange and White, March 30, 1951
Figure 206: Camel 1952 Advertorials/Cartoons

Figure 207: Camel 1958 Advertorials/Cartoons

633 The Orange and White, October 30, 1952
634 The Orange and White, November 14, 1958
Figure 208: Winston 1958 Advertisials/Cartoons

635 The Orange and White, November 14, 1958
Figure 209: Pall Mall 1962 Advertorials/Cartoons

The Orange and White, January 12, 1962
Figure 210: Lucky Strike 1961 Advertorials/Comics

637 The Orange and White, November 2, 1961
Figure 211: Marlboro 1962 Advertorials/Cartoon

638 The Orange and White, September 12, 1962
Figure 212: Kool 1960 Advertorials/Cartoon

639 The Orange and White, May 27, 1960
"I was afraid Grandfather would be Shocked..."

(Ad text)"

Figure 213: Chesterfield 1932 Promotional Advertising

[Image]

---

640 Orange and White, February 19, 1932
Figure 214: Chesterfield 1932 Promotional Advertising

Orange and White, April 29, 1932

Figure 215: Chesterfield 1937 Promotional Advertising

Orange and White, May 7, 1937
Figure 216: Camel 1935 Promotional Advertising

[Image of Camel Caravan advertisement]

And remember that Camels, which offer this all-star program for your enjoyment, are made from finer, more expensive tobacco—Turkish and domestic—than any other popular brand.

“Get a lift with a Camel!”

643 Orange and White, October 25, 1935
NEW HIT ON THE RADIO!

"Jack Oakie's College"

It's a riot—it's unbelievable—it's Oakie at his best!

Also BENNY GOODMAN's "Swing" Band,
GEORGE STOLL'S Concert Orchestra,
Hollywood comedians, and singing stars
—and—special talent from the colleges
every Tuesday night!

HERE's college life, not as it is, but as it ought to be, according to Jack Oakie! Imagine Jack Oakie running a college. Think what would happen—and tune in on this remarkable occasion—the first radio series of this popular screen star. Along with Jack, you get Benny Goodman's "swing" rhythm, George Stoll's concert orchestra, guest stars broadcasting direct from Hollywood, and—here's news—special talent from the colleges every week. A sparkling full-hour show that you won't want to miss.

EVERY TUESDAY NIGHT
6:30 pm R.S.T., 6:00 pm E.S.T., 5:30 pm M.S.T., 4:30 pm P.S.T.
WABC-CBS Network. JACK OAKIE, BENNY GOODMAN, GEORGE STOLL
Hollywood comedians and singing stars. Special college talent every week.

MADE FROM FINER, MORE EXPENSIVE TOBACCO—TURKISH AND DOMESTIC—THAN ANY OTHER POPULAR BRAND.

Figure 217: Camel 1937 Promotional Advertising
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644 Orange and White, January 15, 1937
Figure 218: Phillip Morris 1947 Promotional Advertising

Figure 219: Chesterfield 1948 Promotional Advertising
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645 The Orange and White, December 10, 1947
646 The Orange and White, November 19, 1948
Figure 220: Phillip Morris 1952 Promotional Advertising

647 The Orange and White, April 14, 1952
“None so good as LUCKIES”

“I’ve tried all cigarettes and there’s none so good as LUCKIES. And incidentally I’m careful in my choice of cigarettes. I have to be because of my throat. Put me down as one who always reaches for a LUCKY. It’s a real delight to find a Cellophane wrapper that opens without an ice pick.”

Jean Harlow

Jean Harlow first set the screen ablaze in “Hell’s Angels,” the great air film, and she almost stole the show from a fleet of fifty planes.

See her “Golden,” a Fox film and Columbia’s “Platinum Blonde.”

“*****”

Made of the finest tobaccos—The Cream of many Crops—LUCKY STRIKE Colone offers the throat protection of the exclusive “TOASTING” Process which includes the use of modern Ultra Violet Rays—the process that expels certain harsh, biting irritants naturally present in every tobacco leaf. These expelled irritants are not present in your LUCKY STRIKE. “They’re out—so they can’t be in!” No wonder LUCKIES are always kind to your throat.

“It’s toasted”

Your throat protection against irritation against cough

And Moisture-Proof Cellophane Keeps that “Toasted” Flavor Ever Fresh

TUNE IN—The Lucky Strike Dance Orchestra, every Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday evening over N. B. C. network.

MOISTURE-PROOF CELLOPHANE
Sealed Tight—Ever Right
The Unique Humidor Package Zip—And it’s Open!

See the new notched tabs on the top of the package. Hold down one half with your thumb. Tear off the other half. Simple, Quick, Zip! That’s all. Unique! Wrapped in dust-proof, moisture-proof, germ-proof Cellophane, Clean, protected, neat, FRESH—what could be more modern than LUCKIES’ improved Humidor package——so easy to open Ladies—the LUCKY TAB is—your finger nail protection.

Figure 221: Lucky Strike 1931 Legislation

Orange and White, October 29, 1931
Margaret Sullavan
says Luckies are the answer for her throat

"I am not sure which is more critical—a Broadway audience or the movie microphones. At any rate, whether in Hollywood or New York, an actress has to be certain that her performances are always up to the peak. And that means being careful of the voice and throat. That's why, though I enjoy smoking thoroughly, I try to use judgment in the cigarette I choose. When I first began smoking, Luckies were my choice, because I found this light smoke advisable for my throat. And that's as true today as ever. Luckies are still my standby."

An independent survey was made recently among professional men and women—lawyers, doctors, lecturers, scientists, etc. Of those who said they smoke cigarettes, more than 87% stated they personally prefer a light smoke.
Miss Sullavan verifies the wisdom of this preference, and so do other leading artists of the radio, stage, screen and opera. Their voices are their fortunes. That's why so many of them smoke Luckies. You, too, can have the throat protection of Luckies—a light smoke, free of certain harsh irritants removed by the exclusive process "It's Toasted". Luckies are gentle on the throat.

A Light Smoke
"It's Toasted"—Your Throat Protection
AGAINST IRRITATION—AGAINST COUGH

Figure 222: Lucky Strike 1937 Legislation

649 Orange and White, April 11, 1937
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